

For the spirit that God gave us is no craven spirit, but one to inspire strength, love, and self-discipline. So never be ashamed of your testimony to our Lord...but take your share of suffering for the sake of the Gospel, in the strength that comes from God. 2 Timothy 1:7-8, NEB.


Then to side with Truth is noble, when we share her wretched crust,
Ere her cause bring fame and profit, and 'tis prosperous to be just;
Then it is the brave man chooses, while the coward stands aside,
Doubting in his abject spirit till his Lord is crucified,
And the multitude make virtue of the faith they have denied.



Vol. 1, No. 1

Flint, Michigan

Integrity Publications, Inc.
P.O. Box 1205
Flint, Michigan 48501

BULK RATE
U. S. POSTAGE
 PAID
Flint, Mich
Permit No 239

Integrity

June, 1969

Integrity Hoy Ledbetter

Congregational Independence
..... Dean Thoroman

Lord, Make Me an Instrument of Thy Peace.
..... John Smith

Of Wine and Wineskins David Elkins

The Ins and Outs, Ups and Downs, Populars
and Unpopulars Frank Rester

He who walks in integrity walks securely. Prov. 10:9.

INTEGRITY
Hoy Ledbetter

This is the first issue of INTEGRITY, a monthly periodical which is dedicated to promoting unity, soundness, and honesty in the body of Christ. INTEGRITY is published by a corporation of Michigan residents who are members of the church of Christ. The corporation members, although varying widely in background, age, and religious experience, are united in love for the brotherhood and in their desire to contribute to its growth unto perfection. They believe they know the church and the issues which confront it today. They have selected the following editorial board: Hoy Ledbetter as editor-in-chief, David Elkins, Frank Rester, and Dean Thoroman.

"Integrity" is a word which comes from a Latin root meaning "untouched, intact, entire." It denotes the condition of completeness and soundness, uprightness, honesty, and sincerity. Its relevance to the Christian experience hardly needs documentary support. The RSV uses the word in 24 passages, including Paul's important instructions to his associate: "In your teaching show integrity, gravity, and sound speech." The Biblical usage of the word points to simplicity of intention, the equivalent of being honest, sincere, and genuine, which is fundamental to true character.

In keeping with the connotation of its name, INTEGRITY will seek to encourage believers in Christ to strive to be one, to be pure, and to be honest and sincere in word and deed, among themselves and toward all men. It may legitimately be inferred that the issuance of a publication with such a purpose implies that there is division, impurity and dishonesty to be overcome.

Those who are abreast of current religious conditions are aware of the immediate danger of further division. Churches of Christ are already divided into at least two dozen different factions, many of which for several years now have had no fellowship with each other. Those who have aspired to remove this thorn now see their hopes grow dimmer because of local intensified conflicts. New factions are on the verge of springing up, and already have in some cases, both to add to the division and to debilitate further our historic plea for the unity of all believers. We believe that a solution to this growing problem should be sought with renewed diligence, and we dedicate ourselves to that important search.

INTEGRITY proposes to deal fairly and thoroughly with current issues. In the belief that truth has nothing to fear, we will attempt to cover the various sides of controversial questions, not for the sake of controversy,

but in order that the reader may have opportunity to hear and evaluate himself the bases of particular beliefs. And we believe the ordinary man has sufficient intelligence to decide for himself what is right and what is wrong, provided he is given proper information, and that it is highly insulting for one of his peers to attempt to lord it over his faith.

Churches of Christ have a rich heritage in the reformation movements of the 16th and 19th centuries. When Martin Luther debated with his brethren in the Catholic Church, he set forth two principles which have become basal in all Protestantism. These are:

1. The supreme authority of the Bible.
2. The right of individual interpretation.

Luther contended that popes, councils and human decrees could not be cited as the source of religious authority and that the Bible alone is our rule of faith and practice. But who, his opponents countered, is qualified to interpret the Bible? They argued that the common man could not understand the Scriptures without the interpretation of the church. Luther answered this argument by asserting the right of every man to interpret the Bible for himself. The importance of these two principles in the history of the reformation and restoration could hardly be exaggerated. It was strong belief in these that caused men like Thomas and Alexander Campbell and Barton W. Stone to begin what later evolved into the "Church of Christ."

But there has always been a tendency to get away from the basic principles. They have been accepted in theory, but denied in practice. And they are at stake in some of our keenest controversies today.

It is now being vigorously argued, either directly or indirectly, within some churches of Christ that the common man does not have the right of private judgment. A few church officials will not allow the members of their congregations to hold views contrary to their own, although that has not yet become a general position. Some hold that their interpretation must be the interpretation of all, or else those who disagree will be expelled from the fellowship.

But the more tolerant officials of this sort will not refuse to allow one to believe what he believes - just as long as he does not express that belief! Thus they effectively squelch the right of private judgment while giving it lip service.

We believe that the basal principles of the restoration - the very principles that have made us what we are - are worth defending. We believe further that the taproot of division is departure from them. Yet, at the

same time, we are aware of the danger of entertaining corrupting influences and growing doctrinal unconcern.

We also believe that one of the greatest needs of our generation is that of genuine honesty. When the time comes wherein the point of view we express is determined by the company we are in, it is time for us to ask what became of our integrity. When we cannot question our own beliefs without threatening the peace of the church, we may well lament the departure of such Christian virtues as forbearance and self-surrender. When one cannot speak his mind without destroying his influence, he could profitably (even if painfully) investigate the real basis of that influence. And when Christians are so afraid of their own positions that they cannot bear to hear alternative arguments, it is time to ask what we are afraid of.

INTEGRITY deplors the party spirit, and we pledge ourselves never to promote a faction. We will never encourage any person to leave one faction in order to join another. To us there is nothing more unsavory than a sect devoted to opposition of sectarianism.

We anticipate that some will dismiss us as an underground movement bent on undermining the fundamentals of the faith, but we have no such devious intentions. More than anything else we wish to conserve the fundamentals of the faith, and our only objective with regard to the church is that it might be the true complement of Christ in the world today.

At the present time all readers are receiving INTEGRITY free, their subscriptions being paid out of a fund contributed by our generous friends, but we are not sure how long we will be able to operate on this basis. If anyone thinks what we are saying is worthy of circulation and therefore wishes to contribute, he is invited to do so. Checks should be made to "Integrity" and sent to the address given below.

We invite readers to send us names and addresses to be placed on our mailing list. However, we do not wish to be unwelcome guests in any home. If any reader wishes to be dropped from our list, we invite him to write and so inform us, and we will promptly respond.

We also invite comments, whether critical or commendatory. We will be encouraged by the latter and disciplined by the former. We also welcome material for publication (nothing anonymous, please; remember our name!).

Send all correspondence, including manuscripts, to:
INTEGRITY
P.O. Box 1205
Flint, Michigan 48501

CONGREGATIONAL INDEPENDENCE

Dean A. Thoroman

To what extent are the actions and decisions of one congregation of disciples binding on any other congregation of the same disciples? If one local Church of Christ chooses to ignore or repudiate pronouncements of another local Church of Christ, what recourse does the ignored or repudiated group have? Do other congregations - in the immediate area or otherwise - have any responsibility to get themselves involved in deciding which of the disputing churches to support?

One of the traditional expressions frequently heard among Churches of Christ is "local autonomy." In fact, it is often described as "one of the identifying marks of the New Testament church." Generally, those who use this expression are quite clear in their definition of it. For example, in an article recently published in a church bulletin, a minister writes, "I affirm my conviction that each congregation of churches of Christ must be locally governed without any hierarchy dictating policy from above except that which has come from Christ in His Word. No eldership or group of elderships have the right to dictate to another what should be its policy in any matter." For the purposes of this article, the foregoing statement will be fully accepted as a concise definition of congregational autonomy or independence.

However, the problem is not solved simply by agreeing on terminology. As the aforementioned article points out, ". . . what is to be done when the eldership of another congregation does that which we disapprove? Of course, if we approve of their action there will be no problem." The writer of this bulletin article affirms that "we are not divided over the principle of congregations being self-governing but as to how important this is and how it is to be interpreted." A few questions seem to be in order. How can the PRINCIPLE of local autonomy be INTERPRETED in such a way that the meaning is different from the principle - specifically, that each congregation must be self-governing? Is it not apparent that we are actually divided over the principle and its strict APPLICATION, rather than over interpretation?

Why do so many members of the Church of Christ, including ministers and elders, try so hard to AVOID the PRINCIPLE of local self-rule?

In order to pinpoint some of the inconsistency which is currently making the rounds on this topic, we continue with excerpts from the church paper previously mentioned. Consider this comment: "If another congregation always stands ready to set aside the actions of one church by taking those disfellowshipped into its fellowship the whole purpose of discipline is destroyed." I am personally not acquainted with any congregation that

always stands ready to do what is said here. However, even if the charge were true, the PRINCIPLE of local autonomy would still demand that "no eldership or group of elderships have the right to dictate to another what should be its policy in any matter." It is my opinion that in all congregations EACH CASE SHOULD BE JUDGED ON ITS OWN MERITS.

Honestly, does it not have to be this way? Does not the PRINCIPLE of local autonomy demand this? To accept the principle that ANY disfellowshipped member from ONE congregation MUST remain outside the fellowship of ALL other congregations, destroys the autonomy of all congregations except the one doing the disfellowshipping!

The PRINCIPLE of local self-government means that no congregation may "set aside" the actions of another congregation. To follow the principle logically, however, means that the individual actions of EACH local congregation must be respected - FOR THAT CONGREGATION. To disagree with an action is not to set it aside. Do you know any way to "set aside" the action of any congregation - as long as the action is taken only for itself (and should it not be this way?) and as long as no attempt is made to enforce it anywhere else?

This thought may not be as incidental as first reading may assume: If a congregation decides to FIRE a preacher, does another congregation "set aside" the action by deciding to HIRE him? Follow the implications of your answer to this question to their logical conclusion and you will see a striking parallel to the entire problem relating to congregational independence.

Other than in matters of judgment, wherein do elders have any Biblical support for making decisions? Disagreement in the realm of judgment simply is not the basis of disfellowshipping anyone. Thus, the elders of one church may conscientiously exercise their best judgment - even in the matter of taking disciplinary action against one of their members - and still be called in question regarding their judgment. Those who might question the action taken would also be exercising their own judgment without casting any reflections on the good intentions of all parties concerned.

To question a decision made in the realm of judgment in no way "sets aside" the action taken - at least wherever individuals choose to recognize the action and to go along with whatever suggestions are given to enforce it. Exercising the privilege of disagreeing with such a decision is merely one way of practicing the principle of local and personal independence.

It is not a violation of congregational autonomy nor a breach of respect for one's brethren to disagree honestly and to act differently according to one's own best judgment. It is not a matter of attempting to overrule an-

other church or its leadership to move independently as conscience dictates. The real breach of respect occurs when attempts are made to coerce everyone outside the congregation where the decision is made to give up their own autonomy.

Attempts to enforce decisions ANYWHERE outside the realm of one, local, independent congregation violate the PRINCIPLE of autonomous rule. The real dilemma occurs when more than two congregations get into the act. The elderships of two churches may disagree pointedly about matters of judgment. A third group of elders hears of the disagreement and becomes involved by trying to decide which of the differing views to support. If the judgment of this third group happens to agree with that of either of the other groups, there is a problem of what to do about the group with whom there is disagreement. If AGREEMENT is the basis for FELLOWSHIP, then DISAGREEMENT becomes the basis and the justification for DISFELLOWSHIP. Under these circumstances the minority group tends to find itself increasingly ostracized.

The position taken here is that no dilemma exists if the true PRINCIPLE of local self-government is literally and consistently applied. Each congregation makes decisions only for itself. It is just that simple! If these decisions happen to differ, there is really nothing any other congregation can or should do about it. This is the only way we can keep from having a situation in which one congregation tries to overrule the decisions of any other congregation - and that is what local autonomy is all about in the first place.

To allow anything different from this demonstrates lack of understanding of the PRINCIPLE of local independence, lack of faith in the principle, or an unwillingness to accept the implications of the principle.

Respect for the message of the Bible permits unity without conformity. It allows for disagreement without disfellowship, for discussion without destruction, and for investigation without castigation. There must be freedom to study and to arrive at independent conclusions. There must be freedom to think and to believe what honest study produces. There must be freedom to express one's honest convictions, and there must be freedom from fear of reprisal in any form. This climate of freedom is as important in seeking spiritual truth as in pursuing truth in any other field.

Freedom and searching will inevitably lead to differences in understanding, but we must mature enough to recognize that such differences need not - yea, OUGHT NOT - lead to breaks in fellowship. Instead, our real strength will lie in our ability to consider differing views and to test them in the arena of open discussion. An inquiring mind continually seeks more perfect understanding and never fears having error exposed. Real free-

dom carries with itself the freedom to err. It is one of the calculated risks which an individual or a group assumes in taking the responsibility for his or their own behavior.

Finally, may we all remember that even within the framework of local congregational self-rule there cannot be any lessening of individual responsibility. The right of one church to govern itself must take into consideration the right of each member to "work out his own salvation."

LORD, MAKE ME AN INSTRUMENT OF THY PEACE

John Smith

Lord, make me an instrument of thy peace -
Where there is hatred,
Let me sow peace.
Where there is doubt - faith,
Where there is despair - hope,
Where there is darkness - light.
Where there is sadness,
Let me sow joy.
O Divine Master, grant
That I may not so much seek to be consoled,
As to console,
To be understood, as to understand,
To be loved, as to love.
For it is in giving that we receive,
That we receive pardon.
It is in pardoning -
That we are pardoned,
And it is in dying,
That we are born,
That we are born to eternal life.

There can be little serious doubt that these words represent the true spirit of Christ. All who love the Lord cannot help but thrill to the warmth that is generated in their soul as they imbibe sentiments expressed by St. Francis of Assisi. We all would like to see in these thoughts some identification with our own desires and aspirations, but when we awake from the world of words and ideas to the world of people and reality we altogether too often find no link between these beautiful sentiments and our real selves.

Is there a Christian, a true child of God, who would not echo this prayer? And yet, is it not true that hatred, prejudice, discord and schism exist be-

tween the various segments of the major divisions of Christendom? Is it not incredible that the worst crimes imaginable, in the history of the world, the most ghastly and sickening of murders, the bloodiest of wars, have been committed "in God's name"? Our generation has not been free from the blight of prejudice and open hatred. We have the curse of ignorance and fear ever with us.

In the midst of all this, how can the Christian truly achieve the spirit of Christ and become an instrument of God's peace? How can he sow love where there is hatred and joy where there is sorrow?

One of the greatest barriers to peace is distrust. We are afraid that if we are completely honest; if we truly seek to be at peace; if we go the extra mile, people will take advantage of us. "What if I am honest and he isn't?" is one of our deepest fears, and as a result, we hold ourselves in reserve, and we are very cautious about our inward feelings. It's like the boy who wants to sell his friend a used ball for a dime, so he says, "You give me the dime, and I'll give you the ball." And the friend says, "No, you give me the ball first, and then I'll give you the dime." Each is so afraid of being cheated by the other that they cannot complete the simplest of transactions. Christians are no better off, for they cannot freely discuss their thoughts and ideas with one another without fear of being, as it were, "cheated."

How did St. Francis hope to have his prayer answered? How do we? He was obviously lacking in his attitude toward his fellow men, else he would not have prayed. What did he hope to gain by beseeching God for something as intangible as becoming a peacemaker? What did he want God to do for him? If you were to pray this prayer, in what way would you expect God to answer it?

The second major factor in our failure to be "peacemakers for God" is our lack of understanding of the Holy Spirit and how God guides our lives through his indwelling. May I suggest, without dwelling in detail, that the Holy Spirit is God's only agency for working on the emotions of man. He may work on man's intellect through His Holy Word, but the inward man, his very essence, is left to the Spirit. If I pray to God to change my attitude, it requires an emotional change that deals with my true inner self, and "the Spirit himself bearing witness with our spirit" testifies to me that I am God's child. It is this interaction and cooperation of the Spirit of God and my spirit that effects the emotional changes which results in a spiritually-minded man.

How do I become an instrument for peace in the hands of God? By trusting others, in the hope that they will trust me. Will you be the first one to trust another? Are you trustworthy? Recognize and accept the guidance

of God's Holy Spirit that was given to you at baptism (Acts 2:38), and which he will supply to you in even greater measure if you will ask for it (Luke 11:13). Will you join me now, approaching the throne of God with the words of St. Francis of Assisi, "Lord, make me an instrument of thy peace"?

OF WINE AND WINESKINS

David Elkins

"Nor does anyone pour new wine into used wineskins. If he does, the wine will burst the skins, and both the wine and the skins will be ruined. No! Fresh skins for new wine." Mark 2:22, Today's English Version.

Today, as perhaps never before in the history of denominationalism, the churches are in foment. Concerned members as well as ministers are crying out for spiritual renewal. Traditional doctrines are no longer accepted simply because they wear the hoary beard of age. "Sacred cows" are being dissected, analyzed, and re-evaluated. Orthodoxy is being eyed with as much suspicion and distrust as was heterodoxy a few years ago. Thousands of concerned people are joining hands, hearts, and minds in an effort to find the real essence of our relationship to Christ and one another. To achieve this goal, they are crossing sectarian lines, digging for truth through the dust of 2,000 years of religious tradition, and unapologetically casting aside the superfluous external trappings of what was once simply "the church."

Church of Christ people and other heirs of the Restoration Movement should be thrilled with the unparalleled opportunities for communication, understanding, and mutual truth-seeking with these urgently concerned people. Alexander Campbell, Barton W. Stone, and other Restoration Fathers would have rejoiced to see our day. Perhaps the greatest single mistake we can make is to sit snugly and smugly in our little religious sub-culture and continue telling ourselves that we have nothing to learn from anybody because we have "the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth." In taking such a separatist attitude, we deprive others of the knowledge we do possess and deprive ourselves of the criticism, testing, and evaluation which we need in order to develop a more accurate picture of ourselves and our theology.

Two of the most pertinent issues being discussed today are fellowship and the nature of the church. Keith Miller has written a very incisive book entitled The Taste of New Wine in which he sets forth his personal witness to the spiritual strength which is generated in small groups of Christ-loving people, who meet informally for periods of intensive fellowship. Mil-

ler's book is in reality a timely comment on fellowship and the nature of the church as they should be. The freshness, vitality, and spiritual "aliveness" which characterizes this new movement has led Miller to call it "the new wine."

Though the majority of religious people are still saying that "the old wine is better," it is an indisputable fact that the winepress is turning, and there are many people thirstily drinking the new wine as it spills forth. Humorously enough, some of the thirstiest imbibers are those in a prominent position of orthodoxy. One might call them "closet drinkers." Stifled and parched by the dust of tradition hurled at (or by) them from the Sunday School and pulpit, they are finding that the "new wine" has the paradoxical effect of quenching their thirst and at the same time causing them to desire more. It is only a matter of time until these people become so intoxicated by the "new wine" that their fellows will notice their unorthodoxical staggering and demand that they either "sober up" or relinquish their position as a representative and salesman of the "old wine."

But what does all this have to do with the Church of Christ? First, we are involved in the religious revolution of our times - whether we like to admit it or not. A new breed of young preachers is appearing on the scene. They are not nearly so convinced of the 100% purity of Church of Christ doctrine as were the preachers of the last generation. Almost without knowing it, these young men have been influenced by the educational revolution of our day which says, "Test! Analyze! Evaluate!" It is foolish and unrealistic to expect young people to apply this philosophy to every other facet of their lives and then submissively accept each religious bromide which falls from the lips of an Elizabethan-speaking ecclesiastic who is so far behind the times that he thinks Petula Clark is a flower garden.

As one whose age allows him still to be identifiable with the "younger generation," I can personally testify to the stifling and sterile atmosphere in which the Church of Christ often surrounds its young. I can only plead with the older and more influential brethren to change this atmosphere. To those who are convinced that "dangerous liberals" are at large among us, my pleading will only be interpreted as an attempt to change "God's eternal truth and kingdom." Hopefully, to those who think more objectively, it will be regarded as a plea for the Church of Christ to rid itself of suicidal tendencies. When a system makes no provisions for youth, it is only killing itself. That system can exist only until the generation in power dies off.

As a young preacher who shares kindred feelings with hundreds of other young preachers, allow me to speak representatively: We love the Lord and His truth as much as our Christian maturity allows. We want to discard or change nothing which is really sacred and eternal. But you must

realize that we have our own truth-seeking to do, our own spiritual lives to direct, and our own salvation to work out. We need your help, but it is often lacking. Your scorching words are futile. Your time-worn denouncements are impressive but leave our questions unanswered. Your branding and disfellowshipping leaves us hurt but unhelped. For the sake of Christ, unity, peace, and our souls, please love us, understand us, and even condescend once in a while to listen to us. Forgive our youthful rashness and impatience. Gently lead us back to the narrow path instead of breaking our skulls with a two-by-four when we seem to be out of line. Answer, as best you can, our heart's questions instead of cutting our tongues out to keep us from asking them. But most of all, put your arms around our shoulders; stand by our side; help us fight our innermost battles; guide us into, or seek with us, a consistent and relevant theology.

In the Church of Christ hundreds of young people as well as many older ones have tasted the new wine. We would like to pour it into the wineskins which you offer us. But if those skins are rigid, inflexible, unyielding, and tradition-bound, the new wine will surely break them; and you, we, and the Lord will be the losers.

THE PHILOSOPHIES OF THE
INS AND OUTS, UPS AND DOWNS, POPULARS AND UNPOPULARS
Frank Rester

It is a constant source of amazement and even amusement that man's basic drives, emotions, reactions, patterns of thought and behavior cycles remain the same from generation to generation, regardless of the external environment in which he is cast: whether he is clothed with crude animal skins or a finely woven and tailored suit; whether he lives in a cave in the side of a mountain or in a modern apartment whose climate is artificially controlled by central heating and air conditioning; whether he travels, being carried from place to place by the slow and tedious plodding of an animal, or if he is hurled through the heavens faster than the speed of sound, traversing continents in a matter of minutes; whether he hymns praises to his God while sitting under a tree with his brethren, roofed only by the blue expanse of the heavens and the branches of the tree itself, or if he is cushioned in a velvet covered pew and surrounded by ornate tapestry and delicately stained glass. These externals do not really affect any transformation in the character and behavior of an individual. Love, kindness, fidelity and honesty; or jealousy, envy, lust and greed are regulated from within, not from without the man.

It is interesting to observe that the particular stratum of society occu-

ried by an individual tends to identify his mode of thinking and behavior. Whether it is the thinking that produces the stratum or the stratum that creates the thinking is a question of no mean significance. There are cases where the former is true and instances where the latter seems to be the case. I personally think that in many cases the situation is produced by the interaction of both the former and the latter, rather than one to the exclusion of the other. However, the burden of this article is not so much to philosophize on the cause as to point your minds to the fact that there recurs throughout history the stereotyped and predictable behavior of what I have chosen to call the Ins and the Outs, the Ups and the Downs, the Populars and the Unpopulars, or even the Reformers and the Establishment.

For a case in point I quote J. L. Hurlbut's "Story of the Christian Church." "He (Hildebrand, Pope Gregory VII) made the church supreme over the state. The emperor, Henry IV, having taken offense at Pope Gregory, summoned a synod of German bishops, and induced (or compelled) them to vote the deposition of the pope. Gregory retaliated with an excommunication, absolving all the subjects of Henry IV from their allegiance. Henry found himself absolutely powerless under the papal ban. In January, 1077, the emperor 'having laid aside all belongings of royalty, with bare feet and clad in wool, continued for three days to stand before the gate of the castle, at Canossa in northern Italy, where the pope was staying, in order to make his submission and receive absolution. IT MUST BE ADDED, HOWEVER, THAT NO SOONER DID HENRY REGAIN POWER, THAN HE MADE WAR ON THE POPE, AND DROVE HIM OUT OF ROME." (Emp. mine, FR.) When Henry IV was an "Out," his behavior was strikingly different than when he became an "In." When he became an "In," he acted exactly like the "In" before him (Hildebrand). Rather than the action of Henry being an exception, it is the rule. The fact is that the "Ins" generally follow the age-old philosophy that might makes right, whereas the "Outs" lean heavily to the exhortation, "Come, let us reason together," or possibly, "Bring forth your strong reasons." Of course, when an individual is an "In," he can always nod wisely and speak stupidly in parroting some beautiful literary gem like, "Leave them alone and they will go away." The "In" may even express his attitude in more "relevant" terms, such as, "We're already number one, why should we try harder?" In the days of Martin Luther it was worded by a spokesman for the "Ins" that "faith need not be kept with heretics."

In the "Christian Baptist," a paper edited and published by Alexander Campbell from 1823 to 1830, Mr. Campbell analyzed the positions of the "Ins" and "Outs" as follows:

I have long since discovered that there are two systems of logic, or two modes of reasoning that seem to be almost uniformly adopted by two classes in society. irrespective of their

religious or political views. The Ins adopt one system, and the Outs another. By the Ins we understand those in authority with the people; and by the Outs, those not in authority with the people. The former are the Populars, and the latter the Unpopulars. The logic of the Ins has in it the following rules:

1. Never submit any of those points essential to your good standing with the people to the hazard of investigation. Remember you have something to lose, but nothing to gain.

2. When your system is attacked, always extol the wisdom, piety, or virtue of its founders; descant upon its antiquity, and enumerate its votaries.

3. Ridicule the pretensions and expose the arrogance of those who would dare to oppose names so revered, usages so ancient, and authorities so numerous.

4. If possible, as far as lieth in your power, arraign the motives, and impeach the aims of your opposers.

5. Calumniate their characters, if you can, under any pretence, and defame them, but with apparent regret that you should be compelled to do so.

6. And lastly, when you are conscious that you cannot carry your point, represent your opponent as unworthy of your notice; give his system or his arguments the name of some obsolete heresy, and tell how it was blasted and refuted centuries ago.

The logic of the Outs is not so easily reduced to one system as that of the Ins. If in politics, one system is adopted; if in religion, another. But the general points of coincidence are:

1. To submit everything to the test of reason; and if in religion, to revelation.

2. Neither to adopt nor to oppose any point because of the names of the persons who embrace or reject it.

3. Canvass the opinion and arguments of those who oppose, without invading their reputation, or attempting to injure it.

When the cause of the Outs is a good one, such is the system of logic adopted. And even when it is not so good, there must be an apparent respect to the above decisions.

However, brother, lest we become unduly diverted from real values and ultimate objectives, we should ask ourselves the question, "In with whom?" or "Out with whom?" Although ostensibly inconceivable to the Ins, it is nevertheless possible for an individual to be Out with the Ins, yet be in with God. This, finally, is the real issue which should concern and motivate us. Whether we are In or Out with our associates on earth, let us never forget that in the final consummation all our actions shall be judged by a tribunal over which human opinion and popularity wield no influence.

VOICE FROM THE PAST

We have learned that freedom is the safest in the state, and that despotism, however handy it may be, makes poor men. It may make easy government, but it makes inferior citizens. Liberty, on the other hand, however many leaks it may have, and however many storms there are in it, after all, in the long run, makes strong citizens and multiplies the resources and increases the strength of the state.

Now, liberty is just as necessary in the church as it is in the state and in civil affairs. No man, because he is ordained to preach, has any authority over anybody. No church has any right to usurp authority over men's consciences and judgments. A church that does this in the name of God is just as monstrous and detestable as any government upon earth that usurps absolute authority over its subjects. If religion is to be anything, it is to be spontaneous; it is to be the free offering of free souls. The moment you permit the church to say, "We have the light; our conscience being instructed is lord of your conscience," you interfere with men's religious freedom.

-- Henry Ward Beecher.