

A DISCUSSION
ON
ORPHANS
THE BUS MINISTRY
AND
COOPERATION

BETWEEN
ROGER JACKSON - BARRY HUDSON

1973

INTRODUCTION

On March 11, 1973, brother Barry Hudson and two young ladies stopped by the Hamilton Cross Roads church of Christ building to attend services. They were traveling on their way to Florida. The subject for that morning was, "Is the church of Christ a Denomination?" A few days later I received a letter from brother Hudson challenging me and my brethren on several points which related not only to the sermon but to work programs we did and still do engage in. The following is an exact duplication of the correspondence which followed. The elders of the Hamilton Cross Roads congregation thought it worthy of publication and have agreed to provide the finances in the interest of teaching the truth.

Though you may find many things in this correspondence to be hard and frank I ask you to remember that brother Hudson and I are brethren. I feel that the truth was served and can easily be seen. I do not feel any hatred toward brother Hudson and I believe he would say the same.

This discussion is easy to read and reflects the real issue which divides us until this day. It is with a prayer that God's word has been taught that I send this correspondence forth.

--Roger Jackson--

FRED - HARDEMAN COLLEGE LIBRARY,

61594

Roger Jackson,

1973-73

BARRY HUDSON'S FIRST LETTER

March 17, 1973

Dear Mr. Jackson,

If you would, please read this aloud to the congregation or place it on the bulletin board so that everyone may read this.

I was greatly disturbed by the things that were being done by the congregation. If you will recall, I was the young man with the two girls with me that visited the congregation on the Sunday of March 11, 1973. I was passing through on our way back to Florida College.

I am writing to tell you I do not approve of many things you do, as I cannot find a scripture that authorizes such. To support Herald of Truth, the orphan home, the College, and to buy a bus is not authorized by the scriptures. To have a bus ministry is not spoken of in the word of God or even hinted at.

In your sermon Sunday morning you said that the church of Christ is not a denomination but are you not practicing things they do and going against the Bible?

I do not write this because I hate you, but because I love your soul and am concerned. If I am wrong will you not have the same love for me and lead me to the path of right? If I have an open mind will you not also and if I am right accept the only way, the Bible?

I await your reply.

Sincerely,
Barry Hudson.

ROGER JACKSON'S FIRST ANSWER

MARCH 21

Mr. Barry Hudson
Temple Terrace, Fla.

Dear Brother Hudson;

I appreciate your letter of the 17th and the attitude you expressed in it. It is only through such attitudes that we can discuss the things that obviously divide us. I will not presently read your letter to the congregation but will inform them of its contents. The reason is because I would answer its charges and you would not be present to defend yourself. If you want me to go ahead anyway I will. If you would I think it would be best for you to come and read it to the congregation and then allow me equal time after you have finished. I'm sure the brethren would agree. I shall most assuredly place your letter in the bulletin. I am now in the middle of a series on the Great Apostasy but if you insist I will break it for a short time to insert the letter and the reply. If you would like to be placed on the mailing list it is free just let me know. Any answer will be frank so don't think I am harboring malice. Please do not allow this to be your last letter as I hope we can discuss this matter and others in detail.

Your letter had no specific reference to the items we practiced in worship Sunday but if you question any of them just write.

You first mentioned the Herald of Truth. The trouble with our anti brethren is they do not understand generic authority. Jesus said, "Go ye therefore and teach all nations..." The "Go" in that passage is generic. Paul went by foot, no doubt some went by camel or by ship. We have better means at our disposal. We may go by automobile, airplane, train, news paper, radio, or television. The Herald of Truth is merely a means of "going". So I find authorization for Herald of Truth or any other radio or television program in Matthew 28:20. Now you show me the passage that condemns it.

With regard to the Orphan Homes. In like manner I find authority to support such homes as Childhaven under generic authority. James said to support the fatherless and widows in James 1:27. He did not say how to do it and neither did anyone else in the New Testament. The command is to do it and the method is nowhere given. If you condemn us for supporting orphans this way what passage will you use? I find my authority for supporting Childhaven in James 1:27. Now you show me the passage that condemns it.

You mentioned support of the College, I suppose you meant Alabama Christian. We send brother James Turner some money each month not the College. I certainly do not go along with the congregation sending money to any college. There is no authority for that and

in this we agree. If it were a preacher training school which only trained men to preach the gospel I would be in favor of that but the Church cannot support secular education as it violates Ephesians 4:12 which gives the only three (3) areas in which the Church can function viz, Evangelism, edification, and benevolence.

Concerning the bus ministry. Your objection is that the Bible does not authorize us to bring people in to services on a bus. Please tell me where the Bible authorized you to bring those two young ladies who were with you in your automobile? If you can bring them in an automobile why can't I bring them on a bus? Every time the Lord's Church gets busy and seems to come alive for the Lord our anti brethren act up. I can't understand why you are against every project designed to further the cause of the Lord. The only way in the world you can condemn what we are doing is to make laws and restrictions where God has made none.

You charge me with going against the Bible but you gave not one passage that we have violated. What false doctrine are we practicing that the denominations practice?

You cannot condemn me on the basis of your opinions. You are correct in asserting that the only way is the Bible, now write back and give me the passage in that Divine Book that upholds your contentions that all these things are wrong and that the way you and the rest of my anti brethren are feeding the poor, preaching the gospel, and bringing in the lost sinners to hear the gospel is the only approved way.

I await your reply.

In Christian Love,

Roger Jackson
RJ/

BARRY HUDSON'S SECOND LETTER

April 4, 1973

Dear Mr. Jackson,

I appreciate so much your attitude in answering my letter. I am sorry it has taken so long to answer you but my studies here at Florida College have taken a lot of my time.

In reply to your letter, I must say before I begin that there are no two answers, one of us is right, what we need to determine now is who.

I believe in teaching the gospel! But I believe we must do it scripturally. I see nothing wrong in presenting television programs by a congregation to teach others. But the manner in which the program is paid for concerns me. When Jesus said in Matthew 28 to go and teach he was, first of all, telling His Disciples and the Church had not come into existence until the day of Pentecost. True, Jesus' death, burial, and resurrection was the start of the Church but not until the day of Pentecost did it fully come into existence. He was telling His disciples, "Now go preach this gospel everywhere you have an opportunity to do so." Nowhere do I see it said for them to collect funds from several churches, set up a central point for this money to be received, and appoint and pay secretaries and other administration people. When you send money to the Herald of Truth does all of it go to preaching the gospel or is some taken out to pay expenses not related to the gospel?

The key to James 1:27 is "oneself". Is this not talking about the individual's responsibility and not a congregation's? If a member of the Church wants to send money to an orphan home that's his business. But when the Church gives money to support something that is an individual's responsibility, that in itself becomes a sin. Why can't members of your congregation each take one of the orphans? The orphan home in Kentucky was found to have a large number of children there who were not orphans. Have you checked into this at Childhaven? Is every child there an orphan? Are you taking an individual's responsibility and making it a responsibility of the Church?

What is the difference in sending money to the college and these two institutions? The College is as worthy a subject of your money as Herald of Truth and Childhaven. Why do you draw a line here?

Is James Turner preaching at a congregation and they can't support him so you are sending him money to preach or are you putting him through college? If the latter, you can't do this. If a person is going to be a school teacher should the Church support him? Is a person not going to college to better himself in his particular field? I am paying my way through school because I cannot take the Lord's money to improve my own abilities this is my responsibility not the Church.

X My objection also to the bus ministry is that it is supported by the Church. You asked how I could come with the girls in the car Did the Church pay for the car that brought us to services? Did the bus? There you have it. Why can't the members of the congregation, especially the size of yours, pick up the children or adults? Is it because they are too lazy to do this personal service or is it easier for the Church to pay for a bus, which I noticed had a big repair bill. If y'll are interested in getting buisy and coming alive, why can't the members arise earlier on Sunday and go pick these people up?

Don't denominations support these "social" things with their money as you have done? If the congregation is really interested in serving God, they are going to have to get to work teaching the Bible, not let social things bring people in.

The reason I have not given any scriptures is because there aren't that many and you know what they are anyway because I'm pretty sure you've faced others like me before. The scriptures are silent concerning doing the things you are doing, so that is why I don't see why you do them. Matthew 28 and James 1 won't stand up and you know it. The arguements preanted from these passages are very vague and so I can't accept your side. Perhaps by continueing to write we can settle this matter. I would appreciate being put on your mailing list. I think you understand I don't write these things out of hate but only concern that the truth is taught. May God help us in our continued study.

Sincerely,

Barry Hudson

ROGER JACKSON'S SECOND REPLY

April 9

Barry Hudson
Temple Terrace, Fla.

Dear Brother Hudson;

Try as I may I must confess that it gives me no pleasure to send this second reply to your charges. It is a shame that we cannot unite our efforts in the work of the Lord. However, as long as you brethren make laws where God has made none I am afraid that I must agree with you in that both of us cannot be right. Let me reassure you that I consider you one of my brethren although I have seen the division in the Lord's Body that you and your "hobby" have caused. My remarks, though firm, shall be in the spirit of love as I take yours were. I hope that you will not do as some others, that is refuse the obvious truth when you see it. The following is an item by item answer to your letter in the order you wrote.

Your argument on Matthew 28:18-20 is not valid at all. You assert that the passage was given in reference to the work of the Apostles and individuals and did not apply to the Church since the Church was not then established. I would by all means take exception with you. Ephesians 3:10,11 states, "To the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known BY THE CHURCH (emphasis mine RJ) the manifold wisdom of God according to the eternal purpose which He purposed in Christ Jesus." The manifold wisdom of God here is the scheme of human redemption and God said it is to be made known by Jesus' Body, the Church. Surely the command in Matthew 28:18-20 to preach the consummation of that scheme therefore applies to the Church. Paul said the Church is the pillar and ground of the truth. Now the difference between anti congregations and conservative congregations is that you are sitting on that truth while we are preaching it. You brethren have been hung up on individual and congregational commands for a long time. I should like for you to give me a command given to God's people that the individual is not to perform. If all of them exclude the Church then you have destroyed its existence. What do we need it for??? I have fully sustained my argument on this passage and therefore the Church's going by a bus ministry is fully defended on the basis that in going with a bus we are adding nothing to the passage but only going. Now I did not notice that passage that I asked for in my last letter. You remember? I wanted to know where the passage was that states that the way you are doing it (if you are doing it) is the only way. I am waiting.

Now you object to a central organization to receive funds and use them in a cooperative broadcast. My friend, what in the

world are you doing different when anti congregations make up the collection from individuals on Sunday, give it to a treasurer, and then he pays the preacher? And do you not pay him for the time he spends writing his sermon, and typing his sermon, which are all secretarial work? Does all the money you collect in services go to an approved work or does some go to janitorial work, water fountains, comfortable benches, etc.? If it weren't all used to preach the gospel would the abuse argue against the principle? Be honest, the real issue is this, that you would not support the work if every penny went to preaching. Don't cloud the issue. The issue is cooperation not abuse of the program. Now did the first century Church cooperate? Acts 11:27-30 one congregation helped another. I Cor. 16:1,2 several congregations helped one. The situation with the Herald of Truth is several congregations helping one. The examples here are talking about benevolence while we are talking about evangelism both are works of the Church and if you can cooperate in one why not the other? Again I notice you forgot to give me the passage that shows that the way you are doing it is the only way. I'm waiting!

Now on Orphan Homes. At least you give more ground than most antis. Most say the Orphan Home is wrong altogether. Brother if it is right for you to support it as a Christian its right for the Church to support it. Yes James 1:27 referes to the individual but what I want to know is how it eliminates the Church? According to your reasoning five people could agree to send \$10 each to Childhaven and do it scripturally if all five took their money. They could not give it to one of the five and let him take it for that would be doing it from the treasury. If they all dropped their money in a pile they could not do it because then the money would come from a treasury. They could not send it by mail because the mail carrier would put the letters together and that would be a treasury and you can't do that. You see how ridiculous that is. According to your reasoning the Church cannot practice "pure religion." If it excluded the Church from caring for orphans it excludes the Church from caring for widows but I Timothy 5:16 clearly shows that caring for widows extends to the Church. Brother Hudson, be honest, if this passage extends to the Church in the case of widows though naming the individual why, in the name of heaven, does it not extend to the Church in the case of orphans??? Remember, you said we both can't be right! Further, let me show you that commands to individuals are also to the Church. Paul said, "Let him that is taught in the word, communicate unto him that teacheth in all good things." (Gal. 6:6). Nothing but the individual in that passage as in James 1:27. Use is made of it to authorize paying the preacher but you people do it as a congregation don't you? Why, to be consistent each of you would have to pay the preacher individually. "Consistency thou art a jewel." Now where is the passage stating that the way you do benevolence (if you do any) is the only way? You asked why each member can't take an orphan. Some of my brethren do. Have you? You brethren's trouble is you say and do not. Where is the

passage you lean on in calling us sinners in this practice? The difference in us and you is we are fulfilling James 1:27 and you brethren are arguing about it with little quibbles which have not one drop of Bible in them. I answer emphatically that all the children at Childhaven are not orphans in the sense that they have no father or mother. Now does the Bible limit our work to those who have no parents?(Eph.4:28). If a child is cast into a garbage can in infancy is he/she fatherless? Remember you said it was alright for you to send money to Childhaven even though all might not be "orphans." Then why is it not right for the congregation to do so? Lets not cloud the issue again. The issue is on whether or not Childhaven has a right to exist and if it has a right to exist it has the right to be supported. You have admitted that it has a right to exist. Now let me ask you a question and I think the true colors will show; If a child were sitting on the steps of your Church building dying of hunger and the only way you had of feeding that child was to take a dime from the Church treasury would you do so? Don't give me a clouded answer I want a yes or not if you dare. I await your answer!

We send no money to Alabama Christian College. The College trains men in secular fields and cannot be supported by congregations. When we send money to Herald of Truth we are doing the work of evangelism. When we send money to Childhaven we are doing the work of benevolence. These are authorized by Eph.4:12. We have no authority for supporting the College financially and we do NOT. Brother James Turner is a teacher in the College who trains gospel preachers and preaches for a congregation in Montgomery if my understanding is correct. He is not a school teacher he is a gospel preacher training men to preach like the people training you. We are not putting him through school.

Concerning the bus ministry. If you had no way of getting someone the gospel without the Church paying for your going would you allow them to die and go to hell before taking it out of the treasury? That answers your question about the Church paying for bringing the young ladies to services. I do not appreciate your calling my brethren lazy. But since you did lets compare notes (not righteousness) and see who is lazy. Friend, in order to bring those children and adults to services the congregation meets EVERY Saturday and goes door to door for the Lord for about 3-4 hours. On Sunday morning, Sunday night, and Wednesday night, one of the finest Christian workers I have ever met (Buck Brabham) drives that bus at least 30 miles twice to bring people to hear the gospel. On Tuesdays the ladies of this congregation meet and sew used clothes as well as make new ones for those little kids so they can come and learn about Jesus. We meet extra hours every Sunday to determine how we may better prepare ourselves to reach lost souls. Some Saturdays we spend hours distributing clothes to people who have nothing to wear to Church. They have responded. Every Sunday the cars of the brethren bring visitors. We are involved in

numerous cottage meetings each week as well as Bible correspondence courses. Sunday I baptized a young man off of the bus and we have won a whole family back as a result of this bus ministry. And you have the gall to call US lazy! Brother we are feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, caring for the fatherless and widows, and preaching the gospel to the lost while you antis are sitting in your tents of ease crying, "Unscriptural! Unscriptural!" Don't call my brethren lazy.

Since I have shown our practices to be scriptural your charge that we practice denominationalism is unfounded. I want to join hands with you and work with you but you're being unreasonable with your petty quibbles. The work of God is too urgent for us to quibble.

The scriptures are not silent as far as what we are doing and I have fully proved my arguements on Matthew 28:18-20 and James 1:27.

You are correct in that I have faced these issues before. I come from an area divided right down the middle on these issues. They will not even sit down and discuss the matter as you and I are doing. May the Lord bless you for that willingness. Try to be unbiased as I will do the same. I understand that you are sincere or else I am dissallusioned. You will receive the bulletin regularly and I hope you will pass it on.

It is my plan to put our discussion in printed form for the brethren here. When I determine we are finished I will print it.

In Christ,

Roger Jackson

BARRY HUDSON'S THIRD REPLY

Monday
May 7, 1973

Dear Brother Jackson,

In like manner, I would also say it gives me no pleasure to reply to your letter but I will continue to do so until we can come to the right answer, which is the Bible or until one of us does not write anymore. I am sorry for the delay but I had final exams and now I have a few minutes of spare time.

I likewise consider you a brother but an erring brother. When my convictions, based on what I believe to be the Word of God differ from yours, then I must consider you in error, though it gives me no pleasure in saying so.

You wanted me to show you where a command was given to individuals where the Church was not involved. In I Tim. 5:16 Paul says that if any man or woman hath widows, they should relieve them so the Church wouldn't have to be charged and the congregation could carry out other good works. We need to keep these in the proper realm. First there is individually done by Christians then there is collectively done by Christians. One congregation has the oversight of elders. These elders don't oversee a multiple of Churches but one, as instructed by the Word of God. You asked for a passage where an individual did something that they weren't required by the Church to do. Also in Acts 4, Barnabas gave land but he didn't have to give the money he acquired from the land. It was an individual thing that he did on his own. There are some things that an individual can do apart from the Church but many things done by the individual can not be done by the Church.

In I Cor. 9 Paul tells of those who preach the gospel should live by the gospel. But in V-15 he says he didn't use these things because he didn't want anyone to think he was doing it for money. Here is the command for those who preach the gospel to live of it. I agree with you wholeheartedly that much of the money goes to building nice buildings, water fountains, etc. I think we have gone overboard on this. But Brother Jackson, just because these things are done, does that justify you doing something unscriptural? Don't try to put some blame somewhere else but look at the situation as it now stands. The issue of the Herald of Truth is not cooperation but is there an abuse in the program? Is the Herald of Truth an expedient aid? Then by definition an expedient aid best fulfills what the mission of the Church best can do? If Herald of Truth is expedient then the abuses may show it not expedient. If money is wasted, abused, it is not expedient. Now show me in the whole system of Herald of Truth broadcast organization where not one penny is wasted.

A. In the Bible we find this pattern;

1. Each Church gave as it could.
2. Each Church sent directly to the preacher

c-----
 c----- PREACHER
 c-----

B.No Church ever sent money to another Church for preaching. Money was always sent to the Preacher.

A.Someone says!What difference does it make?

B.ONE BIG DIFFERENCE: One is in the New Testament but the other is not. If not authorized it can't be right.

C.No Church ever sent money through another Church for preaching.

c-----

c-----CHURCH -----PREACHER

c-----

There is no authority - either generic or specific - for a "sponsoring Church" in the work of evangelism. In the absence of authority such an arrangement can not be scriptural.

The sponsoring Church is a perversion of the function of the Church. God instructed the elders to the local Church(I Pet.5:1-4 Acts 20:28,14:23).

What we learn from this:

1.The Church may support a preacher while he preaches in that community or in another area.

2.Several Churches may support the same preacher.

3.One Church never sent to or through another Church to support a preacher. (Information from "A Study of Authority,by Billy W.Moore).

You use I Cor.16:1,2 as several congregations helping one but you left out verse 3,"And when I come,whomsoever ye shall approve by your letters,them will I send to bring your liberality (collections) unto Jerusalem." Did they send it to a centralized Church and then to Jerusalem to help them out? No! They sent it through individuals. The Herald of Truth has created a need but we are to meet the need when it comes. This is the difference between benevolence and evangelism.

Oh,yes,the orphan homes! Now let us not cloud the issue. "If it is right for a Christian to support it,why not the Church?" Again I say there is a difference between an individual and a congregation(I Tim.5:16). A mother has children. Does the mother and the Church support the child,or is it the responsibility of the Churches? With your reasoning no Christian can send money through the mail because ten other Christians might send money through the mail to buy,let's say Time Magazine. So because so many Christians subscribed to Time that means the Church supports it! Woa,brother, I can't follow that!--The Church is to care for widows only when they are qualified. Many so called "orphans" are not qualified to receive aid.

Once again you use a passage(Eph.4:28)that is talking about an individual's responsibility. Childhaven has a right to exist but the Church has no right to support it. The reason it is not right for the congregation to support Childhaven is because the benevolent work of the Church was unto the saints not-non-believers. (Acts 2:44,45,4:32-35,6:1,11:29,Rom.15:25,26,15:31,I Cor.16:1,2 II Cor.8:4,9:1,12,I Tim.5:16.). There is neither command nor example for the Church to engage in a work of general benevolence. Can you find me one?

There was, during the time of WW II, a woman named Mrs. Bergmeyer who was in a German prison camp. Her husband was in another camp and her children left alone in England. She heard that her husband had gotten out of the prison camp and was home with her children. The only way she could get out was being very sick, which she was not, or getting pregnant. She got a German guard to make her pregnant and was released to her family. Was she right in doing this?

What is the difference in supporting the college and Childhaven? Both are not supported in the Bible. Why do you support one and not the other? If we believe a principle, let us be consistent.

You keep on using the difference between ind. and congregations. I would say that Eph. 5:19 eliminates inst. music the same way it eliminates Childhaven in Jas. 1:27. Give a passage where the Church is involved in this.

Pure religion is what God gives the Church to do and what the individual is to do. I believe in James 1 it includes what it says. Lets not mix them together.

I commend your congregations work and perhaps I used a poor choice of words in calling them lazy but I think that if you people are so interested and so excited and full of energy to do the Lord's work why have a bus? With all the cars in your parking lot, I just can't believe that the members can't pick these people up without use of a bus. If you are so interested in evangelism why not use the money in a better way than for a bus? Just think of the men you could support. Are you drawing these people in on the bus by giving them the truth or are you drawing them in with food, clothing, and other such things? The gospel is the only thing that saves. Why don't you use it instead of the bus ministry?

I appreciate your sincerity in writing me and standing by what you believe is right. I think you are sincere in doing the good things you are doing but remember Cornelius was a righteous man but not saved until he did what God commanded.

Could you please send me the bulletin to 295 44th Street W Bradenton, Fla. because I am out of college now.

May God bless us as we strive to do what His Word commands.

In Christian Love,
Barry Hudson

ROGER JACKSON'S THIRD REPLY

May 17

Barry Hudson
Bradenton, Fla.

Dear Brother Hudson;

It is good for our discussion to be kept on a high plane. I wish to commend you for your Christian attitude and shall endeavor to display the same. Through this means the correspondance will be of lasting benefit to us and those who might care to read after us later.

You brethren are wont to jump around in your reasoning and discussions. When one stump is burned out from under you instead of acknowledging that you have lost your arguement you just jump to another and pass it off. I shall not allow you to do that. Lets review a little.

(1)Have you forgotten the position you took on Matt.28:18-20? I established,from the Bible,that the "go" is generic,that it was to be done by the Church(Eph.1:22,23,3:10,11) and therefore to operate a bus in the process of going is therefore perfectly right. You haven't begun to show where the bus ministry is wrong you just left the subject.

(2)If James 1:27 extends to the Church in the case of widows why does it not extend to the Church in the case of orphans? They are both joined by the COORDINATE conjunction "AND". Did you forget that one?

(3)We do not support Alabama Christian out of the Church treasury so why did you bring it up again?

(4)You have given me passages showing that the way you are doing evangelistic and benevolent work is one way of doing it but you have not given me the passage I asked for i.e. the one showing that is the only way to do it.

(5)You conveniently overlooked this question; If a starving orphan were sitting on the steps of your building and the only way you had to feed the child was to take money out of the treasury would you take one dime out to feed him?

(6)If you had no way to get the gospel to a soul unless the Church payed the expense would you let that soul die and go to hell before you took the money out of the treasury? You didn't answer that one either.

Much of your letter goes over the same ground. I will not allow you to go on as though I had not written these things.

Now to your present letter: I asked you for a command given to the Church that an individual is not to do and you reversed it. You have shown a passage that states the only way to take care of widows who are not widows indeed is by their family now haven't you got to show a passage just as plainly stating that the only way to take care of orphans is apart from the treasury in order to be equally dogmatic on that line of work? The fact that you can't find it means that your position is wrong. I Tim. 5:16 places the responsibility upon a man or woman to supply the needs of their widowed mother or grandmother. The last part says,"...that

it because you say everything is not exactly right in the home at Cullman. Well are all the families to which you brethren give your support perfect? Is everything in those homes perfect? If not you can't support it. "Consistency thou art a jewel." Yes Herald of Truth is an expedient aid and when you compare the way you antis have taken the gospel into all the world with the way we have carried it you can easily see it. We preach the gospel to more people in a week than you brethren do in a year. You say if money is waisted then the thing is no longer an expedient. You had better get rid of everything in your building that is not absolutely necessary to expediting Heb.10:25. Remove your air conditioner, water fountain, rest rooms, nursery, and your bulletin boards. You can't waiste a dime. Show me what it is that Herald of Truth is doing that waists money unnecessarily, be specific. I noticed your ear-bursting silence on my arguement about paying your preacher for the time he spends in secretarial work. Did you forget that you made a big play on the Herald of Truth paying secretaries? Surely that arguement cost you ground. Now be specific again. You stated, "Now show me in the whole system of Herald of Truth broadcast organization where not one penny is waisted." In reply I say show me in the whole budget of the congregation where you attend where not one penny is waisted.

Your example; (A) 1. Each Church gave as it could. This congregation gives as it can and nobody has said how much but us. (2) Each Church sent directly to the preacher. We send money directly to Rodney Rutherford, James Turner, and others.

Your example (B) No Church ever sent money to another Church for preaching, money was always sent to the preacher. How do you know that? It says Paul received money in II Cor. 11:8 but does not say how it was sent. If your arguement is not on cooperation as you say then you don't have an arguement. I told you it was cooperation that divided us. Without the issue of cooperation your arguement is merely on how Paul got the money and you divide God's people on such a matter! Now look at this; Acts 15:22-32. Teachings (1) One congregation can send some of its own men to assist another congregation. (2) A congregation may support those it sends out. (3) One Church may send a writing to another Church. This authorized tracts to be sent. (4) If this is true one Church may merely send the funds to another Church to purchase writings or tracts. (5) If a Church can send funds for teaching through tracts it can send funds to be used in purchasing radio time for the same purpose. (6) Since the generic authority of the passage authorizes both printed material and money to purchase other teaching material the pattern is not a set one. (7) The Church may act through the hand of a number of men as is the case with Herald of Truth. That's all the proof you heed for the principle of Herald of Truth. There is, most assuredly, New Testament authority for what you called a "sponsoring Church" in the field of evangelism. Paul, Barnabas, Silas, and John Mark all worked out of Antioch and returned there to report on their journeys although

they received money from other congregations while they journeyed (Acts 13:1-3). No argument you have presented was lost so quickly. No congregation who received support from another in the work of evangelism is placed over the supporting congregation. The Church supported's elders rule only in that congregation and no other. Acts 15:22-32 proves your statement to be wrong that no Church ever sent to another Church to support a preacher. They not only sent a preacher but sent the message. Again I remind you that your whole contention is on how the money got there. How trivial in the light of the great responsibility to preach the gospel!

You prove yourself wrong on I Cor.16:1,2. You ask concerning verse 3,"Did they send it to a centralized Church and then to Jerusalem to help them out?" Brother Jerusalem WAS THE CENTRALIZED CHURCH. It went from them to the poor. If you put those by whom it was sent between the Galatian congregations and the Church at Jerusalem you have a human organization between the Churches a point you have always used to condemn Childhaven. Herald of Truth did not create the need to preach the gospel to all the world any more than the Jerusalem brethren created the need for benevolence in the congregation there. You flat lost that one.

Remember the things I said on I Tim.5:16 and your objections to the orphan home are answered. Yes a mother has children and she is to take care of them, that is an ordinary situation. The benevolent program of the Church is activated only in unordinary circumstances. There is no need created in ordinary situations. I am inclined to agree with you on the situation of sending money through the mail. I can see your point. But lets remember what the point was. According to my position the money could be sent by the mail and be alright. According to your position it would be unscriptural and constitute a treasury. Your reasoning condemns your position. What congregation would advise all of its members to subscribe to a secular periodical as the work of the Church? That's unscriptural from the start. Many congregation would advise its membership to send individually to Childhaven as you do. This would be right from the start, since you say the principle is right, but when the money got together it would form a treasury and make it wrong according to you. Again the issue is on how the money gets there, how trivial! That is antism's reasoning, you saw the ridiculous nature, admitted it, and are still condoning such reasoning.

I agree that the Church is only to care for widows and orphans when they are qualified. Now write and tell me when an orphan is qualified.

Eph.4:28 says to give to the needy. If every individual in the congregation is doing it the Church is doing it. You said, "The reason it is not right for the congregation to support Childhaven is because the benevolent work of the Church was unto the saints not non-believers." I'm glad you said that because now we can prove conclusively that your stand against Childhaven is wrong. Gal.6:10 "As we have therefore opportunity let us do good

unto ALL men especially unto them that are of the HOUSEHOLD OF FAITH."(Emphasis mine RJ). If the household of faith in this passage refers to Christians then to whom does the ALL MEN refer? It is so obvious to a thinking soul IT REFERS TO THOSE WHO ARE NOT CHRISTIANS. Down goes your saints only argument against Childhaven!!! The passage you gave does refer to the saints but this one that you left out includes a class called "ALL MEN". When the Antioch Church sent relief to the brethren at Jerusalem in Acts 11 was every member of every household a Christian? If not the father of the house receiving money had to make sure the ones who were unbelievers were slapped away from the table. If the Church can only spend money for believers then your preacher cannot accept pay for preaching to sinners only members of the Church. You must remove water fountains lest unbelievers partake of water provided by Church money. Now don't forget to tell me who the ALL MEN of Gal.6:10 are.

Again you say the Church cannot support Childhaven because all things there are not right. Then neither can an individual support it if things are not all right there.

I have heard the example you used about the German woman. I don't know what bearing it has on our discussion. You ought to write to some of my modernistic brethren about that. I know she was wrong.

There is a lot of difference in supporting Childhaven and a college. When we send money to Childhaven we are fulfilling James 1:27. College work in secular fields is outside the guidelines of Eph.4:12.

When God gives a command and specifies how it is to be carried out we cannot do it any other way. When He gives a command and does not specify a definite way to do it it may be carried out any way which does not violate the passage by adding another command. Eph.5:19 eliminates instrumental music by stating that singing is the way to carry out God's command to make music. Jas.1:27 says to visit the fatherless and widows but nowhere does the Bible bind one way and that way alone. You can't find it and no body else can so you just make a law where God has made none. I have shown you that James 1:27 itself extends to the Church by showing the widow part extends to the Church. The passage is James 1:27 if you want to see it. Listen to what you said, "Pure religion is what God gives the Church to do and what the individual is to do." Does that not put the Church into Jas.1:27? The passage says pure religion has two parts (1)Visit widows. (2)Visit fatherless. You say the Church is to practice pure religion but if they only support widows that is only half of pure religion. If the Church can't support orphans then it can't practice pure religion. If it practices pure religion it supports orphans. You have argued the Church right into James 1:27 now go on and give up this antism.

Brother Hudson, in all honesty, we would not operate a bus ministry if we could do the same work without it. I can't tell you why these children won't come without a bus I only know they won't. We have given them Bibles for coming. They need them

anyway. The bus works better than any way we know of. We don't give much clothing to start with. Just enough that if clothing is the reason they are not coming that what we give them will get them to come. We win their confidence and then teach them the gospel. Jesus taught to make friends of the god of mammon which means to use our money to prepare for eternity if I understand Him correctly.

Surely you can see how weak your stand is. Maybe you are not convinced on all points but I know a young man of your intelligence can see the great fallacies in several points that are so clear.

This is a very profitable study. I will read the bulletins you sent me though I have bulletins from others of your position covering these matters. I look forward to your next reply.

In Christian Love,

Roger Jackson

RJ/

BARRY HUDSON'S FOURTH LETTER

Dear Mr. Jackson,

I am not afraid to answer any question you have to ask. I did not realize I had jumped from stump to stump but I will attempt to answer your "review questions". If I am wrong and cannot answer a question, I will admit it but so far I find the Bible supports me.

Now to the review questions:

(1) Perhaps I need to establish my position on Matt. 28:18-20. First of all I said it referred to the Apostles only--I still believe that. But, based on other scriptures we find where we are to preach the gospel. I believe the "go" is generic but I have to stop somewhere and according to other scriptures, there is a stopping place. I think in some instances a bus could be used, but this is only in a rare instance, and yours isn't one of those. I will deal with this later in your letter.

(2) If James 1:27 was supporting a home for widows, I would say okay but does it say that? Show me one passage in the Bible that says the New Testament Christians built a home for widows or orphans or both. I don't find one. They did assist them, though, if they didn't have any near kin to take care of them (I Tim. 5:16). Do you find an orphan home here? No. If James 1:27, when it says to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, if this gives us the commandment to build orphan homes, then the commandment that says to visit the sick necessitates us building hospitals. Have you done this? Now, Mr. Jackson, why haven't you done it? Is it because you follow some of the Bible and not all of it? The reason you don't support hospitals is because you can't find it in the Bible, so why do you support orphan homes?

(3) I am glad to hear that you don't support Alabama Christian College but you do support men there. Since when did the Church go into the support of men training preachers? I don't want the reasonings of men, I want scripture!

(4) Mr. Jackson, I have shown, from the Bible, that the evangelistic and benevolent work done "by us" is scriptural. Have you not read my letters?

(5) Yes, I did conveniently overlook your question, not by accident though. I asked you about the German woman and you said she was wrong. You contradict yourself though. The story about the German woman was an example from Joseph Fletcher's book "Situation Ethics" which means whatever the situation, the person defines it. He takes instances that will never happen and justifies his position of "free love". How many times, I ask you, how many times have you ever had a starving orphan sitting on the steps of your building? You haven't and I have never seen it. Why? Because our government provides for such. You claim not to be a situationist but you give a situation example! Why did you contradict yourself? May I quote Luther Blackman, "The emotional use that is made of the orphan home is keeping a lot of people from seeing the real issue. Convince people that homeless

children are roaming the streets cold and hungry and that the "antis" are slamming the door in their faces and scriptural arguments fall on deaf ears. The fact that there is not a word of truth in any of that doesn't matter."

(6) Oh, Mr. Jackson, you are proving yourself to be a staunch supporter of Mr. Eletcher. Show me a real life situation and we will discuss it but don't make up situations that don't exist.

I did not mean to infer that the only care for widows were by their family. In II Tim. 5 we see that widows were supported by the Church, but, and I make that a big but, only if their present family was deceased or did not have the financial ability to do so. But did they give support to just any widow or was there qualifications? Yes, there were? Did they build a home for these widows? No. Bible example is given! Once again I ask for a scripture.

When someone says, "We are looking for a home for this puppy," are they asking for contributions for to build a dog pound? No! When we are to provide a home for a widow, are we to build a home? No! How many children in Childhaven are children of parents that were children of Christians before their death? Not many, are there? Are we to support any child that comes along? Maybe by taking him into our home but not building a home for him.

You once again contradict yourself you said, "I am not in fellowship with any that do," concerning the elders having authority over more than one congregation. Do you send money to the Highland Street Congregation, whose elders have the oversight of all these Churches by the pooling of this money? Brother Blackman, "It smacks of hypocrisy to keep saying, 'I believe in the all-sufficiency of the Church' while contending that the Church must set up other organizations to do its work."

My example of an individual's doing something he was not commanded to do in Acts 4 still stands. II Cor. was written in 57 A.D. or somewhere in that time while the incidents of Barnabas was before this. Barnabas did this willingly, supported by the story in Acts 5.

We examine a person on the grounds of his being a Christian. And if he lives according to the Bible. But the money sent to Childhaven is abused. "Childhaven sold \$143,213.31 from its farm in one year and showed \$24,425.09 of that as profit. In addition to this their cash contributions ran as high as \$20,000.00 per month." (Luther Blackman). Boy, I wish some of that money could go for saving of souls. I thought the Church was to give money not make it. Can't you find a place to give money that really needs it?

I question the statement, "We preach the gospel to more people in a week than you do in a year." Have you bought members or taught them the gospel?

You condemn us for things in our buildings but yours was the same. Why are you calling us wrong when you do the same? I said before that I didn't agree with it so you still come back with it. Are you picking or do you want the truth to be known?

Your argument about the preacher getting payed for being a secretary is silly. He sleeps too doesn't he? According to your

reasoning he can't go to sleep because he is getting paid. Of men Mr. Jackson, lets stick to the Bible.

Can you find a N.T. Example that shows that the Church set up an organization to send money to Paul? You said our issue was on cooperation that divided us and that we started it. Alexander Campbell in his reformatory movement to make the Bible his only creed and since then we have followed N.T. example. You divided by bringing in the things not in the Bible.

You use Acts 15 to support your position but did you forget that this wasn't the Church but men talking about the matter of circumcision? You said the Church sent them but how did they do it? By money or by their well wishes? Vine says they were sent as messengers. Jesus sent out the 70, did they get support from a Church? Not established, right? Is it possible to be sent forth without a Church to support you?

In the Bible we read of only a Church sending to a preacher and Churches sending to a preacher but never do we read of a Church or Churches sending to a central organization and then sending preachers out. I haven't lost my argument try again.

Did this congregation send Paul, Barnabas and others by giving money to the other Church or to the men? I'm not even willing to say the Church supported them financially. Your reasoning according to Acts 15 has too many flaws. Give me something that isn't reasoning but Bible truth.

It may seem trivial to you but the gospel was foolishness to men but it is God's way, isn't it?

I'm not giving ground on I Cor. 16:1,2,3. Who were the poor that the money was given to? Members of the Church at Jerusalem- that sounds like one Church to one Church, not Churches to one Church which is centralized to give to other Churches. Why are you taking things out of context?

I said to send money to an orphan home was okay by individuals. This doesn't constitute a treasury or else the Church supports the government by taxes.

An orphan is one without parents. Does the Church have the responsibility to every orphan that exists? If so, you haven't done that. If the parents, who are members of your congregation die, then it is the responsibility for the near kin to care for it. If not any, the individuals of the Church are responsible. You asked me how many orphans I had, which was an unfair question because I wasn't married, but you are. How many do you have?

You really went far on Eph. 4:28 and Gal. 6:10 didn't you? Read Eph. 4 all the way through. Is he talking to the Church or individuals. Individuals right, for how can a Church put away lying, anger, giving place to the devil, and stealing? Is this characteristic of the Church? When it says he, his, him, are not these all personal pronouns? I'm not very smart in English but I'm not foolish enough to think he is talking about a collection of people! If we are to do good to all men, why don't we build highways, movie theatres, anything that men think is good, the Church should support according to your reasoning.

You are using situation ethics again with the example of the father slapping the hand!

Did I ever say an individual could support Childhaven? I said he could support an orphan home. There are other homes other than the "Church of Christ Orphan Homes". The government usually takes care of the orphans needs anyway so why should the Church support it?

Do you believe there are any individuals in the Bible? According to you everyone in the N.T. constitutes the Church. In James 1 he sends greetings to the brethren and in Ephesians he sends greetings to the saints. In Eph.4:28, he gives advice to individuals who are a part of the body. Why do you call everything the Church instead of individuals, as indicated by the use of grammar?

You said without the bus you couldn't get the kids to come. How do you know? Have you tried it? I still say the members can pick these people up. One time a boy told me he had to wear long hair and drink so he could be "in" so he could talk to them about Christ. Should he do wrong so he can lead them to right? C'mon Mr. Jackson, admit it, you like the bus ministry because it is easier not because it does a better job. Are these people interested only in the clothing and things you give them or in the gospel? Nowhere in the N.T. do I read where people gave things to sinners to come to Church. The same gospel that worked then works today. There is an old saying, "As long as the ice cream and cake holds out they are there but when it runs out how many are left. Have you really converted them?"

Mr. Jackson, men more knowledgable than I have written to you brethren and gotten nowhere. I feel the same and wish to discontinue these writings. We have covered the same ground over and over and I need the time for personal Bible study. It is with deep regret that I ask to close but I feel I have supported the Bible. I want to thank you for all the study I have been able to do on this from your questions. May we both continue to search the scriptures for the truth on these matters.

In Christian Love,
Barry Hudson.

ROGER JACKSON'S FOURTH REPLY

June 11

Barry Hudson
Bradenton, Fla.

Dear Brother Hudson,

I must begin this reply with a note of disappointment. I am disappointed in your last reply. The rest were worthy of a young man of your talents. They contained clear thoughts, though an error. The last reply however was unclear and distorted. It did not surprise me that you gave up the battle, and you did since you promised to write until the issue was resolved. I believe the issue has been resolved and that this is the real reason you have quit. I am surprised you did not write the full retraction of your hobby after the battle you lost on James 1:27. Brother Hudson we both know why you did not mention what I said on the passage. You said the Church was to practice the "pure religion" of James 1:27. I responded by pointing out that the "pure religion" had two parts i.e. care of widows and care of orphans. Therefore, by your own admission, THE CHURCH IS IN JAS. 1:27 just as much as the individual. You saw that, never mentioned it, and suddenly gave up the discussion. Is it any wonder why???

In No.1 of your last reply. You stated that in some instances the bus could be used but only in "rare" instances. Then you said you would give them at the end of the letter. You never did! That's why I can't see your viewpoint, because you brethren keep saying you are going to give us the Bible's only way of doing the Lord's work and then you never do. I know why you don't follow the subject forward it is because if you can say the bus can be used in rare cases the only authority you have to say where the "rare scriptural" ends and the "ordinary unscriptural" begins is YOU! That puts the whole matter of the bus ministry in the realm of opinion the same place the method of care of orphans is. Not having a scripture to sustain your contention in either field you just make a law that draws the line and go on. You labored hard but lost your Matt.28:18-20 argument with every reply. The "go" is still generic, you admitted it yourself by saying other passages make it so, and therefore my argument that generic authority allows any reasonable means of carrying out the command STANDS. The bus ministry is a means that expedites Matt.28:13-20 and adds nothing to it. No wonder you decided to quit!

✓ In No.2 of your reply. You wanted me to show you where the New Testament Church built a home for widows supposing that that would be the only way to justify it. Brother Hudson if this were the case you could not build a building to seat in for there is no New Testament example of such. The building is an expedient which adds nothing to the command to assemble. Now a home for qualified widows would be an expedient also. But there are not as many such widows as orphans so the orphans need it and the

views last. You never did tell me that most crucial defini-
tion of a "qualified orphan". You made a big play on the fact that
some orphans at Childhaven were not qualified. I really wanted
to see if you would dare go as far as to really let it be known
how many laws you would make for God, even to defining an orphan.
I know what you consider a "qualified orphan" anyway, one who has
no living parents. The brother who wrote the bulletins you sent
to me said some of the "Orphans" he had had living parents.
You knew it and was as silent as the tomb. If you said a "Qual-
ified Orphan" was one with no living parents and Childhaven had
unqualified orphans then so did your brother Smith. If you take
the other view that an orphan is one who has no one who will take
care of him you would justify Childhaven on the grounds that all
of the orphans are qualified. On one hand you condemn brother
Smith and on the other you justify Childhaven so you just quit.
The command to visit the sick does not authorize building a hospi-
tal since there is a great difference in visiting the sick and
healing the sick. A hospital can heal the sick but the Church is
to provide for their needs (visit) while they are recovering. If
we had been commanded to heal the sick we would be authorized to
build a hospital. You have no parallel. Why weren't you as honest
with my argument on the passage? I pointed out that if the
widow part of James 1:27 extended to the Church and care for
widows and orphans were connected with the coordinate conjunction
"and" why did not the care for orphans extend to the Church? Your
failure to even notice this argument and others just as weighty
is the reason you do not gain more converts from among conserva-
tive brethren.

In No.3 of your last reply. You show your true colors when
you object to supporting men to train gospel preachers. It is
quite obvious in the New Testament that Paul instructed Timothy
and Titus, two young gospel preachers. Paul even called Timothy
his son in the faith. Did not the Church support Paul while he
did this? You admitted that yourself. Your own words continue
to condemn your position. Timothy was a companion to Paul until
the very end for Paul wrote to him to come to him at Rome. If
you convert a young man to the faith and proceed to teach him
while you receive a salary from the Church what else are you
doing but training a gospel preacher if he someday preaches?
Your position is unscriptural, unreasonable, and utterly unthinkable.
According to your reasoning Paul could have never written
I & II Timothy or Titus giving instruction in their ministry
because he was spending his time training a gospel preacher while
receiving money from the Church. Shame on you for such a blunder!
I'd quit too!

In No.4 of your last reply. I am glad to agree with you that
you have shown from the Bible that the benevolent work you brethren
do is scriptural. I have never questioned that and said so.
You sought to dodge the issue and you knew it when you did. What
I wanted to know and still do is where the Bible says THE WAY WE
ARE DOING IT IS WRONG. You never offered that passage of scripture.

The division comes when you say we are going to hell for the way we are doing it and leave it there.

In No.5 of your last reply. I knew when you asked it where your example of the German woman came from. It is quite common and used often in conservative circles.. I did not ask you if the case of the starving orphan was possible or not but what you would do if it happened. You are afraid to answer my questions after all. Alan Highers asked the same question to Eural Bingham in their debate in Corinth Mississippi. He made the mistake of answering it. In so doing he gave up his entire position. Brother Bingham was surely more honest than you. He admitted he would take a dime out of the treasury to feed the child. The only reason you would fail to answer is because you would not. You people would let a child starve before you would give up your unscriptural hobby, you would let a soul perish in hell before you would send a bus to expedite Matt.28:18-20 surely the devil is delighted in you. Your situation ethics arguement is not a necessary conclusion to my position but a twisted view you have manufactured. In the end you do as all false teachers must, you grab at straws. The situation that I gave is not only possible but real. While you wrangle about methods and cooperation all supported by generic authority, there are orphans at your door you can't touch because of your pet theory. There aren't any orphans on the door step of our building and if there were we would either cloth them ourselves or send them to Childhaven after our means were exhausted. WHAT WOULD YOU DO? I had hoped you would say. Luther Blackman needs to read our discussion and some others and he would change his tune as many times as you have in this discussion. You know good and well that the emotional appeal is not the grounds of our contention. I think it is the crafty handling of God's word by men like Luther Blackman that has prejudiced your mind so that you cannot see the obvious insurmountable contradictions you have encountered in this discussion. Perhaps you did see them and that is the reason why you quit.

In No.6 of your last reply. I am not a supporter of Fletcher and you know it. I have given you Book, chapter, and verse for my position.

You are wont to talk much about "rare" cases and big "buts" in the reasoning before us. In other words what ever seems to support me is a "rare case" and what contradicts you is a big "but". YOU MINIMIZE THE DISAGREEABLE AND MAGNIFY THE AGREEABLE IN YOUR CASE. I thought you were going to be honest. We don't know whether they built a home for widows in the first century or not. If they did it would just expedite the command. But you are constrained by your position to say with resounding authority(?) that they did not and anyone who does will go to hell! The same reasoning knocks out your Church building. No passage says they built a building, if they did it would just expedite the command to meet. But your position constrains you to say they did not build a building therefore whosoever builds a building today will go to hell.

If the Church were commanded to care for puppies what would be wrong with building a dog house? You did not give a passage there either. Do you have a dog? If so do you care for him? When you built him a house were you doing anything but caring for him? Surely the legs of the lame are unequal. You come right back to the argument on the Church helping saints only except you conveniently omitted what I said about it. Let us review. I pointed out the fact that Gal.6:10 says do good unto ALL MEN especially unto the HOUSEHOLD OF FAITH. Now if the Household of Faith is the Church (and we both know it is) whom are the ALL MEN to whom the Church is to DO GOOD.? You say you are not afraid to answer any questions but brother you didn't dare touch that one! You know it authorizes doing good to non-members and that argument against Childhaven has been killed two times over. I know why you quit!

I maintain the statement that I made that I am not in fellowship with any congregation that exercises authority outside its own membership because I knew you were going to accuse the Highland elders of doing it. They never have exercised any authority outside Highland and if they did we would surely know it since we support their efforts. It remains for you to show where they are guilty of this charge. When the Antioch Church sent to Jerusalem did they lose their autonomy? We have the authority to stop that money at any time we desire. "If the mere transfere of money means the loss of autonomy there could be no cooperation at all." (Thomas Warren). You listen to Blackman too much.

If Barnabas could give a portion of all his money to the Church and everybody in the Church did it the Church would be active.

You still persist in objecting to Childhaven on the basis that some of the money is being abused. I thoroughly answered that and you stuck up your nose at it. I asked you to show me where not one dime of your contribution where you preach is wasted. If you cannot then your argument condemns the Church where you preach as well as Childhaven. Truth is consistent and you certainly are not. You and I are discussing the principle not the abuse. So remember that if the abuse of funds argue against Childhaven then the waisting of one dime where you preach condemns you. We can give money where they really need it but according to you antis we can't give it anywhere unless we give it according to your rules.

We have never hought anybody. That is just an empty charge which one would expect from one so engressed in a loss of position as you are.

Yes we do have water fountains and rest rooms but we don't condemn anybody for having them. You fogged the issue again. Remember I pointed out that if your argument on the Church only being able to help saints were true this meant that you could not have water fountains and rest rooms for sinners would use them. Its you who must condemn them to be consistent, incidentally that is another argument you conveniently forgot and substituted quotes from Blackman and Fletcher.

You saw the silly nature of objecting to paying for secretarial work didn't you Barry? It was you who objected to paying for secretaries remember? You brought up a Fletcher case too didn't you? You never did tell us how you could consistently object to supporting Herald off truth on the basis that some of the money went for secretaries and then pay a preacher who is a part-time secretary himself. You just sidetracked the issue and quit. I know why you quit and all the people who read this discussion will know.

If you had followed the New Testament examples of cooperation you would never have been an anti. The reason you emerged is because the Church started doing something, not because we perverted the scriptures. If we were still doing nothing you could not tell the conservative brethren from the antis.

It is possible to be sent forth without the Church supporting you. That has nothing to do with the issue. You did not touch the arguments I made on the section of scripture. I hope the readers will check that section on Acts 15. Lets see you take a journey on nothing but the brethren's "well - wishes." I dare say the mass transportation media would have something to say about that. Try to fill your automobile up on the well-wishes of the brethren. The going implies the money for the sending.

Of all these examples you gave don't you think it is just possible that they tell us that cooperation is authorized? And don't you suppose God wanted us to know that the method, since they are legion, is quite up to us? Which example did He bind as the only one? Why, my argument that the Jerusalem Church was the sponsoring Church has not been touched! You didn't really try. If you aren't willing to say that Antioch gave any money to the men who went up to Jerusalem then how can you use it as an example of the only way to preach the gospel?

It remains to be seen that all the money was given and all whom it benefited were Christians. That was the point and you lost it. Jerusalem was the centralized organization and you know it!

If it is alright for the individual to support Childhaven it is alright for the Church to support it. What is right for one is right for the other, since the care of orphans is in the line of the work of the Church.

If an orphan is only one without parents then you had better correct brother Smith who calls the children he has "orphans" when he plainly said their parents are still living. Poor fellow, he is going to hell for supporting unqualified orphans. I did not know you were a single man but in reply to your question of how many orphans I have I say everyone at Childhaven is mine in a very real sense. They can be yours for just 24 a day as Brother Smith said. You'll have to give up your hobby though.

I don't see how you can, with a straight face, say that the Ephesian letter was not written with the Church in its context. To you brethren everything is individual and if you were left alone there would be no Church. Sometimes I wonder what, if anything, you brethren teach that THE CHURCH CAN DO, Brother the

Church had better put away lying, anger, and the such like. According to you the Church could not put away evil nor practice pure religion. WHAT CAN IT DO? In one breath you say He, Him, Himself, can only refer to individual activity and then when the same words are used in Gal.6:6 with respect to paying the preacher they suddenly become words referring to congregational activity and you pay the preacher out of the treasury. "Consistency, thou art a jewel." If they can mean congregational activity in Gal.6:6 they can extend to congregational activity in Eph.4, Jas.1:27 or anywhere else. Surely the opening of your eyes to this fact was a deciding factor in your quitting!!! How absurd to think that building highways is under the benevolent program of the Church and how evidently weak is a position that stoops to such absurdities to keep such an antibiblical position!

Situation ethics involves morals so in the case of the father having to slap the hand of an unbelieving child to keep him from receiving food bought by Church money is not a situation ethics problem it is a necessary consequence of antism. If the Church can only help saints then only children who are Christians could benefit from the money sent from Antioch to Jerusalem. Don't say it couldn't happen for if there were any antis at Antioch it did happen!

Yes you did say an individual could support Childhaven. You said an individual could support an orphan home, Childhaven is an orphan home, so you said an individual could support Childhaven. Isn't that simple?

In answer to your question as to whether or not I believe there are any individuals in the Bible I reply, "Is there a Church in the Bible?" I call individuals members of the Church because that is what Paul called them in Rom.13:5ff. There are many individual members but they make up one body. When I look at my hand I look at the body and so it is with all the parts. When you look at your members you never see the body. Your anti theory is a Church killing theory.

Yes we have tried to get kids to come without the bus and some do. We are not to do wrong to lead people to the right and you have utterly failed to show where the bus ministry is wrong. The bus ministry is in no way easier than the "Car ministry" if it was you antis would be hard at it. Try it sometimes. We don't give clothing in order to get people to come to the services but in order that they may come. Fulfilling a necessity not contributing a luxury, as I am sure you will continue to broadcast in spite of the truth. You judge what you have not seen. Yes they do remain faithful. You can't help your lost cause by mud slinging..

I regret that we must close this discussion. In all honesty you know as well as those who read this material that you have not covered the arguments I presented. Some you never came back to at all. I would like to believe that you honestly missed them but I cannot. I know that many of your persuasion have written to conservative brethren before but the reason they did not

convert anybody was because their position was just as weak as yours.

I hope to begin publication of this discussion within the next 30 days if the Lord be willing as I think it will serve the cause of truth in this area as well as others. Please write if you desire a copy.

In His Service,

Roger Jackson
RJ/

FREED - HARDEMAN COLLEGE LIBRARY

61594