

## The Brother Moyer Letter

*(An open letter to brother Forrest Moyer)*

Merie Weiss / Spring Valley Church of Christ / 148 W. Maple St. / San Diego, CA 92103

---

After hearing your lectures from a tape recording dealing with a letter and a lesson on the Holy Spirit, written by me (Merie Weiss), the Spring Valley Church of Christ unanimously made the decision that I should answer your charges made against those things which I have written. The church at the same time felt it would be right and equitable that the congregation before whom the accusations were made should have the opportunity to hear my defense as well as to rationalize and weigh the things which you have said in the light of my reply. Therefore, we are mailing this letter to the members of the congregation as well as yourself.

We begin this letter by saying that every Christian has a right and a responsibility to express as well as to teach those things which they honestly believe to be scriptural without being called a false teacher, or one who perverts the word of God. Inasmuch as the church is so divided upon so many things, and cannot come into an agreement upon hardly anything, it ill behooves a preacher to denounce and call names because he happens to disagree with that which is taught by others. Because you differed with some of my positions upon different subjects does not necessarily mean that you proved your assertions, or that I am a false teacher, or that you taught the truth.

In order to keep this letter within a reasonable length it will be impossible to answer you on every point with which you dealt, but there will be enough said that anyone reading it will be able to judge for themselves whether or not your charges were justified. However, anyone who would like to read the letter for themselves and who would like to study the lesson on the Holy Spirit can do so, since we will be glad to send them both

missives. The congregation should make up their own minds, do their own judging and make their own decisions in this matter by reading the material themselves. In that manner they can compare what you have said and what is written by me, with the Bible, which is of course the proper source of all truth; and let what we say be judged by the word of God.

Primarily the letter and lesson on the Holy Spirit was written and mailed throughout the United States, Canada, Alaska and to Honolulu to warn the brotherhood against the unscriptural plan of brethren Tant and Wm. E. Wallace in attempting to influence the brethren to make an alliance or bring them into a relationship with the institutional brethren, which is forbidden by God. Furthermore, this plan was and is designed to bring the conservatives into a "full fellowship" with the liberals in the future. However, you ignored the warning outlined in the letter as well as the proof of what was said by me relative to the plans of not only these brethren but others in developing this unscriptural project, wherein I quoted extensively from the writings of both brethren Tant and Wallace.

We would ask why this apathy, this negligence towards the congregation to whom you have the responsibility to warn as well as to expose those who endanger their spiritual welfare? Is not this also the duty of the elders who are supposed to look after the souls of the flocks? Do you not think that you should enlighten the congregation to the danger inherent in any kind of fellowship or association with the liberals who have left the truth? The apostatized brethren are a danger and a menace to the conservatives because they believe and practice that which is unauthorized by the word of God. The church is warned by God in this

respect, "Now I entreat you brethren, MARK THEM WHICH CAUSE DIVISIONS AND AVOID THEM. For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple." This verse of scripture plainly forbids any fellowship with those who have apostatized from the truth. Therefore, we cannot understand why you ignored this portion of my letter seeing that it was the motivating cause of the letter in the first place.

All you had to say about this plan of brethren Tant and Wallace was accuse me of "talking about brother Tant". However, so that those who will read this open letter will know exactly what I said, we will insert here a few quotes from brother Tant and Wallace, and the congregation can judge for themselves whether or not brother Tant and Wallace are in the process or have already divided the conservative portion of the church. And furthermore they are influencing the church through the pages of the Gospel Guardian, to ally themselves, cooperate with, and hope to bring into "full fellowship later" the church and the institutional brethren. 2nd John 9 to 11 as well as 2nd Thessalonians 3:6 . This of course is forbidden of God. When those who once had the truth, apostatized from it into error, and begin to teach and practice that which is unauthorized by God, then those who adhere to the commandments of Christ, must withdraw themselves from them. This is the law of Christ.

We all know, including yourself that the institutionalists have erred from the truth. We quote from the Gospel Guardian April 17, 1969, as brother Tant writes, "Frankly we are hoping to wage a sort of "peace offensive". We are trying to reach many thousands of brethren in the "institutional" churches with a simple plea that we explore the areas where we might work together, and try, as much as possible, to compose our differences, as we face a common enemy-- the threat of classical liberalism". This plainly states that brother Tant is seeking "peace areas where we can work together and try to compose our differences," with the liberals,

who by their own words are not going to give up those things which they teach and practice and which are not authorized by God.

In the gospel Guardian Sept. 4, 1969 brother Wallace writes, "If we cooperate with the liberals in a battle against a common enemy-- modernism--will we gain anything regarding our fight against institutionalists and sponsoring church projects? I contend that a closer communication and association with "liberal" brethren IS WORTH CAREFUL CONSIDERATION." (emphasis mine) .Here is the suggestion from brother Wallace for cooperation with the institutionalists regardless of their unauthorized practices. It is difficult to understand brother Wallace's reasoning, when he admits we are fighting institutionalists but at the same time asks the church to join them. To justify such a paradoxical position, both brethren Tant and Wallace point out the dangers of modernism, which is nothing more or less than the talking in tongues, the so-called casting out of demons and the prophesying, which the institutionalists are now engaging in, which is proof of their lost condition.

We ask in this connection would God sanction or support holy people of God in such a gross violation of His commandments? Are we to go to the enemies of God, those who have fallen into error and no longer follow the truth (the institutionalists) and neither brethren Tant nor Wallace deny this, and ask them to help us fight the tongue talkers? Especially in view of the fact that God has forbidden such a relationship and commanded that we avoid (stay away from) them? Would we not be transgressing the commandments in Romans 16:17 & 18 as well as 2nd Thessalonians 3:6, and we quote, "Now we COMMAND YOU BROTHERN, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from EVERY brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the traditions which he received of us."

If God commands that we avoid and withdraw ourselves from those who walk disorderly and who do not obey the

commandments of Christ, would not that which brethren Tant and Wallace are encouraging and asking the church to do be a sin, seeing that it is a transgression of the law of Christ? Gal. 1:7 & 9. Herein Paul says all false teachers are accursed. Inasmuch as the liberals have left the truth and teach and practice that which is false, then we must believe the Bible that they are accursed of God. They divided the body of Christ and therefore, are under condemnation and accursed of God. However, brethren Tant and Wallace are asking us to fellowship and work with them.

Brother Cogdill in a series of articles in the Gospel Guardian of 1966 on "Fellowship" has this to say in the Aug. 18th publication, "We have learned that the only way we can enjoy fellowship with God is through the Gospel. It is through the Gospel that we are called into this fellowship and to continue in it, WE MUST CONTINUE TO WALK IN HARMONY WITH THE GOSPEL AS IT DIRECTS." (emphasis mine) I cannot enjoy God's acceptance and approval and therefore have fellowship with Him when I believe, teach and have fellowship with those who teach DOCTRINES THAT ARE CONTRARY TO GOD'S WORD. I must walk in accordance with the truth, if I am to enjoy fellowship with God.

These words are true (however it is doubtful that brother Cogdill still adheres to them inasmuch as he attended meetings with the apostatized and erring brethren, the institutionalists) and his changed position does not alter the truth of that which he has written. The point of course is clear. We cannot have fellowship with the apostatized brethren (liberals) without forfeiting our fellowship with God.

We quote further in the same article, after brother Cogdill quotes Romans 16:17 & 18, "this teaches not only that those who teach false doctrines cannot have fellowship with God but also that those who fellowship THEM IN THEIR FALSE TEACHING are also alienated from God. False teachers are to be "marked" or

branded and AVOIDED----- not FELLOWSHIPED." (emphasis mine) However, in spite of this position and the commandments of the Bible brethren Tant and Wallace are still working towards a full fellowship with the apostatized brethren, those who teach false doctrine-- the liberals.

Therefore, the Spring Valley Church of Christ used the letter sent to you and your congregation, as well as hundreds throughout the United States, to warn them against such a dangerous as well as unscriptural plan. These brethren have many followers and this has divided the conservative portion of the church. There are those of us who cannot adhere or accept such an unscriptural and false position which is in violation of the commandments of Christ. Therefore, we would ask you brother Moyer where do you stand upon this question of fellowshiping the institutionalists? You did not in your open document of me as a false teacher even touch upon this dangerous plan, the primary reason for writing the letter in the first place, and the congregation should ask you why? Am I a false teacher as you say because I warn against false teachers? It would be much more equitable and much more beneficial to the congregation if you busied yourself warning and exposing men like brethren Tant and Wallace, as well as the 13 who attended meetings with the institutionalists in direct violation of the commandments of Christ, rather than taking so much time out to lecture about me.

We might ask here about the liberals in your midst. Have they repented of their past sins and the fact that they helped to divide the body of Christ, and have they confessed publicly that they might be clean before God, and have they asked for forgiveness? What have you and the elders done about this situation in the congregation? Instead of denouncing me as a false teacher for exposing and warning against the plans of brethren Tant and Wallace and others, it would seem that you should thank the Spring Valley church for their consideration and act of love in exposing and warning the brotherhood against those who are dividing the

church , and who are trying to lead the church into paths of unrighteousness, wherein if they should follow these brethren they will violate the very plain commandments of Christ, thereby sinning.

Therefore, instead of "talking about brother Tant" I merely did that which any Christian who loves the church should or would do--warn the brethren against fellowshiping the institutional brethren, as well as brethren Tant and Wallace who are asking the church to follow them into sin. What have you done about this very dangerous and unscriptural plan of these brethren? The congregation should ask you this question.

We will continue now to answer some of your charges relative to the "elder question". In the letter we proved conclusively that the church is to govern itself, under the oversight of the eldership; and we stated a fact when we said that too many of the churches have preacher-elder rule which is not found in the Bible.

You admitted in your lecture that this was the kind of rule you had where you are preaching; however, you never proved with scriptures that this was according to the pattern of the New Testament. You said, "the elders meet every week for two or three hours to study and to take care of the affairs of the church". I may not have quoted your exact words, but the meaning has not been changed. However, we challenge this kind of procedure, seeing there is no scripture for such. There is not one example or scripture in the New Testament wherein the elders met together to take care of the affairs of the church, without the congregation being present.

We do have examples and scripture which prove just the opposite of that which you teach and practice. It would be interesting to me , as well as to the church at Spring Valley, if you would explain why you did not answer any of the scriptures which I used in my letter to prove my argument. You went on at great length quoting many scriptures from the Bible about

the elders, ALL OF WHICH I AGREE UPON. We do not differ over the words of God, we differ about that which is taught and practiced, not only where you teach, but practically throughout the brotherhood, and which cannot be found in the Bible.

We ask you to prove by scripture where the elders are to "govern" the church, make practically all the decisions, as well as to handle the problems of the church, and the congregation is left out of all of this. The elders rule by "example" and "oversight". They are not to be "Lords" over the people of God. 1st Peter 5:3. Furthermore 'overseers' means to watch over the work being done by others. This you admitted yourself. It does not mean, as most churches practice, that the elders take over all responsibility, solve the problems and make the decisions. This sort of rule cannot be found in the New Testament. Acts 20: 28. The elders are overseers and they are to feed the flock. Which would mean that they are to teach (one of their qualifications) and see that the church is fed spiritual food-- the proper kind. This would mean they must have knowledge and wisdom in abundance.

We read in Math. 20:20-28 and we quote 25 to 28, "Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them, BUT IT SHALL NOT BE SO AMONG YOU; but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister; and whosoever will be chief among you let him be your servant:" So the rule of the elders today is not to be an arbitrary one, where they rule as Lords over the congregation, but one of oversight to see that the congregation does it's works, so necessary to their spiritual welfare, and to keep the wolves away from the flock, as well as to see to it that false teaching is not disseminated. This is their rule--oversight by watching over the souls of those under their care and watching over the work of the congregation as they obey those things which the Lord has commanded.

However, the elders instead of ruling by example and oversight have taken over the work of the church, and their example quite often is not one which would help or edify the church in their works or in their lives. There are in the first place too many unqualified elders, men who have not learned to control their tempers, those who have failed to garner knowledge and wisdom by diligent study of the word of God. In most instances they are not qualified to do the judging of problems, being not apt in the scriptures. Furthermore, many become puffed up and exercise the wrong kind of rule by lording it over the congregation. Many are arrogant and too many lack godliness and humility and love for those whom they have the responsibility to look after. As a shepherd watches over its flock as the sheep go about their business of going from place to place to feed themselves, so should the elders in love and humility watch over the souls of those of the body of Christ and see to it that the church does its work of saving souls, solving their problems and judging the affairs of the congregation as they do their works. The rule of the elders is to SEE TO IT THAT THE CONGREGATION DOES IT ALL IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE SCRIPTURES.

Instead however, the elders and the preachers to a great extent have usurped the work of the church by taking over the "management" of it and the church is left with nothing to do except perhaps whatever the elders or the preacher designates. There are a few that fulfill the command of Christ and become teachers; however, the Bible commands that ALL teach, Heb. 5:11 to 14. Furthermore, when the work, the decisions and the problems of the church are taken over by the elders and preacher, the church becomes bored, spiritually apathetic, ignorant (why learn the Bible when the elders and preacher take care of everything) and suffer from spiritual malnutrition.

One of the pernicious and dangerous results of this usurping of the work of the church by the elders and preachers is because of lack of knowledge, the church becomes dependent upon

the preacher and the elders for everything. Few would have the knowledge to know whether or not the preacher is teaching the truth because they have not been taught properly and few have studied sufficiently to know for themselves. The attitude of most of the members of the church today is similar to that of the Catholics in their deference towards their priests and their acceptance of everything they say or do. And the elders and preachers love to have it so--it makes their unscriptural rule easier. Seldom are their decisions or their teachings questioned. How could it be, seeing the congregation blindly accepts it without question. So the church has been led into paths that were and are not cast up by the Lord.

It is most strange brother Moyer that you did not take the scriptures which I used in the letter to prove the remarks made above, but you ignored them. Why? I did not, as you have unjustly accused me, pervert them or misuse them; if I did why did you not expose this? The fact that you did not even mention the scriptures (with one exception) I used is proof that YOU COULD NOT PROVE MY POSITION FALSE, although you called me a false teacher. The congregation should read this letter and study the scriptures which we will now quote from the word of God and we shall in this way learn the truth. The congregation should study for themselves all of the questions which I brought up in my letter and not be disposed to take in everything which you preach and teach without question. You teach too many things which are not in harmony with God's word, and if they searched the scriptures they would and could know this.

In 1st Cor. 6:1 to 9 we read, "Dare any of you having a matter against another go to law before the unjust (unrighteous) and not BEFORE THE SAINTS?" As we all know the saints include WOMEN as well as men; therefore, we conclude from this verse that when matters of business need to be settled THE SAINT (THE CHURCH) ARE TO DO THE JUDGING. Do you have this kind of rule in the congregation where you preach brother Moyer?

We proceed, "do you not know that the saints shall judge the world and if the world shall be judged by you, are you unworthy to judge the smallest matters?" In these scriptures our understanding is enlightened and we learn that if the church is to sit in judgment upon the world, then while in this world, (with the word of God to help us) the people of God should be able to judge the matters, the problems and the affairs which come before the church. Plain, isn't it?

We would ask those who read this letter, why does the church practice the elder--preacher rule and the church is left out of practically everything pertaining to church affairs? The women are not allowed in the business meetings and the church is taught that she has no right in such. You taught this in your lectures brother Moyer; however, we wonder if the church agreed with you in this. These scriptures quoted here definitely and unequivocally teach that the SAINTS ARE TO JUDGE THE MATTERS WHICH COME BEFORE THE CHURCH. It is NOT the exclusive right of the elders; and WOMEN are SAINTS, therefore they are included in the judging. We would question you brother Moyer as to why you did not bring up my exegesis of 1 Cor. 6:1 to 9 in your lectures but rather ignored them?

The solving of the problems, the matters which need to be judged, and the decisions to be made, ARE TO BE DECIDED AND JUDGED BY ALL THE CHURCH. God intended the people of God to study and learn how to manage their own affairs, UNDER THE OVERSIGHT OF THE ELDERS. The gospel does not teach that the congregation is to be utterly dependent upon the elders and the preacher in this respect. Neither does the gospel teach that the women are to be excluded from the business meetings and from exercising of the knowledge of the Bible in judging the matters which come before the church. The verses in 1st Cor. 6 cannot be perverted to mean anything more or less than that which I taught in my letter. I did not teach falsely in this matter, but we would ask, brother

Moyer, why did you not mention these scriptures in your lectures?

We will go on to further prove our position in the matter of elders ruling; as well as whether or not women should be given their scriptural right to serve God in the manner prescribed by His word. These two questions are closely interlocked and if we prove by the scriptures that the church has the scriptural right and the responsibility to handle their own affairs, solve their own problems and judge the matters which come up before the church we have done away with the traditional and unscriptural practice of the kind of elder--preacher rule so prevalent today, and accepted by practically all those in the church.

In the 18th chapter of Matthew, 15 to 18, we are taught that a matter which can not be solved between two Christians must be taken BEFORE THE CHURCH it doesn't say that a matter of this kind is to be taken before the the ELDERS but before the CHURCH. This fits with 1st Cor. 6: 1 to 9. The church is composed of both women and men; therefore, all are to participate in matters which are brought before the church. I believe that the scriptures teach that ALL THE CHURCH JUDGES THE BUSINESS OF THE CHURCH, NOT just the elders and / or the men.

You used many scriptures brother Moyer trying to prove your contention that the elders were to exercise rule over the church; and that the women had no part in the judging of the affairs of the church. I AGREED with every scripture you used, but I do not agree with your conclusions which you drew from them. The weakness of your arguments were shown by your inability to deal with the scriptures which we are using to prove our position that the church is to govern itself and the elders are to oversee that all is done in decency and order and according to the word of God.

In Acts 6:1 to 6 the church is asked to "CHOOSE OUT SEVEN MEN OF HONEST REPORT, full of the Holy Spirit and wisdom,

WHOM WE MAY APPOINT OVER THIS BUSINESS". We see here the church (all of it, both men and women) were to choose out men (without the apostles help) to take care of some BUSINESS of the church. The example is for us and the word of God has never nullified this teaching. Although the church has succeeded in changing it and substituting an elder rule which is practiced today, such CANNOT BE FOUND IN THE SCRIPTURES. God did not intend that a few men (not even the apostles) would handle the business of the church but ALL were to have a part in it. Why did you ignore these scriptures when you lectured before the congregation about me and my false teaching? Would it not have been fair to have told your congregation about Matt. 18 : 15 to 18; Acts 6:1 to 6; and 1st Cor. 6:1 to 9, thereby letting them decide whether I perverted them or not?

You gave no scriptures where God separated the women and the men in the church. You did not give one scripture which proved that the elders were to take care of the business of the church, handle and solve the problems and do all the work of the church. The congregation should take note of this. In Romans 16: 1&2 we read, "I commend unto you Phebe our sister, which is a servant of the church which is at Cencrea: That ye receive her in the Lord, as becometh saints, and that you assist her in whatsoever BUSINESS she hath need of you; for she has been a succorer of many and of myself." Here was a woman handling some of the business of the church . Furthermore, she was traveling to another congregation in this business. Paul admonished that the SAINTS were to receive her, which means of course that it wasn't just the elders and the preacher who were to assist Phebe in the business of the church, but ALL the church had this responsibility. Was Phebe a she-elder; was she stepping out of her place, (whatever that means) was she interfering in the business of another congregation, or was she doing the will of God? She was sent to the church and the letter was addressed to the saints. Romans 1 : 6&7

As would have most of the church, who have been brain-washed with this unscriptural attitude towards the women, your position brother Moyer would have prohibited Phebe from carrying out her business then and would today deny a Christian woman her right to participate in the business of the church; although God has ordained and Paul proved by the scriptures that she has just as much right scripturally to participate in the business of the church as the men. In fact she is commanded to do so. Every man who attends business meetings, when allowed to do so by the elders, is breaking the law of Christ, when he accepts this unscriptural position which prohibits his wife or the women participating in the business meetings as well as he. The ignorance of the congregation is not more clearly proven than the blind acquiescence to this unscriptural practice. Yet I am accused of perverting the word of God. Have I perverted these scriptures brother Moyer?

In 1st Cor. 5:1 to 8 Paul teaches that the church "when it is gathered together" is to exercise their judgment and take care of a very serious matter of a fornicator in their midst. Were the women in this gathering? Did they participate in this judgment of withdrawing from the sinner? Also these scriptures further prove that ALL of the church is to do their work, and to solve their problems, and to manage their own affairs, UNDER the SUPERVISION (oversight) of the elders, that all might be done according to the word of God. And the church is taught to OBEY the elders as they watch over their souls. If there are elders properly qualified, righteous and humble, filled with knowledge and wisdom then the church is fortunate indeed to have as overseers those who will see to it that all the affairs and the work of the church is carried out according to the law of Christ. THIS IS THEIR RULE AND THE EXTENT OF IT. The church must be allowed to do its own work, learn to teach, to judge, learn to exercise and put into action that which they learn. This is God's way. The church works as ONE body, "neither male nor female, but all are one", working together to carry out

the gospel. We might say here, although it is plainly evident in the scriptures that there is not one gospel for the men and one for the women. ALL obey the same commandments.

We want to refer now to Acts 15: 1 to 41 wherein I proved that at a very important and decisive meeting of the church, where the elders and apostles presided, all of the church participated in a grave matter of false teaching. It might be said here that the apostles could have called just the elders and themselves to settle this matter, but they left the example for our learning, that when it came to business of the church, no matter in what area or how important or serious THAT ALL OF THE CHURCH WERE TO HAVE THEIR PART IN IT.

Paul and Barnabas were sent by the BRETHREN down to Jerusalem to see about this matter. The 4th verse read "when they came to Jerusalem they were received OF THE CHURCH, and of the apostles and the elders." So all were there. But men arose and began teaching, "to command THEM to keep the law of Moses". This was the reason in the first place for Paul and Barnabas to make this trip. Who were the false teachers teaching? They were commanding the CHURCH to "keep the law of Moses". The elders and the apostles wanted the matter to come before the Church because the people of God were those being affected by the false teaching; and they were the ones who needed to be warned and taught correctly. This is most plain, and unless this chapter is perverted all can come into a knowledge of the truth about whether the meeting was private or whether all the church participated.

We would ask you brother Moyer respecting your reference to Galatians 2:2 (wherein Paul, when preaching at Jerusalem, taught there some privately) why you brought in this private teaching when giving your exegesis of Acts 15? It is most apparent that the WHOLE CHURCH was at this meeting, and trying to infer that it was private by using scriptures Gal. 2:2 is most questionable. However verse 7 reads, "and

when there had been much disputation, Peter rose up and said unto them, Men and BRETHREN, ye know how that a good while ago God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel and believe." Was Peter talking to the apostles only? What he is saying is most pertinent and ALL OF THE CHURCH needs to hear it.

Verse 12 reads, "then all the MULTITUDE kept silence and gave audience to Barnabas and Paul --". You mentioned this verse brother Moyer in your lecture and gave as your interpretation of it that the MULTITUDE WAS SILENT. First was private now it is silent. However, the 13th verse (which you did not quote or mention) belies your exegesis of verse 12. Why didn't you read verse 13? It reads, "And AFTER THEY HELD THEIR PEACE, James ANSWERED (they were disputing) saying, Men and Brethren hearken unto me:" "after they held their peace" could only mean that they had been speaking and they had stopped. Furthermore verse 22 confirms the participation of the church in this matter, and it reads, "Then pleased it the apostles and elders, WITH THE WHOLE CHURCH, to send chosen men of their own company to Antioch with Paul and Barnabas;" The whole church had a part in the choosing the men who would travel to Antioch with Paul and Barnabas. They must have been vocal.

Were women in this gathering? Did they participate in the meeting and the decision? When God says the "WHOLE CHURCH" He means ALL of it and THAT INCLUDES BOTH WOMEN AND MEN; they all came into an agreement both men and WOMEN. They were all involved in the meeting. Didn't the women need to be warned as well as the men about the matter of false teaching? What scripture can be used to teach that they did not have a part and participate in the discussion as well as the men? They had their part in the decision made as well as the choosing of the men who were to go with Paul and Barnabas to Antioch, because it reads, "it pleased the WHOLE CHURCH". Are not

the women just as much a part of the church as the men? From the way the men discriminate against them, and treat them as second rate citizens of heaven one would think that the church was divided into one part women and one part men. This is a man made pattern and all those who practice it are violating the word of God.

When those who accompanied Paul and Barnabas came to Antioch the 30th verse reads, "So when they were dismissed, they came to Antioch: and WHEN THEY HAD GATHERED THE MULTITUDE TOGETHER, they delivered the epistle...". Therefore, brother Moyer, we have proven that the scriptures do teach that women as well as men must do the works of God; that they have the same right to participate in business meetings, in discussions, to solve problems, and to judge the matters which come before the church, as the men. Where are the scriptures which teach that the women can go to heaven if they scrub floors, keep the house clean, and take care of the family? I've never found in the Bible that the physical things which are necessary for all Christians had any spiritual value. The Bible plainly separates the physical, material and the spiritual. The word of God is perfect converting the soul. The physical things have no value whatsoever in changing our carnal natures or molding us into that which is necessary to make us righteous. Only the word of God and the application of it in our daily lives will convert and keep us converted and keep us working doing the works of God, which are most necessary if we are to inherit heaven. If scrubbing floors and taking care of children will give the women a home in heaven, would it not also (if true) give men eternal life?

When the church is denied their scriptural right to participate and involve themselves in the business and work of the church, they suffer from ignorance (why learn if you never use it?), indifference, lack of zeal, and lack of love for their brethren. Certainly love would have dictated a different approach and handling of the letter and lesson on the Holy Spirit. It will

behoove one who calls himself a Christian and who has the responsibility to preach the true word of God, to carelessly call names and to accuse a Christian of being a false teacher with no more to support your accusations than quoting many scriptures. I agree with all the scriptures you quoted but not the conclusions at which you arrived. You accuse but you have not proven your accusations.

In proving that the women have the same privileges, the same responsibilities and the scriptural right to enter into all the business of the church, as well as the men, we have more or less disposed of the "elder question". By returning the women to their rightful position in the church as a member and a worker and one who can and must judge the affairs which come before the congregation: and who must exercise their righteous understanding by helping to solve the problems which are a part of all church business, we have proven that the elders and the men do not run the church. The scriptures are plain and understandable and they undeniably teach that the CHURCH (BOTH MEN AND WOMEN) RUN THE AFFAIRS OF THE CHURCH AND TAKE CARE OF THE BUSINESS necessary to the orderly working of the congregation. The bible only teaches one way, and that is, as is taught on these pages, that both men and women, did participate in works of benevolence, Acts 6:1-6; as well as took part in choosing men from the congregation for special work, which could of course include the choosing of elders and deacons. Furthermore ALL the church was part of the gathering wherein the work of converting the lost and establishing churches was reported. Acts 14:1-2

Again in 1st Cor. 6:1-8 the saints (women and men) were admonished and taught about judging the business and the problems of the church; made to understand that they were not to take their troubles or affairs of the congregation before the world, but to take care of it amongst themselves. The discipline of the fornicator, as well as the unruly and factious, (1st Cor. 5:1-7 and Matt. 18:15-18) was put into

the hands of the CHURCH. The elders were to supervise, set the example, watch over the souls of the saints, and feed (teach) the church and take the responsibility of seeing that all matters of business, discipline, and problems WOULD BE HANDLED BY THE CHURCH ACCORDING TO THE PATTERN OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. No other conclusions can be drawn from the examples and teaching of these verses and those of Acts 15:1-41. But you failed to answer any of the scriptures which I used to prove my points. Why?

Therefore, you are in error brother Moyer when you taught and preached that the affairs, problems and business of the church is to be done BY THE ELDERS. Nowhere in the New Testament can you find scriptures which will uphold you in this false position. However, we are cognizant of the fact that probably 99% of the church adheres to this false and unscriptural viewpoint. Should the congregation over which you act as preacher analyze your lectures they will find that while you quoted innumerable scriptures, NONE OF THEM PROVED THAT THE ELDERS EXERCISE THE ARBITRARY AND UNSCRIPTURAL RULE which they have presumed and assumed in governing the affairs of the congregation where you do the preaching. So you have neglected to preach the truth and edify the church in the manner prescribed by the word of God.

The scriptures which I have used in this letter as well as in the letter which you and some of the elders received WERE NEVER ANSWERED BY YOU. It is good to quote scriptures, but quoting scriptures did not prove me a false teacher. You could only do that by answering my arguments with scriptures which would in turn negate those which I have used. ALL scriptures which you quoted, I BELIEVE; but you did not prove the scriptures which I have used here and in the other letter to uphold my position upon the elders type of rule to be exercised in the church, as well as their oversight over the congregation, to be wrong. As a matter of fact you ignored them completely

In proving that the Bible teaches involvement of ALL THE CHURCH in the affairs and the business of the church, it quite obviously sets at rest that old bagaboo, so commonly taught amongst us, that a woman can't teach a man. In our letter we went thoroughly into the question of women teaching. We proved by 1st Tim. 2:11-12 that if one is to adhere to the theory that a woman cannot teach a man, then we have the problem of trying to explain why the church allows the women to teach a man. In mixed Bible classes she is allowed to express her opinions and give her exegesis of scriptures; and in gatherings of an informal nature in the home and other places she is allowed the freedom to express herself freely when men are present. Furthermore she teaches her children both girls and boys, young ladies and young men (and would be derelict in her duty if she did not ) she teaches and studies with her husband, which is her God given right. But if 1st Tim. 2:11-12 means she can't teach a man -- then she could not be allowed to do any of this.

If we believe the scriptures which I have employed in proving my position relative to the work of the church and the involvement of ALL in the many facets of the business and problems of the church, such as discipline, benevolence, edifying and judging then it would be only logical to believe and to conclude that if the women took part in all of this she would have to speak, discuss and participate vocally when men are present. In doing this IT would be necessary for her to judge righteously; which would in turn necessitate knowing the word of God as well as being able to use it. This certainly would do away with the ignorance amongst the women of the church. If she participates in all of this SHE WOULD BE COMPELLED TO HAVE KNOWLEDGE OF THE GOSPEL. Therefore, if we believe the scriptures, we have proven that the women can teach a man because it would be impossible for her to take part in the business and problems of the church WITHOUT SPEAKING and this would at times necessitate her teaching when men were present.

In 1st Tim. 2:11-12 the word "teach" is used in the same manner as in Matt. 28:18-19 wherein Christ commanded the apostles to go into all the world and "teach" all nations. This of course meant preach, because that is what they did. Preaching always, if scriptural, naturally involves teaching. Therefore, in teaching (preaching) the woman is not to usurp authority over the man. God gave man the exclusive right to preach. No women can preach without usurping the authority of the man; this is his exclusive domain given him by God. In teaching in mixed classes, teaching husbands or children, attending business meeting and in judging the affairs of the church, the women are only exercising their right given to them by God. However, the authority to preach has been given to the men and herein she is silenced. She cannot serve as an elder or deacon, these positions also are reserved exclusively for the men. The qualifications alone would deny her this authority.

In Acts 18:24-26, Priscilla taught and corrected a preacher. If 1st Tim. 2:11 & 12 means a woman cannot teach a man then we have a problem. These passages of scripture are a part of Bible teaching and prove that 1st Tim. 2:11 & 12 is perverted from its true meaning if it is dogmatically used to silence the women every time a man is present. Therefore, we would have to look for another explanation of it than that which you employed brother Moyer, inasmuch as 1st Tim. 2:11 & 12 comes into conflict with Acts. 18:24-26. We must accept the fact that Priscilla taught a preacher, which proves the scriptures teach that a woman CAN TEACH A MAN.

When we find two scriptures in conflict with each other we know that our exegesis of one or both is wrong. Inasmuch as Acts 18:24-26 is plain and teaches a woman can teach a man then we must look for another explanation of 1st Tim. 2:11 & 12; which does not mean what the brethren teach, and of course they do not practice what they teach. In 1st Cor. 14:23 to 40 we find there was disorder in the church; and Paul admonishes them that "when the church

came together:" (verse 23) the women were not to exercise their spiritual gifts, which were given to them as well as the men. We understand that when it is used in the 14th chapter of 1st Cor., and also in 1st Cor. 5:1-5, "when the church is gathered together" it means the day God ordained for the church to come together to worship. Paul was admonishing the brethren, both men and women for their disorderly conduct in all trying to speak at once and in misusing their spiritual gifts of prophesying and talking in tongues. In the 34th verse we read "Let your women keep silence in the churches (in the churches could only mean when the church assembles together) for it is not permitted for them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law."

The word "silence" regarding the women in 1st Tim. 2:11 is used in the same manner in the above verses proving that the women are to keep silent in the worship on the first day of the week. If there is any other place where God silences the women we do not find it in the Bible. Therefore she is free to teach, to convert, to attend the meetings of the church, and participate in all the business and work of the church the same as the men. Is she not a saint? Our space is limited in this letter but anyone interested may send for the letter which goes into this subject even more thoroughly.

You gave quite a lot of time to teaching against my position on the paid preacher system. Inasmuch as this letter must be kept short we only want to say that the preacher must be an evangelist and an evangelist by New Testament pattern must "go out into all the world" preaching and converting the lost. He must establish churches everywhere. He can stay and train, teach and set in order, or he can continue to go into areas where there is not church and preach and convert, and leave some other evangelist to do the watering. In 1st Cor. 3:5 we are told that Paul established the church but Apollos came and continued the necessary work of teaching and training the church so that it

COULD CARRY ON ITS OWN WORK. Also read 1st Tim. 1:2-3. Titus 1:4-5.

In 2nd Thess. 3:7 - 10 as well as 1st Cor. 9 Paul sets the example for the evangelist which is to labor and work but not be chargeable to anyone.

He did not charge for preaching. He did expect, and sometimes got it, for the affluent church to support him (as all other evangelists) as they journeyed everywhere planting the church of Christ. He never intended for the preacher to preach to churches who had long been established and were able to take care of their own affairs, either under the elders oversight or by the church itself. In the church where you are preaching does it really need you? Are there not many men who could qualify or could be trained to do the preaching and edifying and send you into the hard places to do the work God commanded all preachers to do --- to establish churches WHERE THERE ARE NONE. This is the method by which the Lord expected the world to be saved. The world can't be taught and converted when the preachers stay in one place preaching over and over to converted members who can be preached to and taught just as well by the elders (who should be qualified to do this job) or men in the congregation. Then the money they pay you could support probably two or more men in the field doing that which the Lord commanded the evangelists to do -- go OUT INTO THE WORLD AND SAVE THE LOST, and establish the church where there was none.

It would seem to me that in your lectures you ignored my position on this subject and conveyed to your listeners that I did not believe that preachers should be paid. However, I believe every scripture you quoted, and I do not continue to believe that the church has the responsibility of supporting the evangelist (preacher) as he goes from place to place preaching and converting the lost and ESTABLISHING CHURCHES. The paid preacher system which is a man made practice cannot be found in the New Testament, therefore I do not believe in it. The church after

it has been planted, must be watered, (trained and made self sustaining) taught the word, and edified until it is able to carry on its own work of preaching, teaching and working to save the souls of the lost. The paid preacher system of which you are a part nullifies and does away with the New Testament plan of evangelism and destroys the pattern set by Paul and Peter and all the apostles and preachers of long ago. Therefore it is sinful. 1st John 3:4.

Because of the deadly practice which has become the pattern of rotating preachers from one converted group to another and paying them for doing that which is almost worthless as to the saving of the souls of the lost we have created an unscriptural (just as unscriptural as the Herald of Truth or the institutions of the liberals) system which has caused true evangelism to practically die. The members of the church have become so accustomed to this state of affairs, that when they are taught the truth they find it difficult to accept. However, if they would study the pattern as set down in Acts and all other books of the New Testament and accept them, they will be made to understand that which they tolerate and support violates the scriptures and is sinful. All who practices it will be held accountable on the judgment day.

Romans 15:20 reads, "Yea, so I have strived to preach the gospel, NOT WHERE CHRIST WAS NAMED, lest I should build upon another man's foundation. But it is written, "To whom He was not spoken of, they shall see; and they that had not heard shall understand." It is evident from this scripture that the preacher was to found churches --THIS IS THE EXAMPLE SET BY PAUL AND ALL THE PREACHERS OF NEW TESTAMENT TIMES; the evangelist (preacher) is not to build upon another's foundation; his responsibility is to build the foundation. This of course would mean that the preacher GO WHERE THE GOSPEL HAD NOT BEEN PREACHED and teach and convert and establish the church. No other exegesis could be made of this scripture and the example set by the preachers in New Testament times. The Bible reveals that the preachers MOVED

from place to place ESTABLISHING CHURCHES.

If the preacher does not go forth into areas where the gospel has not been preached how are they to fulfill their mission and their responsibility before God in saving the lost and establishing churches everywhere? Therefore, brother Moyer you did me an injustice when you said that I did not believe in paying preachers. Inasmuch as the scriptures teach that the preacher should be supported by the church or churches as he moved from place to place converting the lost and founding the church in regions and states where the word of God had never been heard, I believe and teach that the preacher who obeys and carries out the example and pattern of the New Testament should be supported by the church. In this respect I believe every scripture you quoted in your lectures.

However, I also believe and teach that the paid preacher system has caused the church to lose its saving power and has failed to establish the church where the gospel has not been taught. Are you practicing the pattern as laid down in the word of God of going from place to place where the word of God has not been heard and teaching and converting the lost, establishing churches? Your answer of course would have to be that you do not practice the New Testament pattern of evangelism; but you have succumbed to the vitiating and corrupted form of preaching for pay which is practiced by practically all the brotherhood, and which has the tendency to corrupt all who lend themselves to it. It is that which has almost if not completely destroyed the pattern set in the New Testament for true evangelism. In your lectures against the teaching in my letter you exposed to all your unwillingness to follow and practice the gospel.

In 2nd Cor. 10:15 & 16 we read, "Not boasting of things without measure, that is, of other men's labours; but having hope, when your faith is increased that we shall be enlarged (magnified) by you according to our rule (province) abundantly. To preach the gospel IN

THE REGIONS BEYOND YOU, and not to boast in ANOTHER MAN'S LAND (province) of things made ready to our hand." This verse is simple and easily understood. Paul states (and he set the example for every preacher who has lived and will live by his life and work) that he did not go where some other evangelist had already set up the work. He went forth where there was no church. However, we realize that the young church would need attention from time to time and we find Paul sending Timothy to take care of the false teaching being disseminated at Ephesus; also Paul left Titus at Crete ( while he went on his journeys to establish other churches) to set the church in order. 1st Tim. 1:2 & 3, Titus 1:4 & 5 and 3:7 to 11. We find Apollos teaching and edifying, training and helping the church that it might reach the state where it could take care of its own affairs, while Paul continued to go to regions where the church had not been established. 1st Cor. 3:5 to 11.

We find at times the evangelist after establishing the church stayed several years in one place and taught and trained those whom he converted. Nor was it uncommon for the founder to return "to see how the churches are getting along." Acts 15:35 to 41. **BUT THE PATTERN OF THE NEW TESTAMENT WAS THAT THE PREACHERS WERE CONSTANTLY ON THE MOVE**, going into all the world teaching and converting the lost and establishing the church of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Anyone who is honest and searching for the truth will find in a careful and diligent study of the scriptures that that which I taught in my letter was scriptural and according to the word of God. However, that which is practiced amongst the brotherhood, not only by you but practically all the preachers, is a far cry from what Paul and the evangelists believed, taught and practiced, in New Testament times. You did not answer the scriptures I used in my letter, nor did you prove me a false teacher in this respect.

The proof of all that I am contending for is found in the lack of zeal, the lack of new

churches, the concentration of churches in given cities and states, the sparsity of baptisms, the ignorance as well as the do-nothing habits of the congregations where the preacher-elder rule is practiced, and the paid preacher system of rotating from one established church to another converted group. The fact that a preacher has been hired at the congregation where you preach, to take care of the personal work, is indicative and manifests the lack of sound teaching as well as the fact that the church hasn't been taught to DO THEIR OWN WORK. The congregation can't go to heaven on the coattails of the preacher. Furthermore, are not the elders capable of teaching as well as overseeing that the congregation does its own teaching and personal work without hiring someone else to do their job?

Are you not as the preacher responsible for failing to teach and encourage the members of the church to go out and do house-to-house work and hold their own Bible classes and work at the job of saving souls? Do you not have the time to take the lead in this kind of work? If not, why not? Aren't you supposed to save souls; are you not to edify, exhort and encourage those of the congregation to WORK; without hiring some other preacher to do that which the church should be doing? Or is your time spent in other pursuits of a more material nature?

It would seem from what I heard on the tape that you attempted to influence the congregation against my letter and lesson by saying "she believes in divine guidance." Do not ALL CHRISTIANS believe in divine guidance? Is there any other kind? Then you connected this thought, which came from you and not from my writings, with such corrupted teachers as Mary Baker Eddy, Joe Smith, Mary Ellen White, and Aimee Semple McPherson. Why did you do this brother Moyer? If you are honest you will have to admit there was not a thing in my letter that would lead anyone to believe that I even remotely believed or taught such ridiculous and preposterous things as these people have written claiming that angels talked to them, that they

could prophesy and that they were ordained by God to write the absurd, devilish and ungodly things which they taught.

Furthermore, you conveyed to the congregation that I believed in miracles in a way which is foreign to the Bible. Do not ALL Christians believe in miracles? Not the demonstrative kind, where angels appear or where God talked directly or indirectly to the people. I made that very plain. But you again tied this up with tongue talking and the devilish practices of casting out demons, and prophesying, which has become a practice of some of the brethren who have left God, and are now suffering the punishment of God by being sent a "strong delusion that they will believe a lie that they might all be damned because they have pleasure in unrighteousness." 2nd Thess. 2:10 to 12. They have rottenness of the mind and are condemned before God and man. I said in my letter words to this effect, and you could not have failed to understand what I wrote.

There is not anything in my letter which would permit anyone who was honest, to believe for a moment that you and I differed upon the tongue talking brethren and where they are headed. So we ask again -- WHY brother Moyer? We believe in the miracles of prayer. How could we ask for the impossible of God, such as that the dying, whom perhaps doctors have given up, might be allowed to live. Most of us in the church have seen our prayers answered in this respect. Is this a miracle? Anyway I believe in that kind of a miracle; and I also believe that anyone who does not, does not really believe in prayer. They had better read James 5:13 to 20 and 1st John 5:13 to 16, and believe them. 1st John 3:22 and hundreds of others.

I believe in the miracle of seeing the dead being made alive spiritually in baptism. Before a sinner is baptized he is DEAD spiritually. When lowered into the water GOD OPERATES by cutting away the sins, and the blood cleanses. Col. 2:11 to 13. Therefore the blood is there, which is a miracle, the sins are cut away by

God, this is a miracle because no man is capable of operating on the sinner nor quickening the dead into life, and when the one who is baptized emerges from the water he has the Holy Spirit within his mortal body, a gift from God. Are these not all miracle? If not are they done by natural means? Explain them away brother Moyer if you can, but I believe the word of God. Now does any of this even remotely resemble anything Mary Baker Eddy, Joe Smith or any other false prophet believes. No, nor does it have any resemblance to the corrupted and deluded tongue talkers which are condemned by God. Jude 1 to 25 Heb. 6:1 to 6.

When a member of the church becomes so carnal that he can no longer separate the spiritual from the material he then is unable to accept the teachings of Christ. "My words they are spirit and they are life," but the carnal and materialistic and earthy mind is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. Roman 8:7 Perhaps this is your trouble brother Moyer. Christ said to the carnally minded Jews, "Why do ye not understand my speech? even because you cannot hear my word." In my position relative to the paid preacher, I made the statement that all who sell the gospel for money have become corrupted. Your lectures did not make me change my mind in this respect but further confirmed everything I said about the paid preachers. Your reaction to the letter and the lesson on the Holy Spirit is indicative of the mind and attitude of one who has failed to grow spiritually and is lacking in the Christian graces so necessary to inherit a home in heaven. It is natural for the natural man to fight to preserve that which gives him security and a portion of the "good life" (the material things); and that which I taught in the letter does not conform to your way of life, although it was the truth; but you do not believe it. The carnal mind is not subject to the spiritual. This is tantamount to unbelief.

The preachers of old, the apostles and Christ thought little of security, money, or a place to live. Their minds, their hearts and their bodies were offered as living sacrifices that the great

and glorious gospel of Christ might be taken throughout the world. The paid preaching system, which corrupts the minds, and the hearts of those who practice it, also corrupted the WAY which Christ instituted whereby man could be saved. But the world, the millions yet unsaved cannot be converted and brought to Christ when the preachers stay with the churches which are already converted and able to take care of their own affairs, and in so doing do not obey Christ by spreading the gospel and establishing churches wherever there are none. The paid preacher system has virtually if not completely destroyed the New Testament plan of evangelism.

The letter was designed to stir the church into analyzing and evaluating their own lives by the Bible standard (rather than by the paid preacher's rules) and to study and see if what is taught is scriptural. It was sent with the hope and the prayer that many would read it and think of heaven and hell; and which one is to be their ultimate destination. Certainly ignorance, worldliness, unsound teaching, unscriptural practices and lack of works, will not save those who indulge in such, from the fiery torment of hell. We had hoped perhaps some would listen and awaken from the deadly sleep into which they had been lulled by the preachers who are paid to preach; and who are more intent upon their salaries than the souls of those who are perishing for lack of spiritual food. They should read the 2nd chapter of 2 Peter and consider verses 18 to 22.

In my letter I made the statement that practically all of the brotherhood with few exceptions HAD REJECTED THE HOLY SPIRIT. The Holy Spirit question is seemingly a touchy subject at this time; and there is a great deal of false teaching being disseminated throughout the brotherhood. However, if one studies the Bible one can find the truth. There are too many conflicting opinions and false teaching in the church and the members would be wise to study this subject for themselves rather than accepting the preachers opinion, seeing that so many differ about it.

In your lecture against my teaching on the Holy Spirit you said to the congregation, "do you know of anyone who does not believe the Holy Spirit dwells in them; who does not believe in 1st Cor. 6:19? We don't." Inasmuch as you had read the special issue of the gospel Guardian of Aug. 15, 1968 on the subject of the Holy Spirit wherein brother Atkinson a well known preacher in the brotherhood, said that the majority of the brotherhood DID NOT BELIEVE that the Holy Spirit dwelt in them, we would be led to believe that either your memory is not very good or that you deliberately attempted to mislead the congregation into thinking that the brotherhood was in accord upon the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. But the evidence is contrary to your opinion.

We will quote brother Atkinson from the Gospel Guardian, "No less difficult is the particular subject of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. MANY CHRISTIANS (PERHAPS WE MIGHT SAY THE MAJORITY) believe that the Holy Spirit dwells in a Christian ONLY THROUGH THE WORD. Others, of which I am one, feels that He dwells in Christians in a measure, (we speak of this as the ordinary or non miraculous measure) SEPARATE AND APART FROM THE WORD," So not only do I differ with you when you say that you don't know anyone who does not believe in an indwelling of the Holy Spirit, 1st Cor. 6:19, but brother Atkinson goes further and says he believes that the MAJORITY of the brotherhood DOES NOT BELIEVE IN AN INDWELLING OF THE HOLY SPIRIT. I go even further and say that because of this practically all of the brotherhood has rejected the Holy Spirit which is nothing more or less than REJECTING THE SCRIPTURES. Read 1st Cor. 6:19, Acts 2:38, Acts 5:32, 2nd Tim. 1:14, Romans 8:9, 10, 11, 13, 14 & 15. Also Romans 8:26 & 27 and Eph. 4:30, Acts 15:7, 8 & 9. These are rejected and not believed by practically all of the church. Is brother Atkinson a false teacher because he believes the majority of the church doesn't

believe in an indwelling of the Holy Spirit separate and apart from the word?

All of the above verses of scripture will prove an indwelling as well as the work of the Holy Spirit. However practically all of the brotherhood has rejected these scriptures and therefore are not on their way to heaven. Furthermore, those who believe as you do that the Holy Spirit does nothing more or less than that which the word does, also in effect REJECTS THE HOLY SPIRIT because it is a denial of Romans 8:26 & 27 as well as verses 10 to 15. Is it any more unbelieving to reject the personal indwelling of the Holy Spirit than it is to reject His work within our mortal bodies? Either He does help our infirmities (Rom. 8:6), helps us to understand the deep things of God, keeps us from being seduced away from the truth and helps us separate truth from error (1st John 4:6), or He doesn't . We can't accept His indwelling and refuse to accept His work within our mortal bodies.

Furthermore, Elvis Bozarth in the same issue of the Gospel Guardian wherein about fourteen brethren wrote on the subject of the Holy Spirit, said that he did not believe Acts 2:38 and took the position of most of the brethren that the Holy Spirit is NOT given as a gift after baptism. Did you read this brother Moyer, inasmuch as you criticized some of the things which I was critical of in the various articles submitted by some of the leading preachers in the brotherhood, it is odd to say the least that you would say that you didn't know anyone who did believe 1st Cor. 6:19. Well, we present you with Elvis Bozarth and the majority of the brotherhood who do not believe in the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. Perhaps you will now go before the congregation and tell them you made a mistake. Or will you?

To further refute your unscriptural position that the Holy Spirit does nothing more or less than that which the word does (again I reiterate such words cannot be found in ALL of the Bible -- and are based upon a materialistic and unscriptural approach to everything taught in the

New Testament about the Holy Spirit), we quote Gal. 3:2-3, "This only would I learn of you. Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law or by the hearing of faith? Are ye so foolish? Having begun in the Spirit, are ye now made perfect by the flesh?" Herein is taught that the word and the Holy Spirit are two separate entities. The Galatian brethren did NOT HAVE THE HOLY SPIRIT under the law of Moses. Paul reminds them of this and teaches them that the Holy Spirit came after faith (obedience) to the law of Christ. Inasmuch as under Moses law they had the WORD of God, then under the law of Christ they must have acquired SOMETHING MORE than the WORD. This proves that the word and the Holy Spirit do not have the same office and are two different mediums through which God operates.

Your position will not stand by the scriptures, brother Moyer. The Galatian brethren were made to understand that in receiving the Gift of God, Acts 2:38 and Acts 5:32 they had the WORD and they had the Holy Spirit. If we try to rationalize the Holy Spirit from a carnal standpoint we will come up with nothing. The carnal mind cannot and will not accept the spiritual implications of the work and function of God's great GIFT. And Galatians 3:3 certainly proves that Christians have the word AND the Holy Spirit, and both have their own distinct work. The word SAVES, it converts and keeps the child of God converted as they obey and do the works so necessary to their salvation. The Holy Spirit is their Helper and their Comforter in their great task of overcoming the world. Therefore, the Holy Spirit not only dwells in the holy people of God but he performs and does HIS work as God has designed for Him to do.

To deny the work and/or function of the Holy Spirit is to deny the word of God; and all who do so will not inherit eternal life. The position of the church today towards the work and function of the Holy Spirit is quite similar to that of the Baptists, and others like them, who are persuaded to accept baptism but at the same time refuse its work in remitting the sins of the

unconverted. Today the majority of Christians reject the New Testament teaching of the indwelling and function of the Holy Spirit and thereby deny themselves the comfort and the joy and help of which are a necessary part of (or should be) a Christians life. The fruits of the Holy Spirit which are something which the word cannot give, and which are given to all the holy people of God who continue to obey and work out their salvation according to the New Testament plan, are a heavenly favor bestowed upon all those who live obedient and faithful all the days of their lives.

The Holy Spirit strengthens us with might. Eph. 3:16 & 17. This additional strength is given by God through the Holy Spirit so that the holy child of God has all the help needed to overcome the world and the imaginations of the devil. The Holy Spirit teaches us all things. 1st Cor. 2:13; gives us knowledge of the deep things of God, 1st Cor. 2:10; makes it possible to separate truth from error, 1st John 4:6; and keeps us from being led away into error, 1st John 2:27. Furthermore, by the aid of the Holy Spirit we know all things as well as being able to discern the difference between truth and lies religiously speaking. No other people on earth have these helps nor are they able to separate the truth from the devious and contradictory doctrines of man, as we can all see both of the world as well as in the church. All of the division, the contradictory positions, the ignorance and the unbelief which pervades the church today can be traced to their rejection of the Holy Spirit of God.

An understanding of the work of the Holy Spirit in this dispensation will help us to understand why practically all of the church has gone into apostasy and the remnant which is left is full of error and unbelief. The proof of this is found in your unwillingness to accept the Holy Spirit as a helper, Comforter, teacher and guide in the daily lives of all holy people of God, and your inability to separate truth from error. Furthermore, your confusion on the subject is plainly manifest in your unwillingness to accept 1st Cor. 2:10 to 16 and 1st John 2:18 to 29. It is

quite understandable why you would reject these passages of scripture because they most definitely expose your lack of knowledge and/or your unbelief of the scriptures. But no Christian reading them could be made to believe your exegesis of them. When we have the Holy Spirit He keeps us from making such errors.

For instance, to say that the verses in 1st Cor. 2:10 to 16 are applicable to the apostles only cannot be upheld. You have to pervert as well as add your own private interpretation of these verses to think that they are speaking of the apostles only. We might ask here referring to verse 10, has God revealed to us His work as well as to the apostles? Again we ask were the apostles the only recipients of knowledge of the deep things of God? We might also say here that the apostles were men, they were not divine. They lived in the flesh and they had to overcome the flesh the same as all men have had to do. They had the same gospel we have, and their knowledge not only of the scriptures and of the deep things of God was dependent upon the Holy Spirit the same as ours is. They had to obey and live and work out their salvation exactly the same as we have to do. They had no more additional help in this manner than we have. They had an indwelling of the Holy Spirit as we have; and they had to divide truth from error, separate lies from truth, learn to walk uprightly before God the same as we do.

In other words all the commandments in the New Testament which are applicable to us, were obeyed by them outside of those which pertain to the powers given them by the baptism of the Holy Spirit, which were designed especially for them. Paul found himself, after he was baptized, obeying the law of Moses Acts 21:20 to 26. Peter was caught up in sin in Gal. 2:10 to 15. If the Holy Spirit was a Comforter for them He was and is a Comforter for us, if He was a guide for them He also guides us into truth and deep things of God. Do we not need what they had and did they not need what we have-- the Holy Spirit? Because they could perform miracles, talk in tongues, prophesy etc., He did not for one moment give them any additional

powers or help in their daily walk of life than we ourselves have today. They believed and walked by the same rule that we do today.

Therefore, we must take issue with you when you try to pervert the word of God by teaching that 1st Cor. 2:10 to 16 is for the apostles only. And again when you take the position that 1st John 2:18 to 29 is not written for Christians. If not, to whom is it written? However, again we ask that the reader of this letter study again the 2nd Chapter of 1st John for themselves and see if there is anything whereby we could conclude that the teaching therein was not for the church today. The 18th verse reads, "Little children it is the last time and as ye have heard that an antichrist shall come, even now are there many antichrists; whereby we know that it is the last time." Therefore we must assume that Christians are the "little children" and this expression is also used in verse 12. These verses were directed to the children of God then and now. One would have to add or pervert these scriptures to assume otherwise.

We have an unction (Holy Spirit) from the Holy One and the 20th verse teaches this "And ye know all things." We know that only holy people of God can know all things; or in other words the truth of the word of God is hidden from the world, they cannot understand it nor can they separate truth from error. 1st Cor. 1:19 to 31. Only those in the church who are obedient and faithful and in whom the Holy Spirit functions to guide them into all truth, to teach them, to strengthen as well as to help them to separate truth from error, can know all things. I do not believe that only the apostles were guided into all truth, nor that only they were capable of understanding the truth as well as to know the deep things of God. They had no preeminence in this respect. They needed the Holy Spirit to teach them, to help separate truth from error and to understand the word of God the same as all Christians who live holy lives before God today.

In Eph. 4:30 we read, "And grieve not the Holy Spirit of God whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption." We are NOT sealed by the Word but by the HOLY SPIRIT. So your belief that "The Holy Spirit does nothing more or less than that which the word does," is refuted by this verse of scripture. The word cannot be grieved; therefore we must conclude, if we believe the word of God, that the Holy Spirit and the word are two different mediums through which God works and have different functions. Evidently you do not believe Eph. 4:30. One might ask here how do we grieve the Holy Spirit? And one might answer that your position on the Holy Spirit must grieve the Holy Spirit, as it is a definite rejection of His work and power in this dispensation. Your attack on the Spring Valley church through me, must also grieve the Holy Spirit. All sin grieves the Holy Spirit until it is rectified.

Again in Romans 8:26-27 you had to pervert the very plain and understandable teachings of the word of God to try and uphold your unscriptural position that "the Holy Spirit does nothing more or less than the word does." We quote verses 26 & 27, "Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities: for we know not what we should pray for as we ought; but the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered. And He that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because He MAKETH INTERCESSION FOR THE SAINTS ACCORDING TO the will of God."

It is plain that you are in error brother Moyer because it is impossible for the word to make intercession for the saints, or help us in our infirmities. This is the works of the Holy Spirit. Furthermore we are told that the "Holy Spirit makes intercessions for the saints with groanings which cannot be uttered." No one could confuse nor err in making the proper scriptural exegesis of these verses as they are quite plain. They most emphatically separate the WORD and the HOLY SPIRIT and they completely and overwhelmingly confute any argument to the contrary. However, you did not

let that stop you and you deliberately tried to confuse and mislead your hearers by trying to equate verse 26 with verse 22. You did not attempt to explain verse 27 at all because you couldn't, but it is most evident that you do not believe it. "Ye are damned if you don't believe", Mark 16:16. However it is even a worse sin to pervert and/or twist the word of God to make it fit your opinions.

The church will be held responsible before God on the judgment day if they continue to receive and believe your teachings. They have the responsibility of studying the word of God for themselves; they also have the responsibility of rebuking those who err in the word. Titus 3:10-11. Luke 17:3. The church should take note that you quoted many scriptures but you did not take the scriptures which I used and prove that I perverted or distorted them in any way. The above verses from Romans 8 are proof of what I say; and they prove conclusively and scripturally that the Holy Spirit does have a work separate from the word. To not believe this is to die in your sins. It is a heinous sin to call a Christian a false teacher when they are really teaching the truth. It would be well brother Moyer for you to examine yourself and see if you are still in THE faith, 2nd Cor. 13:5. One could, and I do, question whether you have the Holy Spirit inasmuch as you deny Him and reject HIS work, and do your best to teach others that the Holy Spirit "does nothing more or less than that which the word does."

We cannot reject the Holy Spirit and expect Him to continue to dwell within our mortal bodies. It would be well for all those who believe as you do to read Heb. 1:1-6. We believe sincerely that anyone who denies and rejects the work and function of the Holy Spirit does not have God nor Christ, and that they have reached the state as taught in Heb. 1:1-6. In conjunction with these verses read Jude (all of it) with special attention given to verses 18, 19, and 20. We cannot reject a part of the Godhead without rejecting all.

We cannot attempt to answer all of those things you talked about in your lectures but your attempt to smear me with the pitch which has blackened and ruined the lives of those who have followed Satan into the darkest depths of unbelief wherein they think they can cast out demons and talk in tongues, is to say the least reprehensible, and at its worse a wicked thing to do. Your inability to refute my position on the Holy Spirit was exposed when the names of such women as Mary Baker Eddy and Mary Ellen White were brought up with mine in your lectures so as to lead your listeners to think my position in some way was relative to theirs. This was a tactic unworthy of anyone who calls themselves a Christian. If I am a false teacher as you so vehemently and repetitiously proclaimed in your lectures it would seem that instead of having to cast a reflection upon my teachings by such tactics, that you could and should have used scriptures to prove me in error. The weakness of your position was most evident in the devious methods used to attack my integrity and it was evidence of your inability to prove by the scriptures I was a false teacher.

In conjunction with this you also, by suggestions in too many instances too numerous to mention in this letter, left wrong impressions about my teaching. Because you evidently could not prove me in error with scriptures to support your accusations in this respect you said I believed, "The Holy Spirit comes on us." And again you left a false impression by saying that I taught that the "Holy Spirit shows us things to come." Anyone reading my lesson on the Holy Spirit will readily see that I did not in any way even leave an impression of such, anymore than my positions upon Bible subjects could remotely be equated with such women as Mary Baker Eddy, or Mary Ellen White or even Joseph Smith among others who teach false doctrines.

However, while resorting to such petty methods in your attempt to combat the truth of my arguments it also was indicative of the character of the man who used them.

Disagreement amongst Christians is to be expected; but those who disagree and are honestly seeking truth can come together and by an honest seeking for the truth they can come into an accord. This is most necessary if we are to inherit a home in heaven. But to use your influence and position as a preacher to denounce, call names and accuse a Christian sister of being a false teacher and a perverter of the word, and at the same time you are unable to use honest methods and scriptures to prove your accusations, is most contemptible. It is also a sin. We can only hope that the congregation who hires you will have enough spiritual fortitude as well as enough knowledge of the scriptures to take the necessary steps to clean out all unrighteousness and unscriptural practices and beliefs and return to the "old paths" and begin anew upon the pure and clean commandments of the New Testament. Rom. 13:10-14, "The night is far spent, the day is at hand: let us therefore cast off the works of darkness, and let us put on the armour of light." Verse 12.

Our preachers today need to be SENT. They need to begin practicing the New Testament pattern of evangelism. There is not a scripture in the New Testament that will uphold the false system of preaching which is the practice amongst the brotherhood. Preachers must go forth into the places, the highways and the byways and take the word of God and convert the lost and establish the church. To stay for years at a time where the CONGREGATION IS ALREADY CONVERTED AND IS OLD ENOUGH TO TAKE CARE OF ITS OWN WORK AND ITS OWN AFFAIRS AND ITS OWN PREACHING IS TO PERVERT THE TEACHINGS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. This is why so many of the preachers are corrupted and money becomes their tantamount and sometimes their sole reason for preaching. The souls of millions throughout the United States are still prisoners of sin because our preachers do NOT GO FORTH everywhere and PREACH THE GOSPEL to the lost and dying. Matt. 28:18-19.

The congregations of the Lord have the scriptural power, the responsibility, and the God-given commandments to send their preachers forth into places where the gospel has not been preached, and support them as they preach, convert and establish churches. This is the Bible way and if we do not change from the perverted, money-mad, easy, slothful, corrupted, and unscriptural method of keeping our preachers bound to our side by MONEY, all will perish. There will be no home in heaven for those who lend themselves to this unscriptural practice, not only the preachers but also the members who make the paid preacher system possible.

If there was ever a time in the history of Christianity when God's people needed to send forth the evangelist into the highways and byways to teach the lost, IT IS NOW! Not only do the preachers need to become evangelists and take up the hard work of converting the lost, but they also need to get to work teaching from house-to-house Acts 20:20 and organizing Bible classes for the members of the church so that they may work at the job of saving souls. The women during the day (ALL OF THEM) can organize children's classes in the neighborhoods where they live and teach the children of the heathen. Perhaps in this manner many of the heathens (mothers and fathers) may be contacted and interested and perhaps converted. The men can have cottage classes in the evenings. WORK!

The world is lawless, blood thirsty, violent, dishonest, murderous, rapacious, immoral, unmoral, drug and alcohol oriented and very irreligious and unreligious. The primary reason for all this is because our preachers have sat themselves down in a soft place, worked for a salary, and neglected to go forth INTO ALL THE WORLD and PREACH AND CONVERT THE LOST. That brethren is hard work. "A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump." But the church is lazy, unlearned, worldly and unconverted. We had better get busy or the wrath of God will be sent down upon us.

Already the church has gone so far away into apostasy that they believe in tongue talking, and casting out of demons. However, we believe that the unscriptural practices and beliefs and the ignorance of the people of God is far more of a danger and a threat to the church as a whole than the manifest evidence of these who have gone so far away from God they are "twice dead, foaming out their shame and to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness forever." Can we sit on our hands, continue in our easy, worldly worthless, and unproductive lives and hope to have a home in heaven? "The whole duty of man is to fear God and keep His commandments." This the church is not doing.

Do you, as a preacher brother Moyer, encourage your people to go forth and to work, teach and to use their time in converting, not only their own souls, but that of others? Do you go into places where the work has not been taken and teach the lost and establish churches where there is none? Rom. 15:20-21. 2nd Cor. 10:16-19 and 1st Cor. 3:6-9. Have you and are you obeying these scriptures brother Moyer? Are those to whom you preach busily engaged in teaching and giving their time and efforts to the work of the Lord? In a congregation as large as the one where you preach there ought to be a hundred classes being taught by converted members, both men and women. But are there? "I entreat ye brethren by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy acceptable unto God, WHICH IS YOUR REASONABLE SERVICE. And be not conformed to this world--". Rom. 12:1-2. READ IT.

We believe that enough has been written for those who read this letter to be able to evaluate not only your life and position relative to the scriptures but also mine as well as the Spring Valley Church of Christ. We commend this letter to all and our thoughts, our prayers and our love are sent to all of you with the hope that the words written here may do that for which they are intended. We would be glad to hear from any who might be interested whether asking questions or otherwise.

In Christ's Precious Name,

Merie Weiss  
Spring Valley Church of Christ