

March 1970

Integrity

INTEGRITY is published by a non-profit Michigan corporation. At present there is no subscription charge. Names may be added to the mailing list by writing to the editor. Contributions are not necessary, but since we depend on the generosity of our friends, they are warmly welcomed.

The editorial staff consists of: Hoy Ledbetter, Editor-in-Chief; Frank Rester; and Dean Thoroman. Correspondence for the editor should be sent to:

8494 Bush Hill Court
Grand Blanc, Michigan 48439

In keeping with the connotation of its name, INTEGRITY seeks to encourage all 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.

Volume 1 **March 1970** Number 10

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

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

Address Correction Requested



Disgraceful Graffiti	Hoy Ledbetter
A Very Short Comment	Don Reece
Is there a Lawyer in the House?	Frank Rester
Religion and Relevancy	David Elkins
Miles Apart	Lynn Munroe III
Leadership - The Need	Dean A. Thoroman

DISGRACEFUL GRAFFITI

Hoy Ledbetter

Over the years we have been afflicted with numerous letters of denunciation. In most cases we have not known the people pilloried, nor - since we did not know them - have we thought any less of them because of their exposure. On the contrary, we must admit our frequent inability to reconcile such expurgatory epistles with genuine Christian concern. Letters of disgrace seldom deviate from a definite pattern. A recent one about two of our editors, which was read to me in a long-distance call, makes a good prototype. If you have been favored with one, you might want to check its adherence to the pattern.

Wisely anticipating his readers' suspicions, the writer will usually begin with a protestation of love for his subjects, stressing how long he has known them, how close they have been in the past, and assuring the reader that he is deeply grieved to have to say what he does say about the subject.

The gentleman doth protest too much, methinks.

Frequently the writer has never communicated directly with the subjects. (In the case referred to above, the disgracer has had no contact at all with those whom he exposes and in fact did not even send them a copy.) He rather seeks to convict by hearsay, without attempting to get in touch with or refute the position of the one he assumes to correct.

How writeth this man letters, having never learned?

In an appalling number of cases, the writer judges the motives of his victims. (In the instance cited, the writer unequivocally states that the editors of INTEGRITY express their unacceptable views because of pride!)

The ultimate sin which any man commits against his brother is that of misinterpretation of his motive (G. C. Morgan).

There will be a vague statement of charges in which the accused is held responsible for bringing reproach on the church, being a liberal, departing from the faith, causing division, and so forth. These charges will not be specifically supported, and the writer will neglect to state that he has not personally confronted those charged or attempted to refute their errors. But he will imply that he has done so.

Doth our law judge any man, before it hear him, and know what he doeth?

The writer will assume that the reader's insights agree perfectly with his own, and to assure that this assumption is not disturbed, he will carefully avoid an exact detailing of these insights. If he is too precise, the reader might identify more with the accused than the accuser. Nor

will the writer divulge the fact that he himself is unorthodox on points not directly under consideration. There will be a blissful omission of the thought that either writer or reader might have some inadequate understandings.

And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, and considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye?

Then comes a strong plea to cut off the accused from the fellowship of the church posthaste.

That thou doest, do quickly.

There will be a reiteration of the writer's love for the accused (it could so easily be doubted!) and another expression of regret that something more could not be done to reclaim him.

My little children, let us not love in word, neither in tongue; but in deed and in truth.

This may be accompanied by a touching apology that the matters stated in the letter had to be made public.

If thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone.

But it just had to be done because the subject has boldly challenged some cherished dogmas of the church and thereby has shown himself to have departed from it. Hence, he must be disgraced.

Kill thy physician, and thy fee bestow upon the foul disease.

The church has never wanted for vigilant vaqueros to ride herd on the brotherhood, who, instead of rounding up the strays and bringing them home, prefer to drive them to another pasture. With them, there are no issues to discuss. There is no such thing as honest disagreement. Anyone who differs just does not respect the authority of the Bible - no matter how often he may appeal to the scripture - and his motives are insincere. These watchdogs see nothing wrong with judging their brethren, damning them without ever discussing the issues, and burdening them with all possible obloquy. That they are careless with the truth and take an immoral approach does not matter, since they are doctrinally right!

Men of "integrity" will follow a better course. Like good pastors, they will "confute those who contradict." They will be more interested in ministering grace than in disgracing their brethren. They will beware of a priori condemnation and pressure propaganda. They will recognize that accusing the brethren is pre-eminently the work of the devil and will allow honest doubters to stand or fall before their own Master. And most of all, they will acknowledge that God is the God of motive and will avoid the disposition that caused the ancient Jews to blaspheme against the Holy Spirit.

In the first issue of INTEGRITY we declared our belief in two basic principles: the supreme authority of the Bible; and the right of individual interpretation. In defending these

principles, we are loyal to our religious heritage. They were fundamental in the reformation and restoration movements to which we are so deeply indebted. If we allow any man on earth to deprive us of the right of individual interpretation, then the Bible is no longer our supreme authority. We are avowed partisans of truth alone. We vigorously deny the tacit assumptions that perviousness is the equivalent of perversity, that one's recognition of his ignorance is an admission that he no longer loves the truth. But our right to be mistaken cannot coexist with our denial of another's right to be similarly mistaken.

In dealing with problems related to doctrine, we need to rely less on

prejudice (which is emotional) and more on argument (which is intellectual). Reasonable people can only be changed by reason. Those who judge and slander are either ignorant or malicious, and that fact cannot be denied by a mountain of words about love.

It is not an enemy who taunts me -
then I could bear it;

it is not an adversary who deals insolently with me -
then I could hide from him.

But it is you, my equal,
my companion, my familiar friend.

We used to hold sweet converse together;

within God's house we walked in fellowship. ¶¶¶

A VERY SHORT COMMENT

Don Reece

I have just received and read all the issues of INTEGRITY published to date. I was both surprised and gratified to find that two of the five brethren most closely identified with it were my close personal friends at Freed-Hardeman. For the most part, I am in complete agreement with the outlook and thrust of the magazine.

However, I question two statements on page 120 of the January issue. First, it is said in reference to the division that prevailed among the first century Christians over whether or not the keeping of the law was binding on the Gentiles that "A group among us holding that baptism is not a condition of salvation would be a fitting analogy to the first century situation." However, it appears to me from a careful study of the record that both groups accepted ALL of the conditions of salvation that had been given by the Lord. The problem was not that one of the groups regarded as non-essential something that the Lord had EXPRESSLY bound, but rather that one group thought that something else was also necessary. In view of this, I would ask whether or not a group in the church today accepting all of the terms of the gospel but insisting that it was also necessary to wash the saints feet would not be a better analogy?

Second, I seriously question that we could hold in fellowship a group "holding that baptism is not a condition of salvation." I do not speak here in reference to someone who, like Brother Alexander Campbell, hopes for the salvation of those who are honestly mistaken on the basis of the mercy of God, and leaves it in the hands of God (James Deforest Murch, Christians Only, p. 118). I so hope, and so leave it myself. Neither do I speak in reference to someone like Brother David Lipscomb who might be in doubt as to what procedure to follow in the case of those who have been baptized "to obey God" but who may not have understood all of the connections between baptism and salvation (Earl Irvin West, The Search for the Ancient Order, Vol. 2, pp. 406-407). I speak here in reference to a group outright DENYING any connection between baptism and the new birth. It appears to me that to OUTRIGHT DENY that which the Lord himself has made a condition of salvation would clearly be to pervert the gospel, and to subject the one so doing to the very strong anathema of Galatians 1:7-9, which, I am told, literally means, "let him be cut off" (Robert L. Johnson, The Letter of Paul to the Galatians, The Living Word Commentary, pp. 43-44).

I submit this comment to you, my brethren in the Lord, for your comment, and with the hope that it might provoke more study and discussion, and with a prayer that as a result, we all might receive more light on this point than we now have. ¶¶¶

Comment

Brethren do not determine whom they will fellowship by what the Lord actually said, but rather by what they THINK he said. If we all think alike about what is said, there will be no problem. Where God has said one thing, men often have different opinions.

Some members of the church in the New Testament did think that God had bound circumcision, and others thought he had not. If we assume the former were honest, then they felt about circumcision exactly like we feel about baptism. I believe the Lord binds baptism, and they believed he bound circumcision. Given the same disposition

to tolerance, I cannot see why the circumcision party in the early church should not have felt about someone's denial of the necessity of circumcision just like I feel about someone today denying the necessity of baptism.

This is not to say there is no difference. But would they have thought there was a difference?

The reason I suggested that baptism, rather than questions of work and worship, would be a fitting analogy to the dilemma of the early Christians is because both baptism and circumcision have to do with one's admission into God's community. ¶¶¶

IS THERE A LAWYER IN THE HOUSE?

Frank Rester

Probably the most significant obstacle to fellowship among Christians is an approach to the New Testament scriptures as if they were a legal document to be strictly obeyed and stringently enforced by official rulers of God's divine organization today. This approach requires that we have a carefully detailed and consistently executed rationale for rejecting from our religious strictures even the most passing incident from among the lives of the early disciples of the 1st century. The New Testament thus becomes a document of law from which eagle-eyed scribes and devotees to the system meticulously extract and catalog one regulation after another. And we grow more righteous in direct proportion to how versed we become in party jargon. The greater one's insight into the intricacies of logic in deciphering the ramifications of our legal system, the more highly esteemed he becomes among his contemporaries.

We have laws of inclusion and laws of exclusion. We have exceptions to these laws, and we have contingencies to the exceptions. We have "binding examples," and we have examples which are not "binding." We have commands which are "binding," and we also have methods by which we can even relegate commands to the category of not "binding." And in all of this there is a spooky propensity for an individual to identify with a particular slant of interpretation based, not upon the number of years he has spent studying the New Testament, but rather by the section of the country from which he comes and/or the college which he has attended.

We have developed methods of interpretation and criteria by which an individual is accepted or rejected from our fellowship based upon what we have chosen to call "necessary inference." I am impressed by the fact that what is extremely "necessary" to one individual from one part of the country is not "necessary" at all to an individual from another part of the country. As a matter of fact, it becomes "necessary" to retain his good standing among his fellows that he totally reject the "necessary inference" of the other brother. So what is "necessary" to one person is "unnecessary" to another. The reason for this is that in each case the individual makes one fundamental mistake which pervades his entire thinking. Until this mistake is rectified there seems to be little hope of meaningful progress toward fellowship.

This mistake is that each person assumes that the methods and procedures and practices employed by his segment of the body of Christ are identically and exactly the same as those of the disciples described in the New Testament scriptures. So when he comes upon an incident described in the New Testament that leaves some room for "inference," it becomes very "necessary" for him to simply impose upon that situation what he

would have done if he had been there. And since he would do only what the early disciples would have done, and since the early disciples only did what he would do, it should be obvious that any inferences he would make would be only those "necessary" ones. With him it is not intellectual dishonesty, it is not circular reasoning, it is not begging the question - he's just telling it like it is! Of course, this process is repeated by individuals in each sect, and in each instance a different set of inferences become "necessary." On and on this goes. As I see it, the only thing "necessary" about our "inferences" is that they are "necessary" if we are to maintain our impossible, ridiculous, and fragmented position among the other sects of 20th century Christianity.

But it has not always been this way. Compare this approach with the following proposition from Thomas Campbell's Declaration and Address:

That although inferences and deductions from Scripture premises, when fairly inferred, may be truly called the doctrine of God's holy word, yet are they not formally binding upon the consciences of Christians farther than they perceive the connection, and evidently see that they are so; for their faith must not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power and veracity of God. Therefore, no such deductions can be made terms of communion, but do properly belong to the after and progressive edification of the Church. Hence, it is evident that no such deductions or inferential truths ought to have any place in the Church's confession.

A cognate absurdity to our law of inferences is our use of "examples" in the New Testament scriptures. It really gets "hairy" when we try to explain the rationale (?) for our practice and method of interpretation of examples to someone who does not presently hold to our views. One brother who is quite well known within his segment of the body of Christ wrote a lengthy treatise published in book form which attempts to explain as "precisely and accurately" as possible - and still as simply as possible - the logical procedure employed in arriving at his view of truth. He puts it like this:

Any New Testament example that implies an underlying command, which requires specific action or attitudes of its exemplary characters, establishes a pattern, which requires the same specific action or attitudes of people today.

And conversely:

Any New Testament example that does not imply an underlying command which would require specific action or attitudes of the exemplary characters, establishes no pattern whatever, and serves only to illustrate matters that are purely optional for people today.

If this should leave you somewhat bemused and bewildered, let's look at a couple more statements which are intended to further clarify the idea:

That which is an optional expedient in one relation, but an excluded specific in another, is totally excluded. (The excluded specific classification is stronger than the optional expedient classification and supersedes when these two overlap in the same point of teaching.)

That which is an excluded specific in one relation, and is established as a pattern requirement in another, is a required matter. (The pattern requirement classification is stronger than the excluded specific classification and supersedes, when these two overlap in the same point of teaching.)

This brother was no doubt doing his very best in explaining why his faction of the body believed and practiced what it did, but can you picture in your mind the disciples gathering around our Lord and him giving out with something like that? His "mysteries of the kingdom" in comparative difficulty would be for Ned in the First Reader! Can you imagine Paul sending such instruction to the saints at Corinth or Thessalonica with the intent of alleviating their difficulties? To even attempt this "impossible dream" only showcases the ridiculous extreme to which we have come. As I look back at the time when I actually tried to convince people of such garbage under the misnomer of Christian teaching, I am filled with a deep appreciation for the audience's composure in that they were able to restrain themselves from bursting out with laughter without even holding their hand over their mouth! What do you think? ¶¶¶

RELIGION AND RELEVANCY

David Elkins

"Man, your Christianity doesn't do a thing for me; but Jesus Christ - now he turns me on!" These words, coming from a young man in California, express a sentiment which is becoming increasingly common. More and more people are noting a discrepancy between Jesus Christ and what often goes forth as the religion of Jesus Christ. This discrepancy has been noticed not only by outsiders, but also by those within the contemporary religious establishment. Thousands of perceptive, Christ-loving people are finding that their traditional religion is simply failing to express for them the freshness and excitement they are finding in their discipleship of Jesus. To many, Jesus Christ is warm, real, alive, and contemporary. But present-day religion about him is often cold, unreal,

dead, and anachronistic. Many churchmen who believe unreservedly in the relevancy of Jesus Christ are coming to feel that present-day religion is failing to communicate this relevancy. They are finding, in fact, that to make Christ relevant at all, they have to do a great deal of apologizing for the contemporary church.

One of the primary sources of religious irrelevancy is the confusion of Christianity with culture. Our foreign missionaries have brought this problem to our attention in a vivid way. They have learned (sometimes the hard way) that Christianity and culture are not necessarily synonymous. For example, an American missionary goes to an Oriental country. He builds an American-type church, teaches his converts American-type religious music, and conducts corporate worship at the American time and after his American traditions. Often when the missionary leaves, if not before, the whole effort at building a church comes crashing down! The reason? The missionary was trying to culturize the people as well as Christianize them. As a result, his whole mission enterprise became incongruous and ludicrous in its Oriental setting. Except for a few opportunists or misfits, it held no attraction for the native Orientals. A truly effective mission effort can only come about when the missionary perceives the distinction between culture and Christianity - when he adapts his approach to the native culture and allows the church to be really indigenous.

But we in America also confuse culture and Christianity. Missionaries sometimes make the mistake of trying to transfer a culture from one geographical area to another; but we in America make the mistake of transferring a culture from one era of time to another.

While nearly all churches do this to some degree, perhaps the most extreme group is the Amish. These warm, friendly people live in isolated communities dedicated to the preserving of a past culture. They live as people did two hundred years ago. Many of them buy no manufactured goods, ride in horse-drawn wagons, plow their fields with mules, and use candles to light their homes. Most of us find an Amish settlement interesting and quaint, but not particularly attractive. Because of this lack of appeal to modern man, the ultra-conservative Amish are a dying group. Should we plead with them to give up their cultural hang-ups so that they might better relate their religion to modern man, no doubt they would strongly reject such a plea on the grounds that they must "remain faithful to Christ." These good people have confused culture with Christianity.

It is quite easy for us to see how foreign missionaries and the Amish have gotten culture and Christianity mixed up. It is not difficult for us to see why both often fail to be relevant to other people. But when we turn the light of criticism upon ourselves, we often go blind or resort to all

sorts of defensive or apologetic maneuvers. The fact is, however, practically all religious movements tend to create or retain an alien culture, which makes it extremely difficult for them to relate to the contemporary world in which they find themselves.

Take the typical minister for example. He is often an anachronism - answering questions no one is any longer asking; shelling trenches that were long ago evacuated by the enemy; debating replicas of men and topics that died before the last century was complete. Many of our ministers are having themselves a grand time reliving the thrilling days of yesteryear in a religious environment which they themselves have created for this purpose. Hardly anything is funnier to the young generation than a Victorian-thinking, Elizabethan-speaking, often authoritarian minister. An eminent preacher and editor, who frequents the university campus, always asks to be introduced as an editor rather than as a preacher simply because he has learned that nothing turns off modern young people as much as the typical preacher.

For this reason I strongly feel that if the Church of Christ has something relevant to say to the upcoming generation, then it had best either educate or lovingly dethrone its ministers who are reliving the gay nineties back in Nashville, Tennessee. No such men are going to lead the church to make any appreciable dent in the culture of 1970 America.

Because the minister in today's world dominates the religious scene, it is with him that "updating" the culture of the religious establishment should begin. But if every minister became relevant in his personal approach to the modern scene, the problem of religious relevancy would not be solved. The minister would still find himself serving in a religious structure - all of which tends to resemble a dank and dusty monastery.

A great deal of time will be necessary to rid the church of cultural hang-ups and to re-structure and re-culturize it so as to relate to the modern world. Those of us who are among the "churched" probably do not realize just how alien our religious culture is to the culture of modern, "unchurched" people. The church prays in a language of a by-gone day; it sings in a language of a by-gone day; it reads from Bibles in a language of a by-gone day; it builds church houses with architecture of a by-gone day; its corporate worship is often shackled by traditions of a by-gone day. The entire religious structure seems to cry out, "I am old-fashioned, irrelevant, and dedicated to the preservation of the past. I have found modern life too complicated and will stand simply as a tomb to encase and preserve the bones of a dead culture."

The road to relevancy lies somewhere near the realization that Christianity is life, not a "religion." The culture of true Christianity is not the church building with its atmosphere of holy rituals, professional priests, and religiosity. The fertile soil of original Christianity was not the tem-

ple but the marketplace. Consequently, as the "marketplace" gives way to department stores, factories, gas stations, and air terminals, Christians must not run off and hide in the church house or in a religious sub-culture. They must be involved in the world of men - in life. They must constantly look for newer and more effective ways to communicate Christ to this world of men. They must be committed, not to any religious structure, but to Jesus only; and through a relevant witness they must try to inspire trust and commitment in those with whom they associate. If their witness is to be effective, Christians must be real men and women - not religious oddballs. They must be people of a 1970 culture; not participants in a culture of 1870. Jesus must be so real, so modern, and so relevant to them that they communicate this realness and relevancy to all around them in a vivid, "unreligious" way!

MILES APART

Lynn Munroe III

Perhaps I have been doing it all wrong so far.
Perhaps I should have stood in awe instead of
 been so intimate.
Suppose I should have been stiff and formal
Instead of friendly,
Kneeling, with hands clasped, and in a soft voice
Trying to get through.
Now I've heard you should be feared
And held in awe,
And I should tremble when your hand
Touches my shoulder....
Perhaps I should have used someone
 else's words
Instead of my own,
Words I've repeated until it no longer takes
 any concentration to say them -
They just come out.
I would prefer to say, "You are my friend, sir,
 I need your help,"
Than to piously recite, "Our father, who
 art in heaven, hallowed by thy...."
They say I've come too close.
I'm supposed to stay away
And worship from afar.
I'd rather be held in your arms.

LEADERSHIP - THE NEED

Dean A. Thoroman

More than thirty years of active association with the Church of Christ does not necessarily qualify one to deal adequately with a topic as significant as "Leadership." The material which follows is, however, based on observations and experiences involving scores of church leaders. It is submitted for your careful study and honest reaction. Since the subject has many facets, I hope to present a series of articles in succeeding issues of INTEGRITY.

To say that leadership is needed in the church as much as anywhere else is to state the almost-too-obvious. My earliest memories of serious church-related discussions include numerous references to the great need for more and better Christian leaders. Preachers have mentioned this need from the pulpit. Bible class teachers have often referred to the shortage of qualified leaders. Young people have expressed dissatisfaction with the outcome of certain confrontations with leadership selected without their advice and consent. Others have mentioned various inadequacies revealed through personal experiences with church leaders. Even those who are already recognized as elders have mentioned the necessity of training others to help them currently and to replace them in the future. It is difficult to review the church's serious needs without finally settling on "leadership" as one of the most pressing problems any

congregation faces.

Perhaps one of the reasons that preachers recognize the need for qualified leaders is that they have felt the pressure of being "under" men who they honestly did not believe were capable of guiding themselves, let alone others! Hypocrisy creeps into some of these situations - especially when a preacher does not have the confidence or the courage to state his convictions. It may be a matter of economic expediency for him to play the role of a minister in "subjection to the elders" while everyone knows that HE really tells the elders what to do. He publicly praises and defends these unqualified leaders as "men of great wisdom" and openly thanks God for their great courage. His printed "voice" (the bulletin) extols the "vision" and "good judgment" of such men. But, if you get him off to one side where no one can hear what he tells you, you hear a far different story. He just can't understand how such OBVIOUSLY UNQUALIFIED MEN were ever appointed to be elders in the first place! Little wonder he says so much about the shortage of QUALIFIED leaders!

The "average" church member who has sought guidance from an "average" elder truly knows about the need for capable leaders. In fact, he may know better than most anyone else. In the first place, he hesitates to carry weighty matters

to a person who may never have demonstrated any unique ability to cope with his own personal problems, including the matter of dealing with his own children. But, let's suppose that circumstances become so desperate that Mr. Average Church Member takes his problem to an elder in whom he has some measure of confidence. Usually, it doesn't take long to realize the futility of such a move. How many church leaders (including elders and ministers) are equipped to provide guidance for the emotionally disturbed? More importantly, how many are willing to ADMIT they are not capable of giving such help? Is it any wonder that most church members recognize their leaders in terms of STRUCTURE AND ORGANIZATION rather than as persons who are prepared and willing to provide personal guidance as it is needed?

Documentation of the need for qualified leaders is a relatively easy matter. Did you ever have the privilege of sitting in an "official" elders' meeting? If so, you probably recall the lengthy discussions on such significant topics as who gets keys to the building, what color to paint classroom walls, ways to prevent breaking of floodlights in parking lots, when to sponsor a working bee around the building, which type of wax to use on the basement tile, how to fix a leaking faucet in the men's restroom, and whether or not to increase the annual support to the Herald of Truth by \$60! You probably heard very little discussion about actual problems that people must face each day - e.g., alcoholism, divorce, violence, unreason-

ableness, insecurity, unfaithfulness, fear, frustration, etc. You heard even less about compassion, concern, and loving care. As the meeting progressed (?) it became painfully apparent that the problem of greatest magnitude became the matter of getting out and away as soon as possible. Talk about the need for leaders!

How may we answer the cry for more and better church leaders? To leave this question unanswered after focusing attention on the need would seem to be adding unnecessary frustration to an undesirable situation.

Adults need to provide examples of TOTAL COMMITMENT TO HONESTY AND TRUTH if young people are expected to do a better job of leading than the previous generation has done. Dedication to Christian principles and devotion to spiritual purposes must be so evident in our lives that no one can rightly question our motives. Similar commitment has been the trademark of all spiritual leaders. It is easy to follow those who are inspired and motivated by their own dedication.

We must seek and encourage leadership potential as early as possible. The characteristics of capable leaders must be seen in the light of DEEDS rather than of POSITION. Let us begin, even now, to SERVE rather than to be served; to GUIDE rather than to command; to ACCEPT AND TOLERATE rather than to reject and to separate. I know no better way to develop the leadership we need than by turning our lives TOTALLY over to THE ONLY INFALLIBLE GUIDE - Jehovah God. ¶¶¶

LETTERS

STILL IN THE WOODS

When I received and lightly perused the last (and first) issue, I used it for kindling, saying to myself: those fellows aren't out of the woods yet, though I have read (and corresponded with) some good articles by Frank printed in other papers. But now I'm glad to receive and read another issue that is focused to the point at issue.

When people come out of the woods they marvel at the warmth of the sun and the softness of the sod. When one notices how beneficent the sunlight is, and the dryness of the air and the ground, he may decide to stay out of the woods permanently. That is, as a place to live and work.

I realize that 2 Cor. 6:16 ("come ye out from among them") may not allude to denominations, but perhaps Rev. 18:4 does, as well as Gal. 5:1; Eph. 5:6, 7; Rom. 12:2 and Jn. 17:14.

When a term such as "Church of Christ" or "Christian Church" is used exclusively as a name for a denomination, THAT makes it just THAT. And when anyone undertakes to say or to tell "what we believe" or do not believe, then he is a "pope" and his followers are his people. Bro. Hoy speaks of "our" restoration movement, "our" divisions, and what "we" have done or been. Then, on page 124, is that name, "Churches of Christ," followed by "we."

Even Carl Ketcherside has a hard time freeing himself from the language of Ashdod - he spoke it for so long. But our language is often the exposition of our thinking, and will never improve until and unless we improve our thinking.

I used to write articles for the Standard and the Restoration Herald

showing that the scriptural name for the church is the "Church of God," based upon Paul's frequent use of it. But I don't anymore - not if it is to be used as a denominational name. Since there is but one church, and "Churches of Christ" in a local area do not constitute the whole church, and neither does any other denomination, we must dispose of denominational names and terminology.

Harry Pratt
Bird Island, Minn.

Our friend is exactly right! If members of "Churches of Christ" do not think they have made a denominational name out of a scriptural term, they might well ask themselves - as G.C. Brewer used to - if they would go into a building which had a sign reading "Church of Jesus Christ." Just adding the name of Jesus would make it unacceptable for many. We really do need a good dose of the "antidenominational serum." If we have left the impression that "Churches of Christ" constitute the whole church in any local area, we have belied our true convictions. The New Testament does not make association with "our" restoration movement a condition of divine election.

IN MOURNING

It grieves me to know how you are persecuting Christ afresh, and I know how it must grieve God.

No one binds any laws on us in the Lord's church. We only present our bodies a living sacrifice to God not man.

Name Withheld
Flint, Mich.

MORE REACTIONS

I thank God for men of your INTEGRITY, who are honestly searching for truth, and are bold enough to proclaim it. You build my hopes for better days for the Restoration Movement in the future.

It was good to meet Hoy and Frank at the Hartford Forum and to hear them speak. 'Twas no less a pleasure to receive my first issue of INTEGRITY. You may rest assured that I shall not request that my name be removed from your list. I am looking forward to the arrival of the next and future issues.

I am enclosing a small token of appreciation. May God bless, and guide, and use you is my prayer.

Ted Leake
Baton Rouge, La.

Please remove my name from your mailing list. I do not wish to receive any more books until you are back in the church.

Lionel Ingram
Swartz Creek, Mich.

I received the copies of INTEGRITY yesterday. I thought I had been looking for them for about a week, but when I began to read them I found that I had been looking for them for at least ten years. I had come to the conclusion, at least ten years ago, as a result of my own study and reflection on the divisions in the Restoration Movement, that our biggest problem has been trying to bind our own understanding of the Bible, in matters not expressly stated, on others, and trying to play God. But I was like one of the old pioneer preachers - I didn't know there was anybody else on earth who would agree with me.

Feel free to print my name and ad-

dress. The day for talking in whispers is, for me, past; and anything I say will be said in the face of the open sun. I shall look forward to the next issue. May God bless you.

Don Reece
Radford, Va.

Having read the January issue (which we had requested as a sample), I am impressed by the sincerity and candor of your journal; Hoy Ledbetter's article shows some fine, honest thought.

God be with you and grant that your work help bring Christians together.
C. W.

Chapel Hill, N. C.

I see no further need for you to clutter up my desk with such an inconsistent conglomeration as this which you call integrity.

John Gibson
Detroit, Mich.

I received the January number of INTEGRITY and read it over twice. The more I read it, the better I like it. I read three other religious papers and I can truly say I like INTEGRITY best. No wasted words, true to the Bible, firm but not bitter, and financed by free will offerings - that I like too. So I enclose a money order for \$5 to be used wherever it is needed most. More power to you. Keep up the good work.

Thomas K. Rouse
Detroit, Mich.

I appreciate the courageous and thought-provoking character of your publication. I would like to receive it on a regular basis. Thank you very much.

Name Withheld
Salisbury, Md.