

KJV 1611

"...THE CHURCH OF THE LIVING GOD, THE PILLAR AND GROUND OF THE TRUTH."

I Timothy 3:15

THE BAPTIST PILLAR

Published by Bible Baptist Church
1203 4th St. Brandon, MB R7A 3J7
Vol. 5 No.4 July/Aug. 1997

Independent

Missionary

J.W. Reaves
Editor & Pastor



CANADA'S ONLY TRUE BAPTIST PAPER



Phone 204-726-5806

Fax 204-728-0995

E-mail bkjv1611@comcast.net

THE NEED FOR A MOTHER -CHURCH

by Pastor Ronnie Wolfe

We will consider this topic in four sections with the following titles: **A Church Enclosed, A Church Fragmented, A Church Estranged, A Church Extended.**

A Church Enclosed

*"A garden inclosed is my sister, my spouse"
(S. of S. 4:12)*

The Lord's church is a distinct and separate organization from any other on the earth. The local church is not simply a fraction or a part of a larger and similar organization. She is loved by God, Christ, and the Holy Spirit. God purchased the church (local concept) with his own blood (Acts 20:28). Jesus Christ delegated authority to his church (Matt. 28:18-20). The Holy Spirit approved the church (local concept) on the Day of Pentecost (Acts 1:5; 2:1-3).

As we think of the church's being a distinct organization unlike any other in the world, let us consider briefly her authority by example.

Example #1: In Acts chapter 6 we read of a problem arising in the church

regarding the "daily ministrations." The problem was solved by a general agreement [today we think of that as a church vote] wherein they chose seven men to take care of the "daily ministrations." The church exercised her distinct authority in doing this. Being members of this church, they voted in agreement to select these seven men.

Proposition #1: What if ten of the members of this church met somewhere away from the regular meeting place and voted to do something about the problem of the "daily ministrations"? Would their agreement together or their vote determine what was or what was not to be done in regard to this "daily ministrations"? The answer is no.

Example #2: In Acts chapter 15 we read of the disagreement that came to the churches over circumcision and the Mosaic Law. When the meeting took place, and agreement was made that is recorded in verse 20. In verse 22 we find that it pleased the apostles, the elders, with the whole church.

Proposition #2: If there were some in the church who met on their own and came to some conclusions concerning

circumcision, would it have any validity in the "inclosed" church? The answer is no. In fact, the sect of the Pharisees (verse 5) did just that; but when it was considered in the context of the church, their decision was refused. Notice also that the persuasion of this "sect" was not even considered by the local church until their influence had caused confusion within the local church.

So, in saying that the church is "inclosed" this writer is advocating that each church of the Lord Jesus is completely independent of all other organizations and that no decisions pertaining to the work of God through the churches can be made outside this local establishment.

Keep this in mind as we consider the next point, which naturally follows.

A Church Fragmented

*"That there should be no schism"
(1 Cor. 12:25)*

This very sect mentioned under our first point (the sect of the Pharisees, Acts 15:5) show their true form in this chapter. First, we must notice that they were believers. These were not lost sinners

who were trying to penetrate the church, but this "sect" formed right within the church itself.

They had formed their own clique and had formed their own sub-theology. They were not teaching works for salvation; they were simply putting the burden of the Law on Christian believers.

The most important aspect of this example, though, is that this sub-set of believers had separated themselves from the church and had taken authority upon themselves to carry on the business of the Lord's church. Acts 15:24 tells us that they "went out from us." This is the perfect example of a small group of believers in a particular church who decide arbitrarily to meet in a different location and appoint themselves to be a body and take upon themselves the authority to select a pastor and deacons and to serve the ordinances; namely, baptism and the Lord's Supper.

This is done on a regular and ongoing basis in Baptist churches around the country. What is wrong with this? Let us consider it by example.

Example: Bro. and Mrs. Swakley are saved through the ministry of the Shawnee

(Need continued on page 2)

THE NEW TESTAMENT CHURCH VS. THE UNIVERSAL INVISIBLE CHURCH

THEORY

By R. Penner

(The U.I.C. Program)
[part 1 of 2]

The Universal Invisible Church "theory" is undoubtedly, one of the biggest blunders of Church doctrine today. The exposure of this theory is of particular interest to me, because I used to both believe and teach a large part of it as church doctrine.

There are five aims the author (me) wishes to accomplish within this report. They are as follows:

1. To clearly state this theoretical doctrine.
2. To establish the particulars surrounding the inception of this theory.
3. To test this theory against the scriptures.
4. To display the fruits of this theory.
5. To establish the true New Testament churches.

It is believed by Universal Invisible church theorists, that the church which Jesus started, was and is a universal, invisible church. It is further believed that all believers gain entry into this body, or membership into it, through a mystical Holy Spirit baptism.

Most false doctrines have a specific man or men as a founder, ex.: Calvin is the founder of "Pre-destination," Campbell was the main founder of "Baptismal Regeneration."

The Universal Invisible church theory, as near as I can determine, can't be traced back to one man, but rather to a specific point in time by a number on men. This period of time was certainly not back to the time of Christ. There is no evidence to suggest that this theory was even heard of until the Reformation of the sixteenth century, never mind the acceptance of such a teaching. To understand this theory's inception, we need to identify two things: who were the initiators of this theory,

and what conditions existed, leading up to the declaration of this theory? To answer the last question first, many heresies along with corruption had crept into the New Testament churches over several centuries. These heresies and conditions, eventually produced the Roman Catholic church. There was a very damaging heresy promoted by Rome, which is, in like fashion, promoted today. This was the defining of "ekklesia" (church) and Basileia (kingdom) to mean the same. These two Greek words are not even close to the same definition. The Roman Catholics needed to push their alignment of these two words, in order to give merit to their Universal Visible false doctrine. This false doctrine gave justification to the Roman Catholics, for their horrendously wicked pursuit of world domination. As far back as the records go, the Roman Catholic hierarchy has vehemently discouraged the laymen from studying the scriptures. Ignorance ran rampant because of this fact. Hosea 4:6 states that, "My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge," while Jesus warns clearly in Matthew 22:29, "Ye do err, not knowing the scriptures, nor the power of God."

So now the world had two types of church doctrine; the few in number, true New Testament local visible churches, and the apostate Universal Visible Roman Catholic Choooorch. The conditions in the apostate, were so wicked and oppressive, that it produced the reformation. The reformation was the birthing of protesting church babies. Who is the mother? Rome is. Who were they protesting against? Rome. So, who are they? They were Protesting Roman Catholics. When we examine Protestant church doctrines, we see they are still very much still a part of Mommy. However, they had to replace the Roman Catholic doctrine of Universal Visible. Hence, out of necessity, the Protestants birthed the Uni-

(UIC continued on page 6)

(Need continued from page 1)

Baptist Church. They both submit themselves to baptism under the authority of this church. After baptism, they are members in good standing with the privilege of participating in various aspects of that church's ministries and activities. They may now vote on issues brought up by that church. They may be served the Lord's Supper by that church and may partake of the same on a regular basis as long as they are members in good standing. They may **not**, however, make personal and private decisions for the church. Whatever decisions are made come before the church for discussion and consideration and are voted upon by the entire membership before any actions are taken.

Now, let us say, that Bro. Swakley moves to a different city and cannot find a Bible-teaching church to attend; so he decides (on his own) that he will get a few believers together and start meeting for prayer and fellowship. After some time and consideration, Bro. and Mrs. Swakley decide that they may as well have a church in that community; so they take the following action: A preacher is called to come to preach to them on a regular basis. The preacher preaches for a while and someone is saved. They determine that the new believer must be baptized, so they decide that the preacher is to do the baptizing. The new convert is immersed in water just the way they used to do at the previous church. Now he is a member of this "church".

At this stage of the drama most people would automatically and without question call this group of people a church. But if we follow through with this example logically, we find that some problems arise. Following are some statements and questions that will, I hope, show the problems.

1. To what church did this couple belong when they were first saved and baptized? Shawnee Baptist Church.

2. By what authority did they perform their privileges in that local church? Local church authority.

3. When they moved away

from the community of the Shawnee Baptist Church, where was their membership? It remained at the Shawnee Baptist Church.

4. Was there anything wrong with meeting with other believers for prayer and fellowship? Absolutely not!

5. Was it wrong for them to call for a preacher to come and preach to them? Not per se! But a mental attitude is being formed at this time, an attitude of worshipping and functioning as a church.

6. What is now the status of the Swakley's membership at Shawnee Baptist Church? By continuing to be members they remain obligated to the church and are under its authority. Distance does not change that. Names are not removed simply because people move to a different place except for nonattendance, which is done because of lack of faithfulness to the church. That is no way to have your name removed from a church roll.

7. Were they wrong for having the new convert baptized? Yes. Having their membership back at Shawnee Baptist, they usurped the authority of Shawnee Baptist Church by asking for the baptism of a new convert of their own.

If they had lived around the corner from the meeting place of Shawnee Baptist Church, would they have taken the same authority upon themselves? Then what makes it all right to do at a distance? Distance does not change authority.

Do you see what is happening? The same thing that happened in Acts chapter 15. A new "sect" is being organized and is going out "from us."

8. Upon baptizing the new convert the authority for baptism was changed from the church to an individual or a fragment. Making this decision to baptize, whether it be made by one person or a few, is usurping the authority of the church; because it becomes an arbitrary decision. Now, does the authority for baptism, then, lie in the preacher? Some would say that it does; but if you will notice the above example, the authority is actually wielded by Mr. and Mrs. Swakley.

Mr. & Mrs. Swakley have

now decided to vote without consent of the church to which they belong. Remember, distance makes no difference in authority. Mr. and Mrs. Swakley have now fragmented the Shawnee Baptist Church by separating to themselves and claiming authority which they do not have. This is no different from ten of the men of a church meeting outside of the building in the parking lot and making decisions for the church. These ten men have no business deciding who will or will not be baptized, because if their discussion determines that Mr. Back be baptized, they must first bring it up before the church before Mr. Back can be baptized. This is church authority.

If these same ten men decided to carry on church business by themselves and simply stay away from the Shawnee Baptist Church, they are still wrong in these ways.

1. They are wrong for not attending their church (Heb. 10:25).

2. They are wrong for not giving to their church (1 Cor. 16:1).

3. They are wrong for not visiting for their church (2 Cor. 5:20).

You may ask why they cannot simply ask for their names to be removed from the church roll of Shawnee Baptist Church. That can be done, but that is a negative aspect. That is like saying that you no longer agree with the theology or the program of the church and do not want to be like them or a part of them.

Not only that, but if your name is removed from a roll by request, you are still submitting to the authority of the church and are considered a disciplined member.

Too, if your name were removed from Shawnee Baptist Church by request, to what church would you belong? If you say none, then how do you become a member of another church?

In our example, the person simply places himself in the new church, and others are added according to his agreement; therefore, the first person to begin the work becomes the authority for all the actions of the church. The authority rests completely

upon that one person.

You do not become a member of any local church simply by declaring that you are such. We have many people in the Harrison area who claim to be members of First Baptist Church but are not.

So we see how innocently that a church can be fragmented. Christ is against a church schism, and this is what develops under the example given.

A "Church" Estranged

"Certain which went out from us"
(Acts 15:24)

When the foregoing example has been developed completely, we find a fine-looking building sitting on the corner of some city somewhere having people attend regularly and being baptized regularly and functioning in the same manner as the Shawnee Baptist Church before mentioned.

But remember that the authority for all this church business comes from one person, the person who got the ball rolling. They will tell you perhaps that the preacher has the authority to baptize, but you tell me who asked the preacher to come and do the baptizing and I will tell you that it was Mr. and/or Mrs. Swakley. So the authority for baptism, church business, the Lord's Supper, church discipline, etc. came from the Swakleys.

This church, instead of being just another Baptist church on another corner in another city is an estranged church, not a true church at all. At what time did the Shawnee Baptist Church vote to give the Swakleys (members of Shawnee) permission to meet together and carry on business as a church? At no time. They assumed it. They claimed it. Yea, they usurped the authority of their own church, betrayed that church, and estranged themselves from that church just as the "sect" in Acts chapter 15 did.

A Church Extended

"Go ye therefore, and teach all nations"

(Matt. 28:19)

The Bible offers a proper way for extending the church of the Lord Jesus Christ to spread throughout the world with her influence and her Gospel. This in modern times is called the "mother church" method. You will not find this phrase in the Scriptures, but the principle is definitely presented by example especially in the book of Acts.

Institutional Authority — a Biblical Principle

Please refer to Deuteronomy Chapter 12. This chapter shows an ancient principle that was practiced by Israel from the commandment of God. Notice especially these verses:

verse 5: *"But unto the place which the LORD your God shall choose out of all your tribes to put his name there, even unto his habitation shall ye seek, and thither thou shalt come."*

verse 8: *"Ye shall not do after all the things that we do here this day, every man whatsoever is right in his own eyes."*

verse 13: *"Take heed to thyself that thou offer not thy burnt offerings in every place that thou seest."*

This same authority is found in the New Testament beginning with the preaching of John the Baptist and continuing throughout what is commonly called the church age. John was a man *"sent from God"* (John 1:33). John did not just begin a ministry of his own, but he had God's direct authority.

This authority continues to our present age. The authority of John was given to the church by Christ in Matt. 28:18-20: *"And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power [authority] is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. Amen."*

Jesus and the Apostles had John's Baptism

Neither Jesus nor any of the

apostles did anything regarding the church until they were baptized by John, so John's baptism carried a very powerful authority. Even the Pharisees demanded to know by what authority Christ did the things that he did (See Matt. 21:23). Jesus answered the Pharisees with a question: *"The baptism of John, whence was it? from heaven, or of men? And they reasoned with themselves, saying, If we shall say, From heaven; he will say unto us, Why did ye not then believe him?"* (Matt. 21:25). The Pharisees could not tell Jesus from where the authority of John came. That is because they refused to recognize Heaven's authority (See Luke 7:29-30).

From One Church to Another: The Biblical Pattern

The church at Jerusalem was the first church in existence. When it was found that there were believers in Samaria through Philip's preaching, the church at Jerusalem sent Peter and John; and they laid their hands on the Samaritans, and they received the demonstration of the Holy Spirit [authority] just as the believers in Jerusalem had received. This receiving of the Holy Spirit was God's institutional sanction. This was necessary because the Samaritans thought that God's authority was already upon them (See John 4:20).

When Saul of Tarsus was saved he was taken to Damascus. A man by the name of Ananias, who evidently was affiliated with the church at Jerusalem (see verse 13), was sent (verse 17) to Saul that he might pray for him and that he might receive his sight and be filled with the Holy Spirit. So, even Paul's ministry was sanctioned by the church at Jerusalem. He was not an authority of himself.

When Paul and Silas were to begin their first missionary journey, they were sent out by the church at Antioch; and when they returned from their missionary journey, they reported to the church at Antioch. That is because they were not a ministry unto themselves, but their ministry was through the local church. Paul teaches us in Eph. 3:21

(Need continued on page 6)



CANADIAN NEWS



Keep Criminals Out of Jail!?

A new sentencing option that keep criminals out of jail has heightened the public's distrust of the justice system because it's being used inappropriately, say critics.

But supporters say while there may be a few snags, conditional sentences save taxpayers money and ease the burden on overcrowded jails.

"It's being applied to cases involving sex offenses and drinking and driving causing death," says executive director of the Canadian Police Association, "It has led some judges to ignore the fundamental principles of sentencing — rehabilitation, deterrents and denunciation — which it was never meant to do."

Last September, the federal government changed the Criminal Code to include conditional sentences for some crimes.

At the judge's discretion, anyone sentenced to less than 2 years in jail can serve their time in the community. Conditions range from house arrest to a promise to keep the peace.

The police association has been pressuring the federal government to amend the law because of the growing number of disturbing cases, such as:

- Three members of a family in Jeffreys, Nfld., are serving three-month sentences for drug trafficking at home

— the same place they peddled drugs for almost a year.

- A 75-year-old Ottawa man was given a conditional sentence after being convicted of sexually assaulting his step-daughter for 12 years when she was a child.
- A Halifax man is serving 2 years under house arrest after he lost control of his car and killed 2 teenagers sitting on the steps of a church.

Highest-Risk Children

A study of Manitoba's 198 highest-risk children shows they are costing the province \$7.9 million annually for treatment and other services.

The profile of the 198 highest-risk children revealed that almost 70% of the children were in the care of child-welfare.

Almost 70% had been physically abused, 65% had been sexually abused, and more than half of their parents were substance abusers.

Almost all of the children were described as aggressive, having behavioural problems and difficulties in school.

Thirty-five of the children had been moved more than 11 times, while another 48 had lived in 6 to 10 placements.

Gays Defended

In Calgary, AB., gay students and their parents are praising the Calgary public school board for adopting protection for homosexual students and

staff. The new guidelines call for district schools to ensure homosexual students and staff a "safe and secure learning environment" through counselling and heightened awareness of harassment and violence.

A trustee said, "We're not condoning any lifestyle, merely the safety of all students."

Just 10 Years Ago

The number of reported cases of AIDS in Canada was 1,000. Compare today's cases of literally thousands.

The figure back then (1,000) was large enough to keep public health officials worried. What must they think NOW!

Scented Soap?

In Nova Scotia, a regional director of the medical organization Canada said worshippers should stop wearing scented products when they come to church. "God gave us normal, healthy bodies, including our odours. Bathing can be done with scent-free soaps and hypo-allergenic shampoos. Scented products are among the items that can cause problems for people with environmental sensitivities. The church takes a stand on such issues as abortion. This is an important issue to take a stand on as well."

Editor's Note: What a joke!!!! Comparing abortion with scented soaps.

Woman Exonerated

After Murdering Unborn Infant

A Canadian woman who shot her unborn child 2 days before his birth committed no offense, and Ontario judge has ruled. Charges of attempted murder were dropped because Canadian law states that a child does not "become a human being" until birth. In 1988 the Canadian Supreme Court struck down the country's abortion law on procedural grounds, and parliament has failed to replace it.

(What in the World!, Vol. 21 No. 5, 1997, citing National Right to Life News, Jan. 9, 1997)

Taxes our Biggest Expense in Canada

A recent study by the Fraser Institute in Canada revealed that the average Canadian family's tax demand rose by an astonishing 1,200 percent in the last 33 years. Back in 1961 the average Canadian family paid only \$1,675 in taxes each year, while today a family pays \$21,228 in taxes. Income taxes and hidden taxes are now the largest single expenditure for families. In fact, we spend more on taxes today than we spend on housing, food, and clothing combined.



INTERNATIONAL NEWS



What "Gene"eology?

"There is no 'gay' gene, any more than there is an 'adultery' gene, a 'pornography addiction' gene, a 'premarital sex' gene, a 'greed' gene, or a 'theft' gene."

The Advocate

O'Hair's Org. Lose Tax-Exempt Status

The IRS has stripped the tax-exempt status of the Society of Separationists and the Stevens American Atheist

Library, 2 of the 5 non-profit organizations founded by Madalyn Murray O'Hair, for tax code violations. O'Hair has been missing since September 1995. In addition, the IRS on Feb. 18 seized the \$231,000 Austin, Texas, home of O'Hair to pay back taxes.

Baptist Challenge

Falwell Fooled by Orthodox Translator?

Dave Hunt (4/97 *Berean Call*) says: "Evangelicals coming

from the west to evangelize Russians naively look to the Orthodox Church for help and are often duped. Jerry Falwell was part of a large evangelistic outreach in Moscow last year involving a tour which many Americans joined to see the 'wonderful response to the gospel in the former Soviet Union.' Jerry was the principal speaker at a large gathering in Moscow's Olympic Stadium. According to Russian/English-speaking

attendees, he gave a clear gospel message, but the translator changed it to conform to Orthodox belief. When Jerry gave the invitation to receive Christ (offensive to Orthodoxy), the translator made it sound like a call for all who wanted to join in prayer. Many raised their hands, leading Jerry and those with him to mistakenly believe there had been a great response to the gospel..." The Russian Orthodox religion is false. It opposes the gospel

and is *not* Christianity.

CC

Genetic Determination or Wilful Choice?

A homosexual, or alcoholic, today is treated as a helpless victim of his biology rather than as a wilful agent with control of his own conduct. This conveniently diminishes accountability and the capacity to choose. Gone is the sense of responsibility for bad choices, as social workers/psychologists/biologists/criminologists scurry to find the "destining gene cluster" to blame for the abusive behaviour, youth/gang violence, homosexuality, drunkenness, etc.

CC

World Vision and Abortion Funding

World Vision recently found itself in a controversy over its support of a bill that provided abortion funding for Third World nations. A Congressman said World Vision's letter of support of the family-planning bill "tipped the scales" in favour of the measure (5/97 *AFA Journal*). Just over a year ago WV president Dr. Robert A. Seiple said the United Nations needs reform but said it fills a necessary role Christians should support (1/1/96 CC). World Vision is a radical new-evangelical relief agency that has used funds donated by Christian to help Communists, Muslims, and Catholics.

CC

Will Ellen Still Wear Pants?

Newsweek's April 14 edition entertained some questions regarding the homosexual/showbiz issue.

Paul Ridnick writes, "If Ellen comes out, will she remain loyal to the lesbian pants creed? Certain Sapphic celebs are clearly encouraged to femme up by their agents and managers, but getting Ellen or Melissa Etheridge or K.D. Lang into a dress is like coaxing Huck Finn into a camisole. I always picture the dressing room warfare, with the performer finally throwing up her hands and exclaiming "Fine! You can put trim on my blazer!" Preachers, churches, and Christians still don't get it.

Everyday magazines, newspapers, and the media are grappling with this clothing issue. Yet I still have pastors say, "It's secondary. Not worth losing people over or risking a church split." Again and again preachers excuse their wives, teen daughters, and church ladies for dressing like the world. The world, the flesh — and yes — the devil knows what this issue is all about! When will we get it?

The Voice in the Wilderness

Catholics Boost Graham's Attendance

Roman Catholics played a key role in Billy Graham's recent San Antonio crusade as a sort of payback for the Baptist show of support during the Pope's 1987 San Antonio visit — and rock stars also provided a big boost (see 5/1 CC). Graham praised the co-operation of Hispanics and Catholics, including an early endorsement from Archbishop Patrick Flores, the top Catholic official in Texas (5/19 *Chr. Today*). Flores taped radio spots encouraging Catholics to attend the crusade to help bring them to a closer commitment to their faith. Graham said: "The Devil has separated us, and a crusade like this is used of God to bring people of all denominations together." To be Scriptural, this sentence should read: "God has separated us [from false-gospel systems such as Roman Catholicism], and a crusade like this is used of *the Devil* to bring people of all denominations together." CC

New Bill Gothard Report

Miles J. Stanford in a new 5-page report entitled "Gothardism" (free, from him at : 480 Vindicator Dr., #111, Colo. Springs, CO 80919) says: "Bill Gothard has one foot in the *Charismatic* (demonism) realm, and the other in the *Covenant* (legalism) realm." In a recent letter from Gothard to us, he confirmed that he attended and participated in Bill Bright's Dec. 1994 fasting and prayer meeting in Orlando, but did not say *why* he, a proclaimed fundamentalist, went. Nor was there any expression of regret for going, or surprise at the liberal/new-

evangelical attendees. The CC editor believes that Gothard does not deserve the support of fundamentalists if he is leading toward new-evangelicalism and Bill Bright ecumenism.

CC

Wimpy American Males

Man as leaders and protectors of society have meekly allowed women to be placed in harmful situations. Women are given guns and told to take on murderers and drug dealers, and may soon face military combat. We are a society of men turned weak and women turned ugly. Ugly with anger at men who have no backbone. Our schools and churches have produced meek little robots — not only by preaching, but mainly by example. Both men and women have lost their identity. A strong man or feminine woman is looked upon as politically incorrect and in this society is scorned unceasingly. Today's male keeps quiet, works hard to support huge government programs, and whiles away his existence between entertainment and lethargy. [Adapted, May '97 *Network*] CC

The Great Disney Betrayal

Disney movies have long promoted magic, occultism, etc., and were never as pure as their reputation. But the new Disney under Michael Eisner has become a money-making machine, outraging three generations of shocked devotees by anti-Christian films released by it and its subsidiaries such as Miramax, Touchstone, and Hollywood Pictures. A 156-page 1996 book *Disney and the Bible* by Perucci Ferraiuolo [Horizon Books, 3825 Hartzdale Dr. Camp Hill, PA 17011, phone 717-761-7044], says of Disney: "Biblically based family values are attacked; Occultism, Satanism, Eastern religions and New Age philosophy are promoted; Sexual perversion is modelled and applauded as an acceptable lifestyle..." The book gives an interesting biographic peek at the man Walt Disney, and cites examples of Disney declension. It has become a haven for homosexu-

als, has homosexual theme nights at its park, and provides health insurance to partners of its homosexual employees. Its publishing company *Hyperion* has anti-family books such as *Growing Up Gay in America*. Disney now owns ABC which has *NYPD Blue*, and the lesbian *Ellen*. Sadly, the new Disney is an unabashed peddler of immorality, licentiousness, and in-your-face homo-sexuality.

CC

Partial-Birth Ban Won't Stop Abortions

Banning barbaric partial-birth abortions, the gruesome technique of murdering late-term unborn infants, will not stop this slaughter of the unborn. Medical monsters can do their dirty work using other methods. As one abortionist noted, if he kills the baby before performing the grisly partial-birth technique, any congressional ban against aborting "a living fetus," would not apply (5/12 *New Amer.*). So he injects a lethal solution into the womb which kills the baby. He then grabs the dead infant, pierces and crushes the skull, drags the dead baby out and disposes of the parts. His tactic begins by killing the fetus in the womb so that he can't be accused of an abortion on "a living fetus." CC

CC

THE DEATH OF SOCIETY

Sexual permissiveness is the death-knell of civilizations, according to anthropologist J.D. Unwin. Unwin studied 88 civilizations, from the dawn of history down to the present. Each culture, he found, began with a strict code of sexual conduct and ended with complete sexual freedom.

(Need continued from page 3)
that God receives glory only through the church.

So down through the ages a continual line of authoritative baptisms has existed even unto our day.

If a person, then, begins a ministry without the express authority of an existing church of the Lord Jesus Christ, then he is a ministry to himself and has divided the church of the Lord and caused a schism, which the Lord hates. He has become a "denomination" of his own, and his ministry is not approved of God. He has taken authority unto himself despite the pattern that God has laid down in Scripture over and over.

May God bless us as we spread the Gospel by way of the churches of the Lord Jesus Christ. He promised that no matter how long the world stands the gates of Hell will not prevail against the church of the Lord. So the authority of God continues throughout history from the time of Christ. Every spiritual worker should be very careful to be sure that this authority is taken with responsibility in order not to usurp the authority of Christ's churches. (Eph. 3:21). □



(UIC continued from page 2)

versal Invisible church theory. They did this so as to justify breaking from Catholicism, and to justify the adversities of "Pet doctrines" throughout Protestantism. At this time, the world now had three stated church doctrines. These were: the local visible New Testament churches, The Universal Visible Roman Catholic church, and Rome's babies the Universal Invisible church theory. Upon looking at the Reformation, one might think that Satan would be upset at the reformers for giving his bride (Rome) a black eye.

However, on closer examination, he is probably just as happy, with the increase of confusion. Satan is a master counterfeiter and deceiver. 2 Corinthians 11:14 shows this. For every doctrine our Lord has, Satan has his perversion and promoters (2 Corinthians 11:15). Pertinent to this topic, Christ has his Church that he started, "...a chaste virgin," (2 Cor. 11:2). Satan has the church he started and her babies. She is the whore of Babylon and Mother of Harlots, as recorded in Revelation 17.

In the study of any topic, one of the first things we must do, is to make sure our reference material is both qualified to instruct and pertinent to our field of study. My primary reference book is the Holy Bible (KJV 1611). All secondary books must meet with the authority of the primary. The Bible is the only truly qualified text of which to base any doctrinal research upon. 2 Timothy 3:16 reads, "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness..." This passage states it very clearly. "Inspired by God." That statement seals its qualification. The first pertinent topic it lists is doctrine. It is the only book to use to establish true God ordained doctrine. This is why God, through Paul, commissioned Timothy, as well as all other Baptist preachers, to "Preach the word...exhort with all...doctrine." (2 Timothy 4:2). The prophesying of the rise of false doctrines, such as the Universal Invisible church theory, are spoken of and explained very clearly in 2 Timothy 4:3, "For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears."

In order to establish what a true New Testament church is, we must look at what the scriptures teach and qualify as such. We will do this at some length, as we proceed.

In the last decade, there has been a vigorous pursuit question of "what does the original Hebrew and Greek say?" This question by primarily ecumenicals, in my opinion, is a pursuit of

challenging biblical authority, rather than acquiring clearer doctrinal understanding. However, a proper study in these fields, accepting definitions and renderings, without pre-conceived assumptions, can prove profitable.

The Greek word for church, which is used some 115 times in the New Testament is "ekklesia." This word was derived from two other words in the Greek. The one word was "ek" which rendered meant "out of." The other word was "Kakew," which rendered meant "I call." From these two words "Ekklesia" defines as "called out." Also, from the Greek study, we can establish the understood common usage of the word, or the philological definition. The common usage of "ekklesia," was an "assembly." From its root definition we get A "called out." From its common usage we get B "assembly." A+B="Called out assembly." This is a pretty easy definition to understand if people want to see it. An observation to consider, is the following, if either of these components, A or B, are deleted, you have nothing of value. A non-called out bunch of people assembling is confusion, and a called out people not assembling is useless. I believe these two descriptions depict a Universal Invisible church, "confused and useless" to the work of God. We know that God would not be the author of such a doctrine because the Bible says in 1 Corinthians 14:33, "for God is not the author of confusion, but of peace, as in all churches of the saints."

As we have mentioned previously, it is profitable to note the understood definition, or contextual usage of the word "ekklesia" at the time of Christ and the early church. It has been defined as, "an assembly of the citizens summoned by the crier; the legislative assembly."

Another definition read, "the assembly of the people, which in Greek cities had the power of final decision in public affairs."

Within these two definitions we see a couple of points, that bring clearer understanding to the definition of "church." Not only were the people of the assembly "citizens;" they also were a "select group," with

the "power" to carry out a specific commission. This is truly a beautiful picture of Jesus' church.

Jesus distinguished his "ekklesia" from other "ekklesias" of the day by calling it "My church" (Matthew 16:18). It wasn't that He gave it any different meaning. This "ekklesia" however, was to be His assembly, constituted according to His legislated criteria, to carry out His commission. To coin a phrase from one of our provinces, you might say true churches are "a distinct society."

It is clear that this called out people must be assembled. We will examine four inherent implications of the word "assembly," so as to grasp a firmer understanding of what Christ's church is called out to be.

An assembly must be local. There is no place within the understanding of the word "assembly," that anyone can derive a concept of universal or plural location. You may have an assembly here, and another over there, but never the same assembly here and there. In roughly one hundred passages of scripture, the Greek word for church which is "ekklesia," is referring to specific geographical locations. Paul persecuted "The church which was at Jerusalem," in Acts 8:1. Paul mentions in Romans 16:4, that not only he, "...but also all the churches of the Gentiles," in their various locations, gave thanks for Priscilla and Aquilla's work in the Gospel. In Galatians 1:2, Paul sent a letter of grace and peace, specifically to the churches of Galatia.

There are approximately fifteen verses that do not refer to any one church specifically, but rather any church generally. The Universalists, like to jump on these scriptures to frame up a doctrine. A good number of such scriptures are found in Ephesians. However, in looking at them, they do not give any support to any Universal Church theory. Ephesians 5:23, which is a much used scripture by Universalists, merely refers to husband and wife relationships. It states that our marital relationships are to mirror that of Christ and any church which is His. 1 Corinthians 11:3, is a

profitable cross reference for this study, as it states, "...that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of every woman is the man..." One Christ over many men, the same as one Christ over many churches. The children of Israel, when they were in the wilderness, also support the assertion that an assembly must be local. We might almost apply the law of first mention, which states that the first mention of a topic gives the key to subsequent teachings on the topic. Acts 7:38, refers to them as "the church in the wilderness." Romans 15:4 states, "For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning..." God gave us a picture of His church in the Old Testament. This picture we would later see built upon. The Bible is both clear and concise on the doctrine of the church being local. When roughly 90% of the occurrences of church in the New Testament refer to specific localities, it would be inconsistent and confusing to try and contort the other 10% of references into a doctrine of total opposite interpretation. According to the law of progressive mention, revelation of any given doctrine is made increasingly clear as the Bible unfolds. However, it will never contradict or oppose the first mentioned occurrence or example which has been given. There again, most Universalists do not know what the Bible sets forth as solid doctrine, because they have not studied the scriptures. The Bible exhorts us in 2 Timothy 2:15, to "study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed." It states the reason next, "rightly dividing the word of truth." We have an example of a people who did this in the formative years of the early church. The "Bereans" in Acts 17, were said to have "searched the scriptures daily, to see if those things were so." They are quite a contrasting example to the Athenians on Mars' hill, further along in Acts 17, who had every kind of confusion in their midst. I think that this is also an accurate comparison between a grounded New Testament church, and a Universal Invisible church promoting assembly.

The second inferred impli-

cation of the word "assembly" is visible. An assembly must be visible. The Bible commands us in Hebrews 10:25 to not forsake the assembling of ourselves together. How members of a church can assemble invisibly is beyond comprehension. The word "assemble" does not entertain any invisible concept. An invisible assembly scenario might be as follows:

An invisible preacher ...
Preaching to invisible
members ... Taking up
invisible tithes.

Obviously ludicrous isn't it? If we again look at the first picture of a church, what do we see? That's exactly my point. We "see" the members. It was a very visible assembly. God performed many miracles for the children of Israel in the wilderness to deliver them from their enemies. Making them invisible was not one of them. Numbers 22:41 speaks of when Balak took Balaam up into the heathen high places, so as to "see" the utmost part of the people. A few questions to ponder: in an invisible assembly how would we "let men see our good works" according to Matthew 5:16? How would people see that we have "love one to another" John 13:35? How also, would we execute church discipline according to Matthew 18:17, if we are all invisible? I would not even know if any body was there, never mind to establish those in agreement or opposed. This example may appear silly, and it is in actuality, but it shows the impossibilities of such a theory.

The third inferred adjective of the word "assembly" is organized. God, through His Word, has continually instructed His church on being organized and orderly. The assembly that is not organized, is a waste of human resources. They might have all the talents that are needed, but if they are not "fitly joined together," as Ephesians 4:16 states in the first part of the verse, they will not "maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love," as the end of the verse states. Verse 15 of the same chapter, states that Christ is the organizer, the

head, not any hierarchy. The Lord has some very definite rules of order, in the organizing of His church. Paul wrote to Titus in chapter one of the book, instructing him to "...set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city," as he had appointed him. There was to be order in the churches; they were to have leaders and examples. It was not an unorganized, no holds barred, free for all "as I feel led" assembly. 1 Timothy 3, speaks specifically about Pastors and Pastors in training's conduct in the church of God, any one of them. It, however, also applies to the rest of the body in application. Verse 15 says that, "...thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the church of the living God." We notice in this scripture, the words "behave thyself." It is apparent in this chapter, that God cares about our homes, that is the life we lead within, but more importantly, "the church of God." (1 Timothy 3:5).

Again, we can go to our first example of a church, in the Old Testament. Were they disorganized? No, absolutely not. They had very specific rules of conduct and organization. According to Numbers 2:34, "the children of Israel did according to all that the LORD commanded Moses." There is a blueprint of success for the New Testament church. This is in the hands of the Master Carpenter. Paul referred to himself as "a wise masterbuilder" in 1 Corinthians 3:10. Why? Because he had hearkened unto the instructions of the Lord. The Lord stated on more than one occasion how he would organize, compile, or build His church. One such place was 1 Corinthians 12:28. "And God hath set some in the church first apostles..." That's what Paul was, an apostle, howbeit borne out of due season. This was the Lord's order of building. Psalm 127:1 states that "...except the Lord build the house, they labour in vain that build it." The U.I.C. theorists tend to stray far and wide of biblical authority or headship, such as a Pastor. 1 Peter 5:2 tells the Pastors to

"take the oversight" of the flock of God that is among them, each local church. The Pastor's office is definitely part of our Lord's plan to organized His church so we are fitly joined together. Hebrews 13:17, tells us to "obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves: for they watch for your souls." The U.I.C.'ers believe that only God (Christ) is over them as a head. They fail to see the scriptures that state he gave "pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints... that we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine..." (Ephesians 4:11,12,14). They seem to believe instead, that they must be carried about by every wind, supposedly of the Holy Spirit, to be fulfilled by this supposed Universal Invisible church.

The fourth implication of the word "assembly", inferred by its definition, is constituted. An assembly must be constituted. This point is very closely related to being organized. What good would come of being an assembly of "dead men's bones?" Christ had specific requirements for the first members of His church, just as there is specific requirements in the membership of any assembly. The first requirement for membership was, are you ready? "They had to be living." Each one of them received Jesus' Words and believed. They received the Word of life into their hearts. John 1:1 states, "...the Word was God..." Jesus is the Word. John 1:4 says, "In him was life..." John 10:28 further states that he gave his disciples—they that followed him—eternal life. So, the first component of membership was salvation.

Romans 8:9 says, "...now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." According to John 3:3 and 5, the Holy Spirit, or Spirit of Christ, is only obtained by way of salvation, being born again. Five epistles of Paul, to local visible churches—I know there are no other kinds—address the members as saints. 1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Ephesians, Philippians,

(UIC continued on page 8)

From The Mailbox

I found your web page and ... I have really enjoyed your page even though I disagree with some of it. But I still ask that God Bless you and yours.

*In Christ
B. B.
Fort Worth, Texas*

Congratulations on another great issue of *The Baptist Pillar*. I especially appreciated the *Presbyterian Baptist* article and the clear piece on doctrine of foreordination. I refer of course to the Vol. 5 No. 3 May/June Edition.

*T. R.
Peoria, IL*

Just wanted to drop you a line and let you know I enjoyed *The Baptist Pillar* today; I ate it all in one sitting! I think the articles are very timely seeing that there are so many Calvinistic and/or Universal Church Baptist(?)

Para-church organizations are so popular because the Local Church is not believed by most, and few BAPTIST preach it right and faithfully. Then there is that "intellectual" system of Calvinism which is sweeping across America more than I imagined. I have been called Calvinist by some, but only because I believe in the working of the Holy Ghost. I abhor easy-believism which is also in the ditch on the other side of the road (most BAPTIST are here). The Lord give us grace to stand true and be earnest contenders for the faith ONCE delivered unto the saints and not eager compromisers of it. I would rather quit than compromise!

...The Lord continue to bless you I pray.

His Word And Grace Be Magnified,

W. M. C.

Please place me on the mailing list for your newsletter *The Baptist Pillar* which I reviewed in the Internet. I would like to receive your insights on what is going on in Canada.

I want to say Amen, Amen and Amen to your article "Hireling Missionaries - America You Can Keep Them." By all means please

do expose any such phoney missionaries that may happen to be pestering you all up there.

...May the Lord Bless...

*Yours in Christ,
T. W.*

Bro. Reaves, Greetings. Hey brother that was a good article you called "Presbyterian Baptist." I'm passing it around to my staff.

I sure agree that I'm neither side of that issue but a Baptist TOO.

I Sure Appreciate You!

*R.T.
Sioux Falls, S.D.*

Brother Reaves we would like to say that we enjoy you Baptist Pillar Paper and your articles which are a blessing.

*In the Lord's Service
F.P.*

(UIC continued from page 7)

Colossians, just to mention a few.

The second observation we see with Jesus' disciples was baptism. The root word "baptizo," defined to be immersed fully, to plunge. This doctrine is very unpopular and confused among U.I.C. theorists. The word "baptizo" tolerates no other method of ordinance. Who's baptism did the disciples have? just anybody's? No, they had John's baptism. the Bible refers to John as, "sent from God" in John 1:6. Mark 1:2 refers to him as, "my messenger." John had been sent from God, to baptize those who believed. He had the authority from God. We see him preaching, then baptizing all those who believed in Mark 1:2-5. He was the only one baptizing any body up until this point. We further see in Mark 1:9, that Jesus was baptized by John. This baptism was the only acceptable baptism for Jesus and his disciples. In the early church in Acts, we see they followed the example laid down by Jesus. Their members were also Authority Baptized Believers. They were baptized by the apostles who got the authority from John, God's messenger. Acts 2:41 and 42 state, "Then they that gladly received his word were baptized: and the same day

were added unto them about three thousand souls. And they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers." They were not added until they both believed and were baptized.

We know that this was in fact a church by what it fulfilled in verse 42. So what type of church were they baptized into here? Was it an invisible universal church? Not!! The word states here that they continued in the apostles' doctrine, of which they had just heard. This was a very local visible church, of which had apostles cast into prison, Acts 5:18, and also members in Acts 8:3. They were obviously very local and visible.

What about the all time favorite, "Baptized into one body, by one Spirit?" I use the U.I.C. theorist's words on that statement. The Bible states in 1 Cor. 12:13, "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free, and have been all made to drink into one Spirit." First of all, the Corinthian church was an example of a very carnal, divided assembly. Although, the manifestation gifts were in operation, the Bible states in 1 Cor. 3:3 that they were carnal because there was yet envy and strife and division among them. There were present contentions over who was saved under who's preaching, who was baptized by which apostle, who had which manifestation gifts of the Holy Spirit, even who was a Jew, and who was a mere Gentile of Greek. What Paul was exhorting, under the inspiration of that same Holy Spirit, was that although they all had different gifts, or purposes, or stations in life, it was one and the same Holy Spirit that had made them partakers of that one body, by leading or drawing them there. They were to be of one accord. Notice the parallel terminology of verse 12, "...and all the members of that one body..." Let us remember, Christ is the head of every New Testament church (or assembly). (Ephesians 4:15). Just the same as He is the head of every man (1 Cor. 11:3). All the members of that church at Corinth, were sealed

with the same Holy Spirit. Verse 13 states, "...have been all made to drink into one spirit." So much for their last hope of substantiating their theory. Universal Invisible church theorists have grabbed at straws from the first day of their theory's birth. They did this so as to justify their lack of compliance with biblical doctrine. Why else would they not join the ranks of the New Testament churches, who from the beginning, had preached against the paganism of Rome. Why else would they not, "come out from among them..." (2 Cor. 6:17), in doctrine, as well as physically. Why? Because they wanted to straddle the fence between the two. Separate, yet attached. As we will see, this has ultimately led them on the road back to Rome, as we see in the ungodly ecumenical alliance movement.

The remainder of this article will be continued in the next

Food for Thought

How would you feel...

IF God gave us the same amount of time and attention that we devote to Him?

IF God put as many things ahead of us as we put ahead of Him?

IF God offered as many excuses as we do, and if the excuses were no more justifiable than ours?

Editor's Note:

In The Baptist Pillar we use articles taken from many different publications and written by many different authors. Please realize that this does not necessarily mean we agree with the doctrinal position of the publication or the author of the article, but that the particular article presents a scriptural truth we do agree with.

If you would like to receive The Baptist Pillar, please write and request one. Also feel free to copy it and hand it out.

You can now access The Baptist Pillar in the world wide web at: <http://www.common.net/~bkjv1611/> or send us a letter at our e-mail address: bkjv1611@common.net