



"I will stand upon my watch, and set me upon the tower, and will watch to see what he will say unto me, and what I will answer when I am reprovèd." Hab. 2:1

November 11, 2011

Table of Contents

[Feature Article](#)

[St. Patrick Was a Baptist](#)

[Blinded Minds](#)

[John 3:16 and Repentance](#)

[Poems That Preach](#)

[Correspondence on Calvinism](#)

[Cartoons To Make Us Wise](#)

[Discouraged Pastors](#)

[Deacon True Sez](#)

[Warmist Yearns For a Dictatorship](#)

[Who Do I Pray To?](#)

[Therapy For the Funny Bone](#)

[Building Bridges](#)

[The True Agenda of Evolutionists](#)

[Eddy-Torial](#)

Feature Article – Why Reproofs Are So Important – Part 8

We come this week to the final article on giving and receiving reproofs. The previous articles dealt with the Myths of reproofing others,

Myth #1 – Reproving others is unspiritual, unloving and unkind,

Myth #2 – It is wrong to reprove anyone outside your local church,

Myth #3 – Words of reproof must never be spoken to or about "God's Anointed Ones."

Myth #4 – Reproof always involves judging and judging is sin.

Myth #5 – It is always wrong to reprove anyone in public. It must always be done in private.

Myth #6 – Only a fruitful Christian is qualified to reprove error.

Myth #7 is, "Only an 'apostle' was ever called by God to keep watch over, and to warn of impending danger with regard to the spiritual safety of the flock."

The fact is, very few Christians believe in giving and receiving reproofs biblically.

What is the basic reason for rejecting reproofs? Self esteem is one of the causes for the rejection of reproofs. Though we read Proverbs 6:23, "For the commandment is a lamp; and the law is light; and reproofs of instruction are the way of life," we do not digest the truths of the verse. Its structure is that of Hebrew poetry and presents the benefits of reproofs in a parallelism. The words "commandment," "law," and "reproof" all speak of God's work in us through His Word. It is a work of conviction and confrontation, and it has three blessed results. 1) It is a lamp, 2) a light, and 3) the way of life. Or in other words, God does His work through reproofs, as He says in II Tim. 3:16, "All Scripture is inspired of God and is profitable for...reproof..."

So what happens to those who will not receive reproofs?

A. God sends many reproofs to men –

King Saul is a tragic example of one who rejected the reproofs God sent. We read the story of his life in I Samuel, chapters 9 to 31.

At first we have high hopes for Saul. He is blest with natural gifts and modesty, and even with godly zeal. But soon we read of Saul taking upon himself the office of priest and of the first reproof from God through Samuel. (13:8–15)

The second reproof came from his citizens when he threatened to take the life of his own son, the champion of Israel. "And Saul answered, God do so and more also: for thou shalt surely die, Jonathan. And the people said unto Saul, Shall Jonathan die, who hath wrought this great salvation in Israel? God forbid: as the LORD liveth, there shall not one hair of his head fall to the ground; for he hath wrought with God this day. So the people rescued Jonathan, that he died not." (I Sam. 14:44,45)

When Saul disobeyed God by not slaying the Amalekites in chapter 15, Samuel reproved him again and separated from him, " And Samuel said, Hath the LORD as great delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of the LORD? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams. For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry. Because thou hast rejected the word of the LORD, he hath also rejected thee from being king.... And Samuel came no more to see Saul until the day of his death: nevertheless Samuel mourned for Saul: and the LORD repented that he had made Saul king over Israel." (I Sam. 15:22,23, 35)

In chapter 16 Saul receives a reproof directly from God when He sends an evil spirit to trouble him. His stubborn rejection of reproofs caused him to be mentally unstable, to experience terrible moodiness, and become violent. In chapter 17, Goliath's taunts were God's means of reproofing Saul, in chapter 18 it was the foreskins of the Philistines, in chapter 19 it was Jonathan who spoke well of David and calmed his father's tempestuous spirit, but in chapter 20, when Jonathan would perceive his father's heart, he nearly loses his life as he offers the very gentlest of reproofs. " And it came to pass on the morrow, which was the second day of the month, that David's place was empty: and Saul said unto Jonathan his son, Wherefore cometh not the son of Jesse to meat, neither yesterday, nor to day? And Jonathan answered Saul, David earnestly asked leave of me to go to Bethlehem: And he said, Let me go, I pray thee; for our family hath a sacrifice in the city; and my brother, he hath commanded me to be there: and now, if I have found favour in thine eyes, let me get away, I pray thee, and see my brethren. Therefore he cometh not unto the king's table. Then Saul's anger was kindled against Jonathan, and he said unto him, Thou son of the perverse rebellious woman, do not I know that thou hast chosen the son of Jesse to thine own confusion, and unto the confusion of thy mother's nakedness? For as long as the son of Jesse liveth upon the ground, thou shalt not be established, nor thy kingdom. Wherefore now send and fetch him unto me, for he shall surely die. And Jonathan answered Saul his father, and said unto him, Wherefore shall he be slain? what hath he done? And Saul cast a javelin at him to smite him: whereby Jonathan knew that it was determined of his father to slay David." (I Sam. 20:27–33)

In chapters 24 and 26 Saul is reproved by David himself as he spares Saul's life twice. In chapter 28 he is reproved for the last time when he visits the witch of Endor and hears the death sentence from a familiar spirit.

B. When reproofs are refused great losses come to the one reproved –

1. Saul lost a dynasty – I Sam. 13:13,14
2. Saul lost his citizens' respect – I Sam. 14:44,45
3. Saul lost his throne and crown – I Sam. 15:23,26

4. Saul lost a sound mind – I Sam. 16:14
5. Saul lost the renown of slaying the giant – I Sam. 18:6
6. Saul lost the confidence of his son – I Sam. 19:1-3
7. Saul lost his self control – I Sam. 20:30-34
8. Saul lost many of his best soldiers – I Sam. 22:1,2
9. Saul lost those who would intercede for him – I Sam. 22:18
10. Saul lost his credibility as commander of his army – I Sam. 24 & 26
11. Saul lost the last shred of his integrity – I Sam. 28:6,7
12. Saul lost his life – I Sam. 31:4

C. The one being reprovved has several options.

1) He can receive reproofs graciously and see them as coming from the hand of the Lord. He can respond with repentance by changing whatever is rightly reprovved and needs changing. He can converse with his reprover and clarify the issues. In doing so, he has an opportunity to minister to his reprover, often helping him to correct misconceptions and defuse emotional excesses. In doing so he also raises his own standards higher and sets an example to all who are observing the exchange between him and his reprover. He has an opportunity to edify his reprover and lay the groundwork for becoming an important source of wise counsel to his reprover. When he receives reproofs graciously he even has the opportunity to build a relationship of biblical love with his reprover.

2) He can ignore his reprover and the reproofs offered, pretending that they were never received. Doing so will give the impression to his reprover (and to any observers) that he is unteachable or that he feels himself to be above reproof. Though he may see himself to be in the right, and may actually be in the right, his refusal to hear the reproofs offered causes others to view him as a proud man, and turn away from him. If he values his reputation he will likely pursue those who are turning away and attempt to persuade them that he is right and that there is no reason for him to receive reproofs. Most often he will produce proofs to show that God is blessing him, thus proving to his friends that he does not need reproofs. The basic premise for this course of action is that "God never reprovves those who are right, and I am always right with God, and this is proven by my reputation, and therefore I never need to be reprovved."

3) He can respond by reprovving his reprover for reprovving him. If he has spoken out strongly against anyone giving reproofs to others, and then proceeds to reprove his reprover, he practices hypocrisy. He may reprove his reprover for inaccuracy, or having wrong motives, or being unspiritual, or unloving. He will quote some or all of the popular myths about reprovving others. In doing so he may hope to discredit his reprover so that he need not consider the reproofs given. If his reprover then searches his own heart and repents of wrong motives, etc., refines his reproofs, and offers them again so that the reproofs bring more pressure to bear, the person being reprovved has four options. He can respond as in point # 1 above. He can respond as in point # 2 above. He can continue to respond as in point # 3, or he can respond as in point # 4 below.

4) He can respond by becoming a scorner. In Proverbs especially, and all throughout the Old Testament there are passages that describe the man who refuses reproofs. He is called a scorner. One commentator defined a scorner as being, "one who despises that which is holy and avoids the company of the noble 'wise men,' but yet in his own vain way seeks for truth; his character is marked by arrogance as that of the wise is characterized by devout caution." In refusing reproofs, the scorner proceeds to rebuke his reprover, often with vehemence, and soon resorts to railing and reviling. He will usually become bitter and even make it his life's work to destroy his reprover's ministry and reputation completely. He attempts to completely silence his reprover, and if it is not possible to slay him, he will treat him as though he were dead. It is often the case that he comes to hate his reprover, and in doing so he brings his own salvation into question.

In closing, it should be noted that it is extremely important for anyone reproving another to first practice receiving reproofs graciously.

Bro. Buddy Smith

[\(Back to Table of Contents\)](#)

St. Patrick Was A Baptist –

By John Summerfield Wimbish, D.D.

A Word About The Message

The sermon, "St. Patrick Was a Baptist," was delivered to a thronged congregation at the Calvary Baptist Church of New York City by the pastor, Dr. John Summerfield Wimbish, on March 12, 1952, just a few days before the phenomenal St. Patrick's Day parade.

On the historic day 95,000 people marched up New York's fashionable Fifth Avenue and an estimated 1,500,000 spectators lined the streets. On the steps of St. Patrick's Cathedral stood Cardinal Spellman and other ecclesiastics to witness the spectacle. Further up Fifth Avenue, the reviewing stand bore such dignitaries as Mayor and Mrs. Vincent Impellitteri, former Postmaster General James A. Farley and scores of city and state officials and military and church leaders.

The message was offered to a world-wide radio audience and there has been an unprecedented demand for it.

Saint Patrick Was A Baptist. After a cautious and critical study of reputable writings, I am thoroughly convinced that he was not affiliated in any way whatsoever with the Roman hierarchy.

It is indeed magnanimous of our Catholic friends to give this humble missionary of ours such prominence on their scroll of illustrious saints. Think of it: they have even erected cathedrals in his honor. However, we feel that it is time to sweep the cobwebs of superstition and the dust of legend off this dear old preacher of the Cross.

To most of us, Patrick is a mythical being, vaguely associated with a serpent exodus from the Emerald Isle. Other misconceptions are that he was Irish, that he was an emissary of the Pope and that his name was Patrick. All of these are false. He was not Irish, he was in his honored grave 175 years before his name was even mentioned in Catholic writings* and his real name was Sucat, which means "warlike" in Modern Welsh.¹ For the sake of simplicity, throughout this message we will refer to him as Patrick.

(* In correspondence with the Abbot of Iona, an Irish Catholic, by the name of Cumman, in 634 A.D., spoke of the "Cycle of our Holy Father Patrick.")

Let us consider first of all,

I. Patrick's History

The libraries of the world contain innumerable biographies of Patrick which we cannot accept as valid. An examination of the facts will reveal that the honored historians of the hierarchy have not always been characterized by honesty, and during the Middle Ages such a web of

superstition was spun around this evangelistic zealot that his real self has been distorted in the minds of millions. Most of these traditions and myths may be found in the seven ancient lives of Patrick, assembled and published in 1647 by John Colgan under the title *Trias Thaumaturga*.

There are two documents by Patrick which are recognized by all parties as being genuine: his "Confession" or "Epistle to the Irish" and his epistle to the Christians under the cruel king, Coroticus. Then, too, we should mention the *Lorica* or Hymn of Patrick, originally written in Latin and known as *The Breastplate*. These authentic writings in an irrefutable way support our convictions concerning the Apostle to the Irish.

Patrick, in his own "Confession" tells us that he was a Briton, not an Irishman. He first saw the light of day in the town of Dumbarton on the River Clyde in the south of Scotland about the year 389 A.D. His father was a Christian deacon and his grandfather a clergyman in the ancient church of Britain, which had never come under the yoke of Rome. These facts in themselves practically crush the claims of the papacy.

At sixteen years of age, our hero was captured by a band of Scottish slave-dealing pirates who sold him to the Druid chieftain, Milcho, who reigned in the north of Ireland. For six years Patrick herded the cattle of this ruthless pagan chieftain. In his "Confession" he tells us: "When I was a youth, I was taken captive before I knew what I should desire or seek, or what I ought to shun."

It was during this time of servitude in the bleak forests of northern Ireland that Patrick turned from his frivolous ways and came into a knowledge of Christ as his own personal Saviour. Of that period he says, "Frequently in the night I prayed and the love of God and His fear increased more and more in me." Possibly it was while a hidden onlooker of the weird Druid ceremonies that he was inspired of God to become a missionary to these heathen people.

He relates how, after six years, he managed to escape from his master and, after a tortuous journey over sea and land, returned to his people in Britain. It must have been a beautiful home-coming as his mother embraced him once again and his father, in amazement, learned of the lad's experiences. They had long before given him up as dead.

Like the great apostle Paul, he received a clear and personal "Macedonian call" from the Lord of harvest to preach the Gospel in the land of his former captivity. Patrick described his call in these words: "Again, I was in Britain with my parents, who received me as their son, and besought me to promise that, after the many afflictions I had endured, I would never leave them again. And then, truly, in the bosom of the night I saw a man as if coming from Ireland, whose name was Victoricus, with numerous letters, one of which he gave me, and I read the beginning of the epistle, containing the Voice of the Irish.

"And while I was reading the beginning of the epistle I thought in my mind that I heard the voice of those who were near the wood Focluti, which is near the western sea. And they shouted thus: 'We beseech thee, holy youth, to come and live amongst us.' And I was greatly pained in my heart, and could not read very much more; and thus I was proved. Thank God, that after many years the Lord performed to them according to their entreaty."

From these words it is evident that his call to go as a missionary to Ireland was not from any Pope or representative of the Roman Church. If our hero had been an agent of Rome, surely Popes Sixtus or Leo, who were his contemporaries, would have informed the Roman constituency of the astounding work being performed by Patrick and his co-laborers.

Dr. J. Lewis Smith, in his scholarly treatise, "Patrick of Ireland Not A Romanist," says, "We have in hand now 140 letters of Pope Leo the Great and we have not found a line written by him or any other Pope or any other man rejoicing over the wonderful additions to the Roman Church by Patrick and his disciples."

Patrick, like Paul, "had the mighty ordination of the nail-pierced hands." The Book of Darrow, one of the oldest of Irish manuscripts, says nothing about his being an ecclesiastic of Rome and in his letter to the Christians under Coroticus and in his "Confession" Patrick makes no mention whatsoever of his being consecrated as a diocesan bishop.

Dr. Hamilton, in his book, "The Irish Church," says this of Patrick's confession letter: "There is not a faint Roman tinge about it. It is ... thoroughly evangelical." And Dr. Todd says: "The Confession of St. Patrick contains not a word of a mission from the Pope Celestine."

We are certain that Patrick was a product of the Celtic Church, noted for its purity of Biblical doctrine, and not an "obsequious tool of the Romish system." Yes, we are positive that Patrick's call to go to Ireland as a missionary was from God Himself and not from Pope Celestine.

[\(Back to Table of Contents\)](#)

Blinded Minds -

California University Introduces First U.S. Multi-Faith School of Theology

Najeeba Syeed-Miller; "The diversity of humankind is not a curse from God"

PBS Newshour 30 October 2011

With Korean-American drummers leading a line of professors, *a new experiment in American religious education began this northern Autumn.*

This was the opening of Southern California's Claremont Lincoln University, which describes itself as America's *first inter-religious school of theology*, one that will train *pastors, rabbis* and eventually *Muslim imams, all on one campus.*

The school's philosophy was captured in the opening remarks of Muslim-American religious scholar Najeeba Syeed-Miller, a professor at Claremont Lincoln. "The diversity of humankind is not a curse from God. It is a sign of God's creation, and *the beauty of humanity is in our very differences*".

"I actually hope that there is conflict. I often say when we get together in interfaith dialogue, we try to out-nice each other and say, oh, you know, you're wonderful! No, you are wonderful!"

"If we are truly going to be *conversation partners*, we need to say, look, this is how I view your tradition. I think we really need to get into conversations about history, because so much of what we carry in interfaith dialogue is about *the negative histories* that each of our communities has had with one another."

"So if we are not willing to go there, then *I don't think any of us are going to be able to move forward*".

[\(Back to Table of Contents\)](#)

John 3:16 and Repentance –

Why Doesn't John 3:16 and Acts 16:31 Mention Repentance?

Some men say that it is not necessary to preach repentance since we don't see it in John 3:16 and Acts 16:31.

It seems to me, though, that this is a strange way to use the Bible, since it is so obvious from other passages that repentance is necessary. Jesus said it is necessary (Luke 13:1-5); Paul said it is necessary (Acts 17:30, etc.); Peter said it is necessary (2 Pet. 3:9). If preaching repentance is not necessary and we only need to preach faith, why did Christ Himself preach repentance?

The reason why verses such as John 3:16 and Acts 16:31 don't mention repentance is that proper saving faith includes repentance and proper repentance includes faith. Repentance and faith are sometimes spoken of in Scripture as both being necessary for salvation (i.e., Acts 20:21; Heb. 6:1), while at other times only one or the other is said to be necessary.

Salvation is referred to as coming to repentance with no mention of faith in Matthew 9:13; 11:20-21; 21:32; Mark 1:4; 2:17; 6:12; Luke 15:7; 24:47; Acts 2:38; 3:19; 5:31; 11:18; 26:20; 2 Corinthians 7:10; 1 Thessalonians 1:9; 2 Timothy 2:25; and 2 Peter 3:9.

Then in other passages, such as John 3:16 and Acts 16:31, salvation is referred to as believing and repentance is not mentioned.

By comparing Scripture with Scripture (rather than isolating Scripture, which is the method used by false teachers), I conclude that saving faith includes repentance. Preaching repentance depends on the soul winning context.

The Philippian jailer was obviously under deep conviction when he cried out, "What must I do to be saved." Doubtless Paul and Barnabas had been witnessing to him. Now he was fully ready to do whatever God told him to do. There was no need to go into repentance. He was already repenting! I, too, have met men in jails that were ready to be saved. They had heard the gospel and God was working in their hearts; they knew that they were sinners and were deeply sorry for their past lives and were ready to bow before God. All that was needed was to explain to them how to put their faith in Christ in a saving manner (e.g., Romans 10:8-13).

On the other hand, when Paul preached to the idolaters at Athens who were looking on the matter of Christ and the resurrection as merely another philosophical debate, he told them that God "now commandeth all men every where to repent" (Acts 17:30).

Pastor Dave Sorenson says:

"Saving faith includes repentance. Repentance is not doing anything. It is not a deed, act, work, or rite. Rather, it is a change of the direction of one's heart. It basically means an attitude of the heart in turning from sin and self and turning to God. That's what Paul was referring to in Acts 20:21 when he referred to 'repentance toward God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ.' Saving faith is the human heart turning to God and then trusting in Jesus Christ. ... Even as there is the part of trusting Christ, there is also the part of turning to Him. That may seem inconsequential, but I believe that here is a spiritual reason they some go through the motions of believing in Christ but are not really born again. They seemingly want the fire escape but there is no interest in turning to God. There is no interest in repentance. They have the attitude, 'God, gimme salvation, but I'm gonna keep on doing my own thing.' ... However, if there is no real turning to God from the heart, they have missed the prerequisite for actually trusting Christ" (*Sorenson, Training Your Children to Turn out Right, 1995*).

Repentance and faith are two separate things that come together for salvation, but they act together as one thing.

“Repentance is included in believing. Howbeit, repentance is not faith, nor faith repentance. ‘He that believeth,’ implies repentance. ‘Repent and be converted,’ involves faith. ‘The hand that clutches the assassin’s knife must open ‘ere it can grasp the gift its intended victim proffers; and opening that hand, though a single act, has a double aspect and purpose. Accepting the gift implies a turning from the crime the heart was bent on, and it was the gift itself that worked the change. Faith is the open hand, relatively to the gift; repentance is the same hand, relatively, not only to the gift but more especially to the dagger that is flung from it.’ ... Repentance is one threefold action: in the understanding--knowledge of sin; in the feelings--pain and grief; in the will--a change of mind and a turning around” (*James Stewart, Evangelism, pp. 48, 49*).

“While it is true that upwards of one hundred and fifteen N.T. passages condition salvation on believing, and fully thirty passages condition salvation on faith ... nevertheless, repentance is an essential condition in God’s glorious Gospel. It is also true that in the last analysis repentance and faith are one and the same act. ‘Ye turned to God from idols’ (1 Th. 1:9). Repentance is included in believing. ‘Howbeit, repentance is not faith, nor faith repentance. ‘He that believeth,’ implies repentance. ‘Repent and be converted,’ involves faith...Repentance and faith can never be separated. ‘Repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ’ (Ac. 20:21). ‘Ye repented NOT ... that ye might believe Him’ (Mt. 21:32). ... Repentance is denying (negative), faith is affirming (positive). Repentance looks within, faith looks above. Repentance sees our misery, faith our Deliverer. Repentance is hunger, faith is the open mouth, and Christ is the living food” (*James Stewart, Evangelism, p. 49*).

“Repentance never saved a soul by its merits; it lays the needful foundation for the temple of faith in the heart. But all the penitential sorrows of Adam’s family would not remove one faint stain of sin. If a man borrowed five thousand dollars, for which he gave security, and squandered it most foolishly, and afterwards, filled with true repentance, he solicited and expected the forgiveness of the debt because he was sorry for it, the spendthrift would only meet with contempt in his application; his sureties would have to pay the money. Faith alone in the Crucified cleanses from all sin, and repentance is God’s instrumentality for leading the sinner to the Lamb of God, the Great Remover of sin” (*William Cathcart*).

(first published August 19, 2008) (*David Cloud, Fundamental Baptist Information Service, P.O. Box 610368, Port Huron, MI 48061, fbns@wayoflife.org*;))

For more on the above subject see the 180–page book *Repentance and Soul Winning*, which is available from [Way of Life Literature](#).)

This is an in–depth study on biblical repentance and a timely warning about unscriptural methods of presenting the gospel.

The opening chapter, entitled “Fundamental Baptists and Quick Prayerism: A Faulty Method of Evangelism Has Produced a Change in the Doctrine of Repentance,” traces the change in the doctrine of repentance among fundamental Baptists during the past 50 years.

REPENTANCE AND SOUL WINNING (D.W. Cloud) [ISBN 1-58318-062-1]

[\(Back to Table of Contents\)](#)



Poems That Preach -

Strangers Yet -

*The Virtues were invited once
To banquet with the Lord of All;
They came, - the great ones rather grim,
And not so pleasant as the small.
They talked and chatted o'er the meal,
They even laughed with temp'rate glee;
And each one knew the other well,
And all were good as good could be.
Benevolence and Gratitude
Alone of all seemed strangers yet;
They stared when they were introduced, -
On earth they never once had met.*

(quoted by *Alexander Whyte* - author unknown)

[\(Back to Table of Contents\)](#)

Correspondence on Calvinism -

"Dear brother-----,

Re your query regarding Calvinism and Arminianism:

Most of us who believe in the sufficiency of Scripture say that we are neither Calvinists nor Arminians. We say we are biblicists. Of course, Calvinists and Arminians may also say they are biblicists. And to a point they are. It is just that, when anyone points out a "problem" text that doesn't fit into their preferred system of theology, they fall back on a default position, which is to refer to the writings of the followers of Calvin or to the followers of Arminius. The default position for a biblicist is simply Scripture. A biblicist believes that no man, including himself has ever thought, said, or written anything of equal accuracy or authority with Holy Scripture.

A young brother once asked what I was (Calvinist or Arminian?) so I told him I am a committed biblicist. Over several months, as we corresponded, I explained the fact that truth about God, as revealed in Scripture, is too large for any theological system to contain without having to trim off the parts that don't fit. I told him that you simply can't squeeze a doctrinal elephant into a Reformed thimble. Some important parts are going to get left out. A better metaphor might be that a universe of theology can only be made to fit into John Calvin's parish if the gravitational pull of reformation dogma compresses the entire cosmos of revelation into a tiny black hole that prevents any light ever escaping again. The only receptacle that is vast enough in compass to hold God's universe of theology is God's book, the Bible itself.

More and more, I am realizing that the theological systems devised by men are actually intellectual grids (composed along the lines of ancient cultural biases) and that these are

used to organize truth about God. None of these "mind-grids" totally originated in Scripture, but in part, at least, in a humanistic philosophy. Reformed theology should be called "the doctrine of God, according to Greek philosophy." Its emphasis on logic and rationalism dominates the lecturers and their students so that Plato prevails over Paul. Reformed theology (whether Sproul's, Mohler's, Piper's, or MacArthur's) cannot resist turning the "scientific method" loose on the attributes of God. As you read their books you find the Renaissance ruling the Reformation.

Augustine is an prime example of this. His curious mixture of gnosticism, Manichaeism, and Catholicism, resulted in him developing a system of theology that was palatable to Roman Catholicism, but not to Bible Christians. Augustine is credited with systematising Roman Catholic theology and polity. Since Protestantism branched off, but never completely forsook Rome, it finds that it cannot repudiate Augustine, with the result that they cannot escape his influence entirely. If you listen closely to reformed preachers you will always hear Augustine muttering away in the background. He's been gone over 1600 years and he still can't be quiet.

I have an old book called *The Theology of Anabaptism*, written by a Mennonite. He develops the thesis that Anabaptists never wrote a book on theology. They just read a verse and said, "We need to act on this." Now that description oversimplifies his thesis, but I see what he is saying. It is simply this, "While the medieval scholars sat in their ivory towers and debated how many angels could pirouette on the head of a pin, the Anabaptists were out and about putting the Bible to work." From what I have read of Anabaptist history, I think he is right. This simplicity of faith and works will no doubt be called "anti-intellectual". It got the Anabaptists into a lot of trouble then and it gets biblicists in hot water today. But I wonder if this is not the solution to the Calvinism/ Arminian debate?

Maybe what we need to do is just to go out and work at winning the world to Christ, instead of wasting another millennium or two arm wrestling with the elite apologists from either camp?

Just a thought or two,

Bro. Buddy Smith

[\(Back to Table of Contents\)](#)

Galatians 1:6-10

I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel: Which is not another; but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ. But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed. For do I now persuade men, or God? or do I seek to please men? for if I yet pleased men, I should not be the servant of Christ.

Cartoons to Make Us Wise –

RAWRZ INVESTOR'S BUSINESS DAILY
2011©



www.investors.com/cartoons

[\(Back to Table of Contents\)](#)

Discouraged Pastors –

The following message by Evangelist Hal Webb is reprinted from the now-defunct Maranatha!!!! paper published by Westside Baptist Church of Natchez), January–February 1997.

"And I will give you pastors according to mine heart, which shall feed you with knowledge and understanding" (Jeremiah 3:15).

I understand there is a ten thousand dollar fine with time in jail for killing eagles, since it is our national bird. A little owl is giving the lumber companies fits as environmentalists seek to preserve its habitat. There are a number of birds and animals on the endangered species list. Frankly, I feel we are overlooking one of the most endangered one: the faithful, godly pastors among us.

When I was a lad my greatest hero was my pastor. No Old Testament child ever stood before Moses with any more awe than I before my pastor. He was my example, my hero, and my best friend. I hung on to his every word and patterned my young life after his Biblical preaching. My own heart was filled with reverential appreciation and a willingness to follow without question or complaint. Such was the attitude of most church members 50 years ago. The pastor was the man of the hour and the respected leader in the community. I have lived to see the disturbing change that has risen up against the faithful servants of God. They are mistrusted, lied about, criticized, misused, hounded, and the most "bashed" profession on earth. I want you to examine some of their greatest sources of discouragement. I have preached over fifty years in their churches and know their problems.

THE GREATEST DISCOURAGEMENT IS APATHY AMONG THE CHURCH MEMBERS.

Apparently it was a problem from the beginning. In Jeremiah 2:32 God lamented, "...my people have forgotten me days without number." It is heartbreaking to see how many professing

believers simply do not care. The church is reluctantly a part of their life but the enthusiasm and priority for church things is missing. It has been submerged under all the earthly things they have allowed to become first. One can be so earthly minded they are no Heavenly good. When a pastor constantly is battered by a barrage of excuses, poor attendance and little support, it is devastating. How can he build a fire when no one wants to be warmed? His heart can burn with zeal and excitement over the potential around him only to be greeted by the "ho hum" of status quo members. The constant dripping of their unconcern slowly moves him toward discouragement and despair. If a request to candidate arrives when he is in such a state it is not hard to figure what will happen. He may go to his study to pray but his wife will go to the bedroom to pack. Apathy is the hardest thing a pastor faces today.

Pastors face a dearth of respect and a breakdown of trust. I sense this everywhere on the part of the children of God. Since the exposure of the TV ministers of deceit and the emergence of cult phonies it seems all men of God have come under closer scrutiny. Your pastor deserves your respect and trust as he seeks to lead you in service and worship. He has nothing in common with that bunch. Scripture is very clear as to how you should treat your pastor.

"...we beseech you, brethren, to know them which labour among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you; And to esteem them very highly in love for their work's sake. And be at peace among yourselves" (1 Thessalonians 5:12-13).

The pastor should be held by the congregation on a very high level as the undershepherd of the flock. We have lost a whole generation of children that have sparse respect for the pastor, for they were not taught this Bible command. The phone and the dinner time gossip mill has largely turned our youth away from pastoral respect. **THE MOST WOUNDED TEENS ARE THOSE WHO HAVE BEEN BOUNCED FROM CHURCH TO CHURCH BY PARENTS WHO COULD NOT GET ALONG WITH THE PASTOR.** The Bible is very clear.

"Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves: for they watch for your souls, as they that must give account, that they may do it with joy, and not with grief: for that is unprofitable for you" (Hebrews 13:17). (first published February 23, 1997) (David Cloud, Fundamental Baptist Information Service, fbns@wayoflife.org;)

[\(Back to Table of Contents\)](#)

Deacon True Sez -

"On a farm and in a church, the fences need to be horse-high, pig-tight and bull-strong."

[\(Back to Table of Contents\)](#)



Warmist Yearns for a Dictatorship -

Andrew Bolt - Thursday, April 21, 11 (06:22 am)

Sydney Morning Herald columnist Elizabeth Farrelly sighs for the virtue of a communist dictatorship, which, unlike Australia, needs not pander to the 80 per cent of the population which has an IQ of just 80 and resists virtuous causes such as global warming:

Whether non-democracies such as China will negotiate the rapids of the coming century more adroitly remains to be seen. Certainly, freed from any need to pander to the 80/80 rule, they have at least one freedom Western-style democracies do not have - the freedom to act decisively.

Farrelly of course imagines herself in the 20 per cent of the intellectual elite, and thus born to dictate.

UPDATE

Farrelly joins other warmists in regretting the freedom of other citizens to disagree with them. Here's former Greens candidate Professor Clive Hamilton:

(T)he implications of 3C, let alone 4C or 5C, are so horrible that we look to any possible scenario to head it off, including the canvassing of "emergency" responses such as the suspension of democratic processes.

Here's Emeritus Professor David Shearman, an IPCC assessor and honorary secretary of Doctors for the Environment Australia:

Government in the future will be based upon . . . a supreme office of the biosphere. The office will comprise specially trained philosopher/ecologists.

These guardians will either rule themselves or advise an authoritarian government of policies based on their ecological training and philosophical sensitivities. These guardians will be specially trained for the task.

[\(Back to Table of Contents\)](#)

Who Do I Pray To? -

(E)very once in a while someone asks me whether we should pray to Jesus Himself or to the Father in the name of Jesus. I can think of a number of verses where the Lord Jesus told His disciples to pray to the Father, but I can't remember one in which he commanded them to pray to Him. There are a scant few texts in which it appears men "prayed" to Jesus, such as the repentant thief on the cross and Stephen calling on the Lord Jesus to receive his spirit when he was



stoned to death in Acts 7, but in contrast to this there are many verses that teach us to pray to the heavenly Father. One problem that may not have been thought through is how it is possible to pray to Jesus in Jesus' name. Is it sane to suppose that any person is approached in His own name? It seems so much more appropriate for God's petitioners to approach Him in the worthiness of His Son, Whom He sent to die for our sins, and Whose death He accepted as a propitiation. Parents often teach their babes to pray to Jesus, and we understand that God is not properly their "Father" until they are born again, but might it not be better for us to teach them to simply pray to "God?" – Ed.)

- **Mt 6:6** But thou, when thou prayest, enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy **Father** which is in secret; and thy Father which seeth in secret shall reward thee openly.
- **Mt 6:8** Be not ye therefore like unto them: for your **Father** knoweth what things ye have need of, before ye ask him.
- **Mt 6:9** After this manner therefore pray ye: Our **Father** which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name.
- **Matthew 7:11** If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your **Father** which is in heaven give good things to them that ask him?
- **Matthew 11:25** At that time Jesus answered and said, I thank thee, O **Father**, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes.
- **Mt 26:39** And he went a little further, and fell on his face, and prayed, saying, O my **Father**, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me: nevertheless not as I will, but as thou wilt.
- **Mt 26:42** He went away again the second time, and prayed, saying, O my **Father**, if this cup may not pass away from me, except I drink it, thy will be done.
- **Mt 26:53** Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my **Father**, and he shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels?
- **Lu 10:21** In that hour Jesus rejoiced in spirit, and said, I thank thee, O **Father**, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes: even so, **Father**; for so it seemed good in thy sight.
- **Lu 11:2** And he said unto them, When ye pray, say, Our **Father** which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, as in heaven, so in earth.
- **Lu 11:11** If a son shall ask bread of any of you that is a **father**, will he give him a stone? or if he ask a fish, will he for a fish give him a serpent?
- **Lu 11:13** If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children: how much more shall your heavenly **Father** give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?
- **Lu 15:21** And the son said unto him, **Father**, I have sinned against heaven, and in thy sight, and am no more worthy to be called thy son.
- **Lu 16:24** And he cried and said, **Father** Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue; for I am tormented in this flame.
- **Lu 22:42** Saying, **Father**, if thou be willing, remove this cup from me: nevertheless not my will, but thine, be done.
- **Lu 23:34** Then said Jesus, **Father**, forgive them; for they know not what they do. And they parted his raiment, and cast lots.
- **Lu 23:46** And when Jesus had cried with a loud voice, he said, **Father**, into thy hands I commend my spirit: and having said thus, he gave up the ghost.
- **Joh 11:41** Then they took away the stone from the place where the dead was laid. And Jesus lifted up his eyes, and said, **Father**, I thank thee that thou hast heard me.
- **Joh 12:28** **Father**, glorify thy name. Then came there a voice from heaven, saying, I have both glorified it, and will glorify it again.
- **Joh 14:13** And whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, that will I do, that the **Father** may be glorified in the Son.
- **Joh 15:16** Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you, and ordained you, that ye should go and bring forth fruit, and that your fruit should remain: that whatsoever ye shall ask of the **Father** in my name, he may give it you.

- [Joh 16:23](#) And in that day ye shall ask me nothing. Verily, verily, I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall ask the **Father** in my name, he will give it you.
- [Joh 16:26](#) At that day ye shall ask in my name: and I say not unto you, that I will pray the **Father** for you:
- [Joh 16:27](#) For the **Father** himself loveth you, because ye have loved me, and have believed that I came out from God.

The issue of who to pray to is basically a theological matter. If the Son is our advocate (1 John 2:1) and He it is through Whom we come to the Father (John 14:6) and it is in His name we pray, well, there are some important doctrines involved.

[\(Back to Table of Contents\)](#)

Therapy For The Funny Bone –

Murphy's Lesser-known Dictums:

- He who laughs last, thinks slowest.
- Change is inevitable, except from a vending machine.
- Those who live by the sword get shot by those who don't.
- Nothing is foolproof to a sufficiently talented fool.
- The 50-50-90 rule: Anytime you have a 50-50 chance of getting something right, there's a 90% probability you'll get it wrong.
- If you lined up all the cars in the world end to end, someone would be stupid enough to try to pass them, five or six at a time, on a hill, in the fog. (And his name might be Murphy?)
- If the shoe fits, get another one just like it.
- The things that come to those who wait will be the things left by those who got there first.
- Give a man a fish and he will eat for a day. Teach a man to fish and he will sit in a boat all day drinking beer.
- Flashlight: A case for holding dead batteries.
- The shin bone is a device for finding furniture in the dark.
- A fine is a tax for doing wrong. A tax is a fine for doing well.
- When you go into court, you are putting yourself in the hands of 12 people who weren't smart enough to get out of jury duty.

You've heard of Murphy's Law? "If it can go wrong, it will." Ever hear of O'Brien's Law? "Murphy was an optimist!"

A blonde lady motorist was about two hours from San Diego when she was flagged down by a man whose truck had broken down.

The man walked up to the car and asked, "Are you going to San Diego?"

"Sure," answered the blonde, "do you need a lift?"

"Not for me. I'll be spending the next three hours fixing my truck. My problem is I've got two chimpanzees in the back which have to be taken to the San Diego Zoo. They're a bit stressed

already so I don't want to keep them on the road all day. Could you possibly take them to the zoo for me? I'll give you \$100 for your trouble."

"I'd be happy to," said the blonde.

So the two chimpanzees were ushered into the back seat of the blonde's car and carefully strapped into their seat belts, and off they went.

Five hours later, the truck driver was driving through the heart of San Diego when suddenly he was horrified! There was the blonde walking down the street, holding hands with the two chimps, much to the amusement of a big crowd.

With a screech of brakes he pulled off the road and ran over to the blonde. "What the world are you doing here?" he demanded, "I gave you \$100 to take these chimpanzees to the zoo."

"Yes, I know you did," said the blonde, "but we had money left over, so now we're going to Sea World."

[\(Back to Table of Contents\)](#)

Building Bridges –

Once upon a time, two brothers who lived on adjoining farms fell into conflict. It was the first serious rift in 40 years of farming side by side, sharing machinery and trading labour and goods as needed without a hitch. Then the long collaboration fell apart.

It began with a small misunderstanding and it grew into a major difference and finally, it exploded into an exchange of bitter words followed by weeks of silence. One morning, there was a knock on John's door. He opened it to find a man with a carpenter's toolbox.

"I'm looking for a few days work," he said. "Perhaps you have a few small jobs here and there I could help with?"

"Yes," said John. "I do have a job for you. Look across the creek at that farm. That's my neighbor. In fact, it's my younger brother. Last week there was a meadow between us. He recently took his bulldozer to the river levee and now there is a creek between us."

John continued, "Well, he may have done this to spite me, but I'll do one better. See that pile of lumber by the barn? I want you to build me a fence, an 8 foot fence, so I won't see his place or his face anymore."

The carpenter said, "I think I understand the situation. Show me the nails, and the post hole digger and I'll be able to do a job that pleases you."

John helped the carpenter get the materials ready and then he went off to town for the day. The carpenter worked hard all that day, measuring, sawing and nailing. About sunset when John returned, the carpenter had just finished his job.

John's eyes opened wide, his jaw dropped. There was no fence there at all. It was a bridge, a bridge that stretched from one side of the creek to the other. A fine piece of work, handrail and all. John looked across the bridge and saw his brother coming towards the bridge.

"You are quite the better fellow to build this bridge after all I've said and done," said the brother. The two brothers stood at each end of the bridge, then they met at the middle, taking each others' hand. They turned to see the carpenter hoist his toolbox onto his shoulder.

"No, wait! Stay a few days. I've got a lot of other projects for you," said John. The carpenter smiled and said, "I'd love to stay on, but I have many more bridges to build." – Anon.

[\(Back to Table of Contents\)](#)

The True Agenda of Evolutionists –

(Despite all the pretence of being "scientifically minded", evolution is basically an anti-God philosophy that seeks to usurp to itself the very nature of God. Through modern technology it pretends to be omniscient, omnipotent, and omnipresent. It presumes itself to be sovereign and claims to be transcendent. Its proponents would have us to believe that they are all-wise. It seeks the glory that belongs to God alone. It demands worship from its followers, and persecutes its critics. It has its high priests, its vestments, and its altars. It even offers sacrifices to its materialistic and Gaian ideologies, as millions of abortions testify.

Russell Grigg's article, excerpted below from creation.com, offers strong evidence of the true agenda of evolutionists. Stalin's cravings for world power were expressed in many ways, but Ivanov's attempts to violate God's law of genetics (that every creature MUST bear after its own kind) were doomed to failure.

Have you noticed that, though men who hate God do their best to acquire some of God's attributes (as above), they are totally disinterested in manifesting the attributes of the love of God, His mercy, or grace. Longsuffering and compassion are not in their vocabularies. Our dear Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, in Him alone, dwelleth the fullness of the Godhead bodily. No others need apply. – Ed.)

Stalin's ape-man Superwarriors

by Russell Grigg

Soviet dictator Joseph Stalin wanted to rebuild the Red Army, in the mid-1920s, with Planet-of-the-Apes-style troops by crossing humans with apes. This was according to a report in The Scotsman newspaper on 20 December 2005.

The report claimed that Stalin ordered Russia's top animal-breeding scientist, Ilya Ivanov, to use his skills to produce a super warrior. Stalin is said to have told Ivanov, 'I want a new invincible human being, insensitive to pain, resistant and indifferent about the quality of food they eat.' In 1926, the Politburo in Moscow passed this request to build a 'living war machine' on to the Academy of Sciences, who engaged Ivanov and sent him to West Africa with many thousands of dollars to conduct experiments in impregnating chimpanzees by artificial insemination. In the USSR, a centre was set up in Georgia, Stalin's birthplace, for the 'apes' to be raised.

Ivanov's experiments in Africa were a total failure. Further experiments in Georgia to use monkey sperm in human volunteers also failed. Ivanov was now in disgrace. For his expensive failure, he was sentenced to five years' jail, commuted to five years' exile in Kazakhstan, where he died in 1932, aged 61.

Some known facts

Ilya Ivanovich Ivanov was born in Russia in 1870. He graduated from the Kharkov University in 1896 and became a full professor in 1907. A veterinary researcher, he perfected artificial insemination and its first use for horse breeding.

In 1910, he gave a presentation at the World Congress of Zoologists in Graz, Austria, on the possibility of creating a human-ape hybrid. In 1924, he obtained permission from the Pasteur Institute in Paris to use its experimental primate station in Kindia, French Guinea, for such an experiment. He sought backing for this from the Soviet Government. Finally in 1925 he obtained US\$10,000 from the Academy of Sciences for his experiments in Africa.

Motives

Stalin undoubtedly knew of his world-famous compatriot's project. US\$10,000 would have been an enormous sum in those days, and it would have been hugely prudent for anyone to have obtained 'approval from the top' before allocating so much on such a bizarre experiment. Dictator Stalin, a passionate atheist, based upon his belief in evolution, was quite capable of envisaging the use of the technology, should it prove successful, to produce slave hybrid warriors. And, because of his evolutionary materialism, he would have had no moral compunctions.

Ivanov shared his master's belief in evolution. If evolution were true, humans and apes would be closely related. So the idea that they could interbreed would not have seemed outlandish. In Africa, Ivanov did not use his own sperm (or that of his son, who was with him), but that of local natives. No doubt he believed the widely held Darwinian racist view that Africans were closer to apes in their ancestry than he, a Caucasian, was. But was he also ashamed to think that any hybrid creature produced with his own sperm would be his 'child'?

From a biblical viewpoint, no such natural human-ape hybrid is possible. God made man in the image of God, not in the image of an ape. People have a spiritual dimension, involving our ability to worship God. God does not, and will not, share His likeness with an ape. Unlike our suggestion concerning Ivanov, God is not ashamed, but pleased, to be our Father and to call us His 'children'—when we put our faith and trust in the Lord Jesus Christ as our Saviour from sin.

Reader feedback: Stalin's ape-men experiment had anti-God motives

I appreciated 'Stalin's Ape-Man Super Warriors' because it offered more insight into something I read years ago about the same subject. At the time, I wondered if it was true, and looked for independent confirmation to no avail—until now. What I read years ago was a brief reference to Prof. Ivanov's African expedition in a book called *The Rabbit King of Russia*. This book was written by Mr R.G. Urch, correspondent for the London Times for Russia and the Baltic states in the 1920s and 1930s. The book was written around 1940, and has fictional dialogue, but follows the career of a very real man, who was a Soviet bureaucrat travelling about Russia to bring more food to the people through rabbit culture. Many of the book's incidents are footnoted by contemporary newspaper references. The details of the Ivanov expedition were the same in this book as in your article—taking place in 1925, financed by \$10,000 US dollars (I would really like to know who gave them the money), and working through the French research station. Mr Urch also footnoted the episode with two Leningrad newspaper articles dated 27 November and 5 December 1925.

Here are some interesting quotes from his book:

'The whole revolting idea is nothing more nor less than to prove that men and animals are one, that religion is wrong, that there is no God.'

'(She) had been indignant from the first about the Soviet Government's efforts to create a race of man-monkey or monkey-man to 'throw into the face of churchmen', as the Bolshevist leaders put it.'

'The task of the Ivanov expedition was simple. It was to go to the Congo and, if possible, induce the French Pasteur station working there under Professor Calmette to assist the Bolshevist scientists to catch a number of female chimpanzee apes. After this, Ivanov and his staff would endeavor to fertilize the apes by artificial methods and bring back the mothers with their little human apes to gladden the hearts of the anti-God Society in Soviet Russia and prove that "There is no God."

Mr Urch also says that the following year a circumstantial report was current in Moscow that the steamer bearing Ivanov's 'interesting female apes' had been lost with all hands in the Black Sea. The expedition seems to have been a failure that the Bolsheviks did not wish to acknowledge.

It's important to realize that this perversely unethical attempt to breed ape-human hybrids has already been tried at least once by the enemies of God, without success. This gives a fitting background to current efforts to make man and ape look genetically similar.

DAVID DEMICK - Nebraska, USA

(to read more go to: <http://creation.com/stalins-ape-man-superwarriors>)

[\(Back to Table of Contents\)](#)

Eddy-Torial -

On my desk I have a little Gideon's New Testament given to me by an ex-soldier. It was his British army Bible and was issued to him in March, 1958. He used it to read over his fallen comrades when they fell in battle. He left it to me in his will when he died, so I use it at times to preach out of.

I knew Brian for twenty five years before he died, and spoke to him many times about his soul. He refused again and again to enlist in the Lord's army. After his time as a British soldier he became a mercenary who sold himself to the highest bidder. One day he said to me, "I could never be a Christian because I believe in war." He was amazed when I replied, "I believe in war, too. The Lord will return one day to judge righteously and make war (Rev. 19:11)."

I've thought a lot about that conversation. Every disciple of Jesus Christ ought to believe in war. We anticipate the triumphant return of Christ when He will defeat all His foes at Armageddon. We who know Christ are at war this very moment. Our conflict with the hosts of darkness is never ending; it is the conflict of the ages. We must wrestle against principalities and powers as they war against our bodies and souls. We must cast down imaginations and every high thing that exalts itself against the knowledge of God. We must wear Emmanuel's armour and wield the Spirit's sword in mortal combat with spiritual wickedness in high places.

At least we ought to do these things. But we don't.

Have you noticed how quiet the battlefield has become? The clash of arms has fallen silent. The sound of marching feet and heavy artillery has been replaced by the sound of snoring saints. And the new style for armour looks awfully pyjama-ish, don't you think?

So how have we come to this apparent truce? Why the deathly hush at the front? Has the enemy given up the fight, realising it is a lost cause? Have we won the final victory and been mustered out of the King's army to go home to sit under own vine in peace? Have we conquered all the foes of God?

Not at all. It is a false peace. It's an ominous synthetic truce brought about by the incremental surrender of the Christian faith. Piece by piece we have negotiated away our armour. Little by little we have given ground to the Enemy and byte by byte we have swallowed the devious promises of the father of lies.

Our churches are under attack as never before, not a frontal attack by our Enemy, but a subtle flanking manoeuvre with an assault from the fifth column inside our churches. Church after church is being defeated by powerful new armaments, using weapons our forefathers never saw. Weapons like electric guitars, drum kits, amplifiers, synthesisers, and wielded by long haired, hard-faced youth playing carnal music to the glassy-eyed saints in the pews.

Once in a while I go looking for video clips of preachers that I hear are preaching heresy. I need to see for myself if it is true, and sadly, it often is. I recently watched Jack Schaap preach online and it grieved me with its brazen disdain for the Word of God. But what shocked me even more was the faces of the old men sitting on the platform behind Schaap. They leaned forward in their seats to catch every word, and listened ever so closely to the preaching of utter piffle! Old men, most likely ex-preachers, the elderly war horses of yesteryear, approvingly lending their support to heresy, with never a word of protest! Is it so they can still sit on the platform and are willing to pay for a ringside seat? Or is it that they are addicted to the lollies on their plates and fear losing them if they object to the lies they hear? Whatever their motivation, they need to re-enlist in the King's army, put on all the armour of faith and go to war against the Enemy, wherever we find him. Outside the church or inside!

Real Christians, and real preachers still believe in war!

Bro. Buddy Smith

[\(Back to Table of Contents\)](#)

Heads Up! is a weekly publication produced by Pastor Buddy Smith, Grace Baptist Church, Malanda, Qld., 4870, Australia.
To be included to receive copies please contact us by one of the following methods:
Post: P.O. Box 684, Malanda, Qld., 4885;
Phone: 07 4096 6657
Email: smiletex@bigpond.net.au