

“NEO-CONSERVATIVES”

Jesus warned the multitude to beware of wolves who come in sheep’s clothing (Matthew 7:15). A wolf in sheep’s clothing is attempting to persuade his potential prey that he is something he is not. If he is identified falsely, it enhances his chances of devouring a pursued after meal. He is more dangerous than an undisguised wolf, because he appears to be one of the sheep. However, when his costume is stripped away, he is still a dangerous wolf.

In the church today, some brethren are claiming to be conservative, but it is a disguise. Their cover is the claim that, “I do not personally believe the New Testament authorizes instrumental music in the song service, therefore, I do not use it, but I can’t say to use it is a sin.” Such a claim exposes this “neo-conservative” for what he really is; an old liberal wolf wrapped up in sheep’s clothing. He decides not to make an issue out of instrumental music, does not oppose it, nor yet determines that instrumental musical accompaniment in the song service is a fellowship issue. Such a person is neither conservative nor sound in doctrine. Consider two passages.

A sound Christian recognizes that one doing something that is not authorized by the New Testament is doing something that is not being done in the name of Christ (Colossians 3:17). That, despite the “neo-conservative’s” contention to the contrary, constitutes a fault. If it doesn’t, why believe there is no authority for instrumental music in the first place? If he does not confess it is a fault, he has denied his own position.

The brother who sees someone overtaken in a fault is obligated to restore him (Galatians 6:1-2). A fault is a deviation from the truth, and carries the idea in this passage of being taken by surprise or without warning; one who is fooled by a wolf in sheep’s clothing! The brother who knows there is no authority for instrumental music, but fails to stand against it has loosed the command of Galatians 6:1-2), and thereby exposes himself as a liberal , not a “new” or any other kind of conservative. He is just as much a wolf in sheep’s clothing as the one who tripped up the brother who was overtaken in a fault in the first place.

Charles Pogue
Rogers, AR

(Editorial comment: The writer referenced just the matter of instrumental music. However, the same scenario could be equally applied on other issues also – including marriage and divorce and remarriage, reevaluation/reaffirmation of elders, the use of organizations not under the oversight of to do the work of the church [quasi missionary societies] – K.J. C.).



BELVEDERE BEACON
Ye are the light of the world” (Matthew 5:14)
Volume 10 Number 45 November 8, 2009
A PUBLICATION OF THE BELVEDERE CHURCH OF CHRIST
535 Clearwater Road, Belvedere, SC 29841-2574
(Greater Augusta, GA area)
SCHEDULE OF SERVICES
SUNDAY: WEDNESDAY:
Bible Classes for all ages 10.00 am. Bible Classes for all ages 7.00 p.m.
Morning Worship 11.00 am.
Evening Worship 6.00 p.m.
EVANGELIST: Ken Chumbley - Tel. No. (803) 279-8663
www.belvederechurchofchrist.org E-mail church@belvederechurchofchrist.org

A “PERSONAL” RELATIONSHIP WITH CHRIST

Peter declared: “If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God;...” (I Peter 4:11). Paul instructed Timothy to “Hold fast the form of sound words,” (II Timothy 1: 13). He also told Titus to “...speak thou the things which become sound doctrine” (Titus 2:3). Is it possible to have a “personal” relationship with Jesus? Is the terminology in our title in harmony with the previously scriptures?

If the phrase serving as our title means anything more than assenting to true propositions concerning Jesus, just what more does it mean? We certainly do not find such terminology in the scriptures. In fact, “A ‘Personal’ Relationship With Christ” is a meaningless phrase. it means anything to anybody. Therefore, its meaning is subjective, i.e. “better felt than told.” This lack of objectivity belies the root and source of the phrase under consideration.

Such terminology derives from the so-called “heartfelt religion” that makes an erroneous difference between “the heart” (emotions) and “the head” (the intellect and rational nature of man). This false concept declares that one must not only believe the gospel with one’s “head,” but also with one’s “heart.” The truth of the matter is found in the inspired statement: “For as he thinketh in his heart, so is he” (Proverbs 23:7). The heart is the head and vice versa. This separation of heart and head is from the deluded imagination of modern secular psychologists, charismatics, and modern theologians has no foundation in the Bible.

What the modern preacher means by a “Personal’ Relationship with Christ” is some sort of “warm feeling.” (Never mind that a cup of hot tea could accomplish the same feeling.) These preachers routinely promote something beyond biblical faith (Romans 10:17; II Corinthians 5:7; Colossians 3:17). Thus, the terminology of our title is not the wholesome teaching authorized in the verses of our first paragraph.

Continued on page 3

A Rendezvous with Death

Pilate's contemptuous question, "Shall I crucify your king?" aroused the senseless fury of the raging mob which sought the Saviour's death to its highest pitch and in a mighty chorus of hate sealed its doom by affirming its loyalty to Caesar and its rejection of Jesus and thus appointed for themselves a rendezvous with death nationally, spiritually and eventually, physically!

Here again, as is so often seen in the affairs of men, is a striking example of people being led, through their own folly, into the repudiation of that which they formerly held most dear. Their most cherished dream and that in which they gloried most had been the messianic expectation which involved the coming of a Deliverer out of Jacob who would liberate them from the yoke of Roman bondage and restore to them their freedom and sovereignty among the nations, and now publicly to proclaim their allegiance to the Roman emperor Caesar and their denial of the messianic hope—both of which allegations were sheer hypocrisy—evidence how far these desperate people went in their effort to destroy Jesus—the real Messiah.

There was far more truth in their wild and reckless affirmations than they intended; they did indeed by this denial of Jesus shut themselves off from His kingdom; by asserting loyalty to Caesar and by renouncing its rightful King the Jewish system committed suicide on that fateful morning in Jerusalem. The Lord earlier warned the Jews of their eventual destruction by Caesar (Luke 19:41-44; 23:27-31), the fulfillment of which, minutely detailed by Jesus, reached its climax in the terrible siege and eventual fall of Jerusalem and the consequent end of the Jewish civil and religious state.

The malignancy and spiteful hate in their deliberate and calculated efforts to destroy the Saviour are without parallel in human history, and the retribution they suffered in consequence has seldom been equaled. All who had a hand in that historic miscarriage of justice have suffered the retribution usually reserved for the most wicked of earth. The infamous Judas died in shame, a suicide. Pilate, whose political fortunes he valued far more than simple justice stood helplessly by and watched his prestige fail, ultimately dying in banishment and in disgrace. Caiaphas was expelled from the high priesthood, Herod perished in shame and in exile, the house of Annas suffered destruction at the hands of a mob, and his son was dragged through the streets of the city. The siege of Jerusalem, with its unspeakable horrors, became the tragic lot of the race as tens of thousands of her people suffered and died, the direct descendants of those who had derisively shouted, "Let his blood be upon us and our children." If ever a rebellious people deserved its fate, they did; and yet, the blood they shed, in the limitless and unfathomable depths of God's great love and wonderful mercy, was poured out even for them and among the last words their innocent victim uttered was a plea for mercy in their behalf. Love at last had conquered and the Lord had achieved His purpose in coming into the world.

Guy N. Woods, Deceased
Ken Chumbley

NEWS AND NOTES

Keep in your prayers the following: Helen Culpepper, Pam Gossett, Lavonne McClish, Linda Chumbley, Maomi Aaron's sister, Leann Rogers, who is having health problems, Myrtle Grimsley, and Lanny Niver together with his daughter and son, and Tim Smith.

Ron Wilson's mother is doing well after her surgery and he is returning home. Steven Wilson has had strep throat.

Myrtle Grimsley continues to recuperate at her daughter's.

Les Culpepper had outpatient surgery on Thursday and is recovering well.

The next fellowship meal will be Saturday, November 21 Les Culpepper will be fixing Catfish nuggets and hush puppies. Those who want to fix additional things are invited to do so. We plan to start about 3.00 p.m.

A "PERSONAL" RELATIONSHIP WITH CHRIST continued from page 1

In looking around our secular and religious world as well as the Lord's church we notice all manner of "charismatic" and "modernist" churches. What do they have in common? In one way or another they reject the rational nature of man. Thus, they teach doctrines that really are nothing more than mindless confrontations and emotional experiences that have nothing to do with faith that comes by hearing the word of God (Romans 10:17; II Corinthians 5:7; Hebrews 11:6).

In looking around our secular and religious world as well as the Lord's church we notice all manner of "charismatic" and "modernist" churches. What do they have in common? In one way or another they reject the rational nature of man. Thus, they teach doctrines that really are nothing more than mindless confrontations and emotional experiences that have nothing to do with faith that comes by hearing the word of God (Romans 10:17; II Corinthians 5:7; Hebrews 11:6).

Therefore, he believed and obeyed the truth that Christ taught. Judas did not believe (have faith) in Christ and, therefore, he did not believe the truth Jesus taught. Hence, he was disobedient to the Lord (John 8:31, 32; II John 9). Regardless of whether one has a personal relationship with Christ, as the apostles had, or came to know him through the evidence contained in the four books of the one gospel of Christ; in either case, one must have faith or confidence in the words of Jesus (the doctrine or gospel of Christ) to the point of obeying his will before one can be saved by the Savior (Matthew 7:21; Luke 6:46; John 14:15).

Since Jesus went back to heaven no human on this earth has had a personal relationship with our Lord. However, this does not rule out the adequate evidence that proves the deity of Christ, that he is man's only Savior, and that he saves man through belief and obedience to his gospel (John 20:30,31; Mark 16:15, 16; Romans 1:16; Acts 2:38,41,42,47). Moreover, when men had a personal relationship with Jesus, such a relationship was not sufficient in and of itself alone to save them. Before men could be saved by Christ they had to believe and obey his will even though they knew him personally.

David P. Brown
Spring, TX