

Seek The Old Paths

"Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths...and walk therein."

(Jeremiah 6:16)

Vol. 4, No. 6

June 1993

THE DEVIL'S DEVICES

Paul M. Wilmoth

The devil is sly and crafty. Peter describes him as a "roaring lion, walking about, seeking whom he may devour" (I Peter 5:8). The devil does not make his appearance as we often see him pictured; in a red suit, with horns and pointed tail, carrying a pitchfork. It sure would be nice if he did! But he does not. He works through men. Often, instead of a pitchfork, he can be seen carrying a Bible. He may be working through your mate, some other family member, or a friend. Paul tells us not to be "ignorant of his devices" (II Cor. 2:11). What are some of the devices of Satan?

(1) **Misrepresentations:** Denominational preachers often tell others that the church of Christ believes in "water salvation." They know that is not the case. Yet, they still will blatantly lie about it to destroy the work of the gospel. Sometimes Satan works through members of the church in getting them to misrepresent others and try to tear down their good for the kingdom.

(2) **Emotionalism:** Satan's preachers say, "If what you teach is true, then my dear old daddy or mother, etc. died and went to

hell." That is nothing more than using emotionalism to dodge plain scriptural teaching. It is truly sad when we realize that relatives died outside of Christ, having never obeyed the plan of salvation. However, the truth is not determined by what my relatives or your relatives may have done or not done. That has no significance at all in determining what is right. God will not change his laws for me or mine; nor does he change it for you and yours. Emotions do not change the teaching of God's law.

(3) **Misuse of scripture:** Just because a man quotes scripture does not mean that he is interpreting it correctly. Satan quoted scripture on the Mount of Temptation but did not apply it accurately.

(4) **Compromise:** One of Satan's favorite devices is compromise. If he can just cause us to "give a little" or to "relax" our convictions a bit, he has already converted you to his side! We have more of a spirit of compromise in the Lord's church today than I have ever known before. The truth cannot be compromised and remain the truth! It becomes a perverted gospel with

any change, no matter how little.

(5) **Comparing of sins:** Satan tries to convince me that my sin is not as great as your sin. Even if that were true, sin is still sin and will keep us out of heaven.

(6) **Only positive preaching:** The Gospel is a positive gospel. In order to teach it correctly we are to "reprove, rebuke, and exhort" (II Tim. 4:1-4). Paul warns us of those who use "good words and fair speeches to deceive the hearts of the simple" (Rom. 16:17-18). Brethren, when you see a preacher who simply cannot bring himself to say anything is wrong, you are witnessing a preacher who has become a device of Satan.

(7) **Transformation:** Paul tells us that the ministers of Satan have transformed themselves into ministers of righteousness. Even Satan appears to many to be an angel of light (II Cor. 11:14-15).

We must wake up to Satan's devices before it is too late. It could be later than we think.

*P.O. Box 5000
Tech Station
Cookeville, TN 38505*

CIVIL WAR IN THE KINGDOM?

Bill Lockwood

One of the most puzzling things to my mind is the continual failure of so many self-appointed arbiters, such as befuddled West, to heed their own injunctions. ... How is it that he can write for a public paper giving all “editors and publishers” and the rest of us black eyes and then insist that before one criticizes another we are obliged to “go directly to the source to discuss the disagreement?”

LARRY WEST, a frequent writer for *Image* magazine, wrote an article entitled “Civil War In The Kingdom” which was printed in the February, 1988, issue of that paper. It is imperative that concerned Christians consider the principles he espoused in that piece. In the following, I review several of his key thoughts. Though West will doubtless say I am inaccurate, I know I am not. Followers of King Jesus therefore are obligated not to utilize West for any meeting, but to seek to win him back from the error of his way.

CIVIL WAR

Bemoaning the strife among liberal and conservative brethren, brother West likens the church to the Blue-Gray conflict between countrymen a century ago.

“Both can legitimately justify their censures. They are truly logical charges.” “And both [liberal and conservative] are right.” “We must call a truce.” “We are to love one another, even in the midst of our doctrinal disagreements.” “There is no place for civil war in God’s

nation.” “It’s time we call on our heroes on all sides – our generals and skilled warriors – and insist they drop their weapons and lead us into peace among brethren.” “May we defend brotherhood peace as strongly as we correctly defend a capella singing.”

First, West willfully distorts the truth in these lines, for all warfare is not a form of “biting and devouring one another” (Gal. 5:14-15). If our wayward brother West means anything here, it is peace at any price. Of course, brother West will deny this is his intent, but look again at what he says. “There is no place for civil war in God’s nation.” This is absolutely the biggest falsehood since Eve was tempted to eat the fruit. Jesus himself says: “*Think not that I came to bring peace on the earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword. For I came to set a man at variance against his father and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter in law against her mother in law: and a man’s foes shall be they of his own household*” (Matt. 10:34-36). Paul promised “*that from among your own selves men shall arise, speaking perverse things.*”

Warfare with the world was the very intent of our Lord’s mission and to the extent that the world invades the church, warfare will be within the church also. The wisdom that is from above does not, as West does, cry “peace” first. It is PURE, then peaceable (James 3:17). Brother West may bewail the raging conflict within to soothe many who do not know better, but it is the Lamb of God that brings it on.

Second, his pious-sounding plea for all to drop their weapons flagrantly forgets who it is that bid take them in hand. Not only so, but we are charged with the “*casting down imaginations*” with the spiritual weapons of our warfare. The simple fact is that brother West’s appeal for “open dialogue” is at cross-purposes with our marching orders, I care not how meek his appeal may sound.

Third, West’s fundamental flaw rears its ugly head at this, “may we defend brotherhood peace as strongly as we correctly defend a capella singing.” This instructs me that peace is of equal importance with truth, unless he here declares a capella singing not necessarily according to truth. Is peace of equal import as truth? While peace is indeed important, it is only a SEC-

ONDARY consideration to truth. The demand is “*buy the truth and sell it not*” (Prov. 23:23). Are we likewise commanded regarding peace? What book has West been reading? Jesus came bearing a sword of division (Luke 12:51). He even told us this was the opposite of West’s peace.

Jesus also came with Truth (John 14:6). Can West imagine our Saviour declaring he also bears error, the opposite of truth? Brother West, you are doctrinally out of step with the Lord here and before brethren support your commendable efforts to save the lost or invite you to preach in any campaign, they are under obligation to bring you back to the fold of truth if you will be led. Yes, brother West, there is a war raging – and your ‘uncertain sounding’ remarks are a part of the cause of it. Hostilities will cease when you and others of your breed quit spouting such bald-faced mistakes as this.

NAME CALLING

West chastises us for “name-calling.”

“Dear family, placing each other in predetermined categories and engaging in name calling is not fruit inspecting. Rather, it is judging, the kind of judging condemned by God.”

While it is true that “name calling” as we normally think of it is out of line since it summons up images of children hurling verbal insults at one another, West evidently has in mind something else. In the next few sentences he goes on to say that we need not be “liberals” or “conservatives,” only “Christian.” “May we not be ‘liberal’ or ‘conservative’ or ‘anti’...”

As in politics, there are varying degrees of each of these, but liberalism is generally a refer-

ence to the one who wishes to play “loose” with the rules; conservatives hold strictly to the accepted rules; and anti’s make a few extra rules of their own. Whether you, reader, agree wholly with these definitions or not, is beside the point. The fact is that EVERYONE recognizes that some views are too loose; others too tight; and others just right. Thus, I ask, is it wrong to so think? Is it sinful to generally categorize another’s stance along these lines? Surely not. As a matter of fact, I defy anyone who does a little thinking for himself concerning the burning issues of the day to avoid it!

Everyone falls within one of these boundary lines and it has become ESSENTIAL to think this way because, as brother West very well knows, the term “Christian” is adopted by representatives in each of these categories. Perhaps if we would be more consistent with the New Covenant and refer to everyone who transgresses the doctrine of Christ a “heretic,” and if every “heretic” would describe himself that way also, we would have no need to categorize one another in the liberal-conservative-anti framework. But brother West would blow the “no love” whistle on us for this usage of the word “heretic.” So, we are bound to utilize labels. Obviously, there can be an unjust tagging of someone based upon insufficient evidence, but this does not forbid the proper recognition that some are “heretics” of the worst order.

Second, West asks:

“May we just be God’s elect. May we name our stances with Bible names only.”

But brother West, this does not change the fact that some of God’s elect apostatize while pretending to stand upon the Bible alone. West knows this occurs. As a matter of fact, strict Bible ter-

minology will not please West any more since he will categorize himself as a “Christian” only – while those of us who know better recognize him as an “unfaithful Christian.” Or, to conform to scriptural nomenclature – a “heretic.” By this the reader can see there is no substance to his proposal. There ARE categories and there always have been. Hand-wringing and tear-jerking will not alter it except call into suspect those who bewail that categories exist.

Third, labeling is not fruit inspecting, per West. No, I do not think so either. It is publishing the results of inspection. Of course, I again admit that it is possible to be mistaken in judgment of another, and because of this, caution ought to be applied. However, after one discovers a bad fruit, shall we just throw it back into the bag and let the consumer find it out by the eating? I have a right to inspect, and I have also the obligation to discover to others where are the bad fruits. West’s diatribe has only the effect of, “go ahead and check out my fruit – just don’t tell anyone if you find some of them rotten.” Now, I declare he is trying by his article to protect someone, and I suspect it is himself.

West has a right to review this article. But it would be no less than absurd for me to demand him to keep his mouth shut on any egregious error he may find or ignore misrepresentations I may make. But I have an idea that if it came down to it, if he needed to, he would not hesitate to say what he thinks are my mistakes herein and thereby CATEGORIZE me against the advice of his own article.

No, reader, West’s entire blast against “name calling” is amiss. Not only is fruit inspecting required, but categorizing and labeling are biblical requirements (Titus 3:10; Rom. 16:17; et. al.). And, this in NO WAY is the judging condemned by Christ. I

admonish West to go and "learn what this meaneth."

OUR ATTITUDE

After all has been said and done, West and his friends will say, it is only the ATTITUDE that brother West wants to check. Let us see.

The chief undercurrent of his entire thesis seems to be the assumption that "attitude" is the major cause of division among churches of Christ. West says: "Doctrines...must be contested, confuted, and refuted," but the civil war, which he disparages, rages because we forget "how love acts" and "we are to love one another, even in the midst of our doctrinal disagreements." The destruction is occurring because of the "manner" in which we carry on the debate. "Strong words not clothed with expressions of love often become bitter words;" we are "not practicing the doctrine of Christ" in our debate. If anyone doubts that West charges our attitudes with the chiefest fault in the ongoing split, hear this: "All sides must stop criticizing the other. For in condemning others, we condemn ourselves,"...there is no place for civil war in the kingdom."

First, it is hard to imagine a stronger criticism of us than West gives - "We have forgotten Christ." He thereby shows himself to know that heavy doses of indictments are needed now and then to cause people to think. We ask for no more allowance than this. Brother West also indicates that he thinks his love and compassion does not just roll over to allow anything to occur, but that strong chastising is occasionally needed to correct problems.

Second, West quotes Matt. 18:15-17 to curtail us from publicly opposing one another. This is the way he thinks it should be applied:

"may we never find ourselves having failed to

obey the doctrine of Matthew 18:15-17, that of going directly to the source to discuss the disagreement."

One of the most puzzling things to my mind is the continual failure of so many self-appointed arbiters, such as befuddled West, to heed their own injunctions. Besides the fact that he ignored that this passage is in a context that deals with *private* offenses, why in the name of common sense did he not apply his doctrine to himself? How is it that he can write for a public paper giving all "editors and publishers" and the rest of us black eyes and then insist that before one criticizes another we are obliged to "go directly to the source to discuss the disagreement?" His own application of the verses should have plugged up his pen before he spilt his critical ink against a people to whom he has never gone in private interviews. He, like all wayward brethren, only impeaches himself. Yet, Apollos confuted the Jews "and that publicly" (Acts 18:28). We shall do the same.

Third, his admonition to "love one another" is always needed. But its over-much mention in West's context indicates that West intends to misuse it to negate other biblical injunctions. For example, brother West wants us to

"quit using strong words not clothed with expressions of love. Accusations void of tears communicate as hateful words...and these destroy Christ-like love." "Name calling is not fruit inspecting."

So, per *Image*, the only criticism allowed is one that is clothed in "loving lingo" of the soft-pedal type. This, I want to say, is absolutely ludicrous. Jesus demanded Peter to "get behind

me Satan" (Matt. 16:23). It is a strange new twist that would foist upon our Lord an unloving "civil war" attitude simply because Jesus did not directly turn around to coddle Peter with a bundle of velvet verbiage. Biblical examples like this could be multiplied endlessly. I do not hereby justify any and every strong correction delivered, but brother West's rule would actually require me to send a "sympathy in love" card to him before this review sees print. I'll not be hobbled by such unreasonable foolishness. This has the evident meaning of "let me teach what I will to whomsoever I will, but don't become defensive in a public way before talking to me personally." Who can believe it?

Fourth, I suppose one of the chiefest sore-spots with me in West's treatise is the following. He himself continually fellowships, aids and abets such wicked

(Continued on page 8, CIVIL WAR

CONTRIBUTORS

Mrs. W. H. Dell.....	\$10
Dorothy Washington	\$10
Thomas D. Hobbs	\$25
Virdie Bray	\$2
Mrs. Ava Burns	\$10
Leon Geeslin	\$20
Obera G. Parker.....	\$5
Lela Rowland	\$5
Lee Oneal Miller.....	\$20
Thomas Harville	\$10
Gary T. Winnett.....	\$15
Perry Sexton	\$25
Mike Ernstburger.....	\$20
Wally Kirby	\$10
William E. Jenkins.....	\$10
Norman Barnes	\$15
Clarence Keller	\$35
Pearlene Price	\$10
Jimmy Vaughn	\$5
Murray Cook	\$10
Anonymous	\$25
L. Douglas La Course	\$5
Wynema A. Chenault	\$10
Bardwell Church of Christ	\$100
Danville Church of Christ	\$150
Homer Brandenburg	\$10
E. A. Ambrose	\$20
Rusty Stephens.....	\$50
Willie Trammel	\$10
Anonymous	\$75
Verona Church of Christ	\$100
Northeast Church of Christ	\$50
T. W. Meredith	\$10

THE SECOND INCARNATION #4

Charles A. Pledge

The Fellowship Of The Spirit is the topic of chapter five in Rubel's **Second Incarnation**. Rubel begins with the basic assumption that the church of the New Testament includes denominations, and possibly even more. Based upon that assumption, Rubel must redefine the gospel in order to strip it of its specifics. To Rubel the foundation gospel (core gospel to others) is the deity of Jesus, his death and resurrection. Those who believe these foundation facts, according to Rubel, are in the church and, therefore, should be fellowshiped. Obviously, Rubel's big problem is not only with the acts of fellowship but also with the boundaries of fellowship. Rubel wishes to draw his own boundaries and ignore the boundaries of Scripture.

Rubel's arbitrary boundaries of fellowship are evident as he deals with the matter of withdrawing fellowship. Given his view of grace, we are surprised he still holds to any notion of withdrawal of fellowship. On the other hand, he needs such a view to withhold fellowship from some who disagree with him. On page 99 he affirms that only three cases of sin authorize withdrawal of fellowship: "(1) When a doctrinal error negates the very heart of the gospel message (the deity of Jesus, C.P.). (2) When sinful behavior is flagrant and persistent, and (3) When a divisive spirit is exhibited that runs roughshod over others and violates their freedom in Christ."

Rubel has changed the five cases of Scripture teaching relative to expelling from fellowship those who are unrepentant: (1) Matt. 18:15-18; a case of personal transgression. (2) Rom. 16:17-18; false teachers who serve their own interests. (3) I Cor. 5:1-13;

immoral actions. (4) II Thess. 3:6; the unruly (disorderly) who will not repent. (5) Titus 3:10; The heretic who wants only to draw disciples after himself. He may or may not teach false doctrine to accomplish this. His aim is disciples.

Scripture teaches us clearly about the cases of sin for which those who refuse to repent shall be expelled from fellowship, Rubel notwithstanding. Where have we heard his cases before? Did not Carl Ketcherside expound them? Did not Ruel Lemmons echo Carl's chant? Have not others stated the same? All in opposition to Holy Scripture!

Rubel's assumption is that fellowship is a framework of support for recovering sinners. He names a few whom he calls sinners: "...fornicators, drunks, preachers, liars, hypocrites, deacons, gossips, etc." (p. 109). Actually, fellowship is that framework of sharing between those who walk in the light of the gospel. Opposite Rubel's view is that stated by the Holy Spirit. We read in I John 1:7: "*But if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin.*" **If** indicates a condition. What is the condition? **Walking in the light!** A condition implies a result to be obtained. What is that result? "**We have fellowship one with another and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin.**" Very simple, isn't it? Walk in the light God provides in his revelation and the fellowship with others doing the same thing is inevitable. Fellowship is joint participation between those of like state. Rubel would have the Spirit filling and animating the

church in its fellowship, apart from the word. His fellowship includes all who believe the deity of Jesus and who are not: (1) Flagrant and persistent sinners; (2) Those whose doctrine does not negate the deity of Jesus, and (3) Those who do not oppose his teaching. According to Rubel, all ought to fellowship those who walk in Rubel's light. Is that not the implied conclusion of all false teachers you have ever met?

Rubel deals with worship in chapter six. He offers Isaiah chapter six as a pattern for worship, but not a rigid pattern. He wants a pattern, but not a rigid one. He wants the freedom to do as he pleases in worship. Basically, he implies that worship of God is not regulated. As an argument that Isaiah chapter six is not to be understood as a rigid pattern for worship he said: "We do not mean to imply that it is a rigid pattern. Only occasionally do worship settings involve the commissioning of individuals for prophetic tasks." Now he has worship involving the commissioning of individuals to prophesy. Does this indicate the direction Rubel is going? How far will he go? When the circumstances are right, and the personnel in his environment are as Rubel desires, there is no way to imagine how far Rubel will go away from truth. Yet, many in the church still can't believe it. Oh, we are told, you misunderstand Rubel. To all these deluded, blind disciples we simply reply: "We can read!"

Although Rubel does not, in his book, openly advocate using the mechanical instrument of music in worship, he accepts the principle of it. He advocates the use of "contemporary as well as traditional music...individuals, groups, and the entire congrega-

tion may offer the music..." (p.132). The same argument for the solo or group singing in worship may equally be used for the mechanical instrument in worship.

Rubel would redefine worship to mean that vague, mysterious "experience of God," or a personal encounter with God beyond the confines of Scripture. Rubel redefines truth in order to support his view of unregulated worship. He says the truth of John 4:24 (worship in truth) is to be understood against the Hebrew concept of truth as "integrity, faithfulness, and right behavior." That, he says, is opposed to the Greek notion of truth as factual statements. Let's allow Jesus to define truth for us, then, let's apply his definition to his own use of the word in John 4:24. Hear Jesus in John 17:17: "Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth." The word of God is truth. If we worship in truth, we worship in the way directed by God's word. Rubel says to worship in truth is "to worship with the whole of one's life laid bare before the Lord." Jesus says to worship in truth is to worship in harmony with God's revelation. Rubel implies there is no specific regulation to worship. Jesus says truth regulates worship. Rubel says just ad lib; let the **tone of worship** be set once it is begun; Jesus says such teaching makes vain the commandments of God, Matthew 15:9. Rubel arrays himself against Jesus Christ and Holy Scripture. Yet he has the temerity to assume a modest, humble appearance in his words. He would destroy the faith of thousands but cry **foul** toward any who oppose his doctrine. He asserts on page 242 that some will oppose his doctrine because they misunderstand it and others will oppose it because they do understand it and feel threatened by it. Excellent! All who oppose his doctrine do so because either they misunderstand it or

else they feel their selfish interests are threatened by his pure doctrine. Rubel knew when he wrote his book he made many irrational statements. Now, in conclusion he tries to cover for them. Rubel says, oppose my doctrine and you either misunderstand or else feel your interests are threatened.

Rubel disavows Existentialism. Yet he quotes Paul Tillich, Karl Barth, R. Bultmann, D. Bonhoeffer, and others of Neo-Orthodox, Existentialist persuasion as authority in definitions and conclusions involving Existentialist definitions, principles, and assumptions. If he accepts the assumptions of Existentialism how can he honestly disavow Existentialism? If he doesn't accept the assumptions, let him renounce what he has written that does approve the assumptions.

The Second Incarnation reflects on the popular level the typical pragmatic, Existentialist, Neo-Orthodox, Form Criticism influenced writings of several among us. These writings reflect the practice of reading widely from denominational leaders and philosophical scholars with a diminishing respect for Scripture and reliance thereupon. It is a time of great sadness and cause for much alarm. Although some of us are not naturally endowed with great, overpowering intellect, that does not mean we can't study and know God's truth (John 8:31-32). Even though time and choice might limit the bulk of our study to God's word, that does not mean we are altogether ignorant of what skeptics have written. Writers such as Rubel assume the basic ignorance of the rest of us concerning whereof they write, and a willingness to be led by the nose by those of superior education.

Rubel's disciples will attack those who disagree with Rubel as being unloving and possessing an evil attitude. Let Rubel tell you

beforehand what his attitude is toward the church; its worship, its service, and its life: "**While these dangers are acknowledged, we still believe the alternative of perpetuating a theologically impoverished and practically deleterious ecclesiology is even worse.**" In plain words, Rubel says the doctrine of the church of Christ is bankrupt and the practical consequences are perniciously harmful to the spiritual health of all members. In other words Rubel says the doctrine of the church of Christ stinks. Isn't that a wonderful attitude to demonstrate toward the church? But his disciples accuse the rest of us of having a bad attitude. Rubel accuses those who oppose his doctrine of either misunderstanding what he says or trying to protect their own interests out of feeling threatened by his doctrine.

Our review has been brief. Another review can be written based solely upon Rubel's false definitions of terms. Another review could be written based solely upon his deliberate twisting and turning and the building of straw men and tearing them down. Other reviews could be written from other perspectives. The point in these remarks is to indicate the amount of error in the book and the attitude behind it. I have read a few books in my lifetime but none; **not one**, so filled with pernicious error as this one. Some things said, placed in another context, would be good. In the context of **The Second Incarnation**, however, their result is evil. It comes down to a statement by Jesus in Matt. 7:17: "*Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit.*" **The Second Incarnation** is a poison tree and all its fruit is poison. If you look for good in it you will waste your time.

7 W. Colorado
Sheridan, WY 82801
4th of 4 parts

E I G H T H A N N U A L

“SEEK THE OLD PATHS” LECTURESHIP

July 25-29, 1993 (Always the 4th Sunday in July)

“Preaching Needed For The Nineties”

Director: Garland Robinson

SUNDAY, JULY 25

- 9:45 Love Thy Neighbor As Thyself*Howell Bigham*
- 10:35 There is but ONE Plan of Salvation*Kerry Clark*
- 7:00 Humanism, selfishness, “felt-needs”
vs. Supreme Love for God*Charles Leonard*
- 8:00 Is the “Old Paths Plea”
Valid for the 90’s?.....*Gilbert Gough*

MONDAY, JULY 26

- 9:00 Preaching Needed but Not Heeded*Victor Eskew*
- 10:00 The Five Points of Calvinism.....*Ferrell Hester*
- 10:00 (Ladies Class) Psalm 50:
Are we Prepared for Worship?*Tanya Bruce Cox*
- 11:00 The Golden Rule*Wayne Cox*
- 1:30 Instrumental Music.....*Ronnie Whittemore*
- 2:30 The Problem of Human Suffering.....*Charles Blair*
- 3:30 Digression – Update ‘93.....*Wayne Coats*
- 7:00 The Influence of TV.....*Sidney White*
- 8:00 The Two Covenants.....*Garland Robinson*

TUESDAY, JULY 27

- 9:00 The Bible School, Filling Time
or Filling Hearts?*Edward White*
- 10:00 “We Be Brethren,” One With Another*Dan Bailey*
- 10:00 (Ladies Class) “We Be Brethren,”
One With Another*Peggy Leonard*
- 11:00 The A.D. 70 Doctrine*Ken Burluson*
- 1:30 Keep Thyself Pure*Jimmy Bates*
- 2:30 There is But ONE FAITH.....*Gilbert Gough*
- 3:30 Digression – Update ‘93.....*Wayne Coats*
- 7:00 Right Attitude Toward ERROR
and Those Who Teach It.....*Jim Boyd*
- 8:00 Right Attitude Toward TRUTH
and Those Who Teach It.....*Charles Blair*

WEDNESDAY, JULY 28

- 9:00 Inspiration and Authority
of the Scriptures*Dan Sikes*
- 10:00 Preaching: Devotional or Doctrinal?*Jim Boyd*
- 10:00 (Ladies Class) Where’s Mother?*Dana Hale*
- 11:00 There is But ONE CHURCH*S. C. Kinningham*
- 1:30 Righteousness, Temperance,
and Judgment to Come.....*Melvin Sapp*
- 2:30 The Lord’s People MUST
Contend for the Faith*Guy Hester*
- 3:30 Digression – Update ‘93.....*Wayne Coats*
- 7:00 Marriage, Divorce, Remarriage.....*Ken Burluson*
- 8:00 The Christ of the Bible,
Both Positive and Negative*Virgil Hale*

THURSDAY, JULY 29

- 9:00 Christian Evidences*David Jones*
- 10:00 Preaching Needed from the
Old Testament*Ronald Choate*
- 10:00 (Ladies Class) Great Examples
from the Old Testament*Shirley Mays*
- 11:00 The Christian Home:
Living It or Losing It?*Virgil Hale*
- 1:30 Evangelism: Local and Foreign*John Grubb*
- 2:30 Miracles Have Ceased*Dean Gittings*
- 3:30 Digression – Update ‘93.....*Wayne Coats*
- 7:00 Homosexuality, Sin or
Alternate Lifestyle?.....*John A. Mays*
- 8:00 Who Will Stand in the Gap?*Melvin Sapp*

East Corinth Church of Christ

1801 Cruise St., Corinth, MS 38834 / (601) 286-2040 or 286-6575

We recommend those staying in a motel stay at **Econo Lodge** (601) 286-4421 or (800) 446-6900. RV units may park on our property with water and electrical hook-ups provided. We prefer that you let us know in advance of your plans. All lessons will be both video and audio taped. There will also be an outline book of the lessons. This is one of the best lectureships you will attend – nothing but the old Jerusalem Gospel!

SEE PAGE 7 FOR THE FULL SCHEDULE OF THE SEEK THE OLD PATHS LECTURESHIP

The 1993 "Seek The Old Paths" lectureship book is being printed by the East Corinth Church of Christ and will be given out FREE as a work of the church as long as supplies last. If you would like to have a copy by mail, please send us a self-addressed 6"x9" envelope with 65 cents postage affixed. The book will not be ready until the lectureship.

CIVIL WAR

Continued from page 4)

efforts as *Image* magazine, the Tulsa Workshop, and Crossroadism and other modernistic maneuvers bent on destroying every vestige of our identity. He, and a host of liberal "train-robbers" with which he associates, have hijacked most of the church and has been chug-a-lugging to pull these cars behind the engines; fellowship with the Christian Church, imitating the 'no pattern' doctrine of the Disciples of Christ, instrumental music is a matter of opinion, women's roles in the church are largely based upon culture, the Holy Spirit operates directly, worship services should be one big entertaining sha-bang, Baptist doctrine of salvation by grace ALONE, unity in doctrinal diversity, one-cannot-know-the-truth philosophy, and other abominable doctrines. Further, West has been shoveling coal into every engine that pulls this deceitful train. But let one of us lift a finger to derail this out-of-control express or to remove a few passengers and he jumps down and admonishes us to settle down and holster our six-shooters. No, brother West. As I say now to all these liberals, "You get OFF that train first, boys. Quit furthering what we know to be false doctrine. Resign from these slick-covered magazines that preach apostasy, close down your workshops and seminars, quit your schismatic friends of the Demas order who spew sectarian departures over the church, then we can 'dialogue.' But if you do not, know this: you need to be exposed and we shall continue to do it. I intend to cast down every stronghold of the wicked one that I can and until you desist from harassing our people with every false way of the devil and lending a hand to those who do likewise, I shall not lay down my arms nor approach the parley table."

Yes, sir, it comes with mighty poor grace for brother West to call upon us to cease hostilities against his teaching.

211 N. Fifth
Marlow, OK 73055

MAILBAG



"I am currently a freshman at Oklahoma Christian University. Last week I visited my grandparents in south Texas and while there, read your brochure on abortion. I was

extremely impressed with the quality of your paper and the teachings found therein. Would you please send it to me." ...*Oklahoma City, OK*. "It would mean a lot to me to receive your publication, **Seek The Old Paths**. Our minister sometimes shares his copy with me but I would very much like to have it sent to my address and I can share it with many. I enjoy so much reading the articles and I get really encouraged as I am often accused, by my brethren, as being 'knit-picky, judgmental' and a 'traditionalist' only because I refuse to add to or take from the scriptures and insist the Bible will **never** be outdated. With Respect, Appreciation and Christian Love..." ...*Jonesboro, TX*. "**Seek The Old Paths**" is an excellent paper. Not many will print such needed articles. I hope it can become a major paper in circulation. While many congregations may not be hearing fatal false doctrine, probably most are not hearing genuine 'gospel sermons' that it takes to keep them properly taught. Hopefully, **Seek The Old Paths** can reach many with the Truth that saves" ...*Indianapolis, IN*.

Seek The Old Paths is a publication of the **East Corinth Church of Christ** and is under the oversight of its elders. Its primary purpose and goal in publication can be found in Jude 3; II Timothy 4:2; Titus 1:13; Titus 2:1; II Peter 1:12.

Editor: **Garland M. Robinson**
Associate Editor: **Jimmy Bates**

Non-Profit Org.
U.S. Postage
P A I D
Permit No. 253
Corinth, MS

EAST CORINTH CHURCH OF CHRIST
1801 CRUISE ST.
CORINTH, MS 38834-5108

ADDRESS CORRECTION REQUESTED