

2011 CAMPMEETINGS AND OTHER EVENTS, WITH A FAIRLY STRONG DOSE OF DOCTRINE

As it concerns the 2011 ~~_____~~, we only made it to the last night service. We saw enough in this service to make us regret that we had missed the preceding night services. When I left that night it was past 12:30 and I think the service was over, but I wouldn't guarantee it for we had already thought it was over one time and was wrong. Sister Peggy Powell claimed Sanctification in this service. Nevertheless one young man did volunteer to me that, the youth camp would have been better without "the rock and roll music". We did not solicit this information, however we will say this; Sound equipment should not be volumized (in the service) to a level any higher than that necessary for making the sound clearly distinguishable throughout the sanctuary. Those who have lost all desire to control such equipment may know that they are being infected by the spirit of "this present world".

Several of our North Ga. churches have banded together into a Holiness fellowship and they have a good number of young people. The heavy irony of the matter is that this fellowship is orienting itself toward liberalism, and forsaking the counsel of the elders. In spite of this the Lord is blessing this group of young people in a way such as we have hardly ever seen exceeded. Lets pray that these young folks (although they are doing good already) will yet seek out and choose the old paths of Holiness. Having such a spiritual group of young folks, it appears good to us that every scheduled service should be a youth service, seeing as this would open up an avenue through which the Holy Ghost may more freely move in the service. The night services of the Toccoa Campmeeting were pretty regular. It was reported that the day services were very good. In the night services Bro. Jamie Ellington preached good. The number in attendance in the night services was low and more so as the meeting wound down to a close. We now say this. Those who purposefully shunned the Toccoa meeting, the South Carolina camp meeting, or any other Holiness meeting most likely do not realize that they are manifesting raw carnality, the works of the flesh, envy, strife, and jealousy. This is carnality Corinthian style. These folks had better be glad for (and hopeful in) our New Doctrine which we call Sovereign Non-Imputability and for the not so new truth, which it embodies. Jealousy is very much in evidence among our people and it is a thing which (when it is there) can hardly be hid. Of course we cover it all up with a cloak of self-righteousness.

Recently we were invited to attend a church business meeting and so we did. Never have we witnessed a more pitiful attempt at holding a business session at church or anywhere else. These good folks came to this meeting with a squabble on their minds and brother they had a squabble. They provided us with one of the most lucid examples of Corinthian carnality that we could ever have asked for. The Pastor got up (after congregational prayer) and opened the floor for "discussion" without stating any rules of order or providing any guidelines or objectives for the intended discussion. A certain good sister then commenced the discussion and bedlam quickly descended, two or three trying to talk at the same time, trying to talk over one another, threatening to never set foot in the church again, and so on. One good person walked out. Some began saying "I knew it was going to be this way". I guess they did, they ordered it that way. The Pastors wife repetitively insisted that she felt she was being accused, whether she was or not, this did nothing to help matters but rather revealed a lack of desire for peaceful resolution. Before it was over the Pastor announced that he was resigning and most if not all of the congregants began pleading with him to reconsider. At one point a certain lay brother got up, walked to the front of the church and announced that he was the "overseer" of the said church, having been so appointed by the deed-holder of the said church who hardly never (if ever) darkens the door of said church. The calmest influence in the whole affair was a young Christian man who tried (through the voice of reason) to calm the assembly but with very small success. When it was all over most everyone laughed, shook hands, hugged necks and went their ways. This church is now without a Pastor, and although we have requested of them that they call the former Pastor back, it yet remains to be seen what they will do about that. The Pastor did reconsider but evidently was not able to work things out with the "overseer".

It would be good if all these folks would humble down and confess that they have carnality problems. Carnality is tearing up our churches, and we are getting ready to start pulling the cover off. Carnality keeps one from being able (or even wanting) to fly over the fleshly variances which will arise in church family life.

Now. The fact that our "outward man" is "reckoned" to be "dead to sin" does not negate the fore-gone fact that he (the outward man) is "sold under sin", see Rom.8:23. The irrefutable verification of this negative factor is the indisputable truth that he (the outward man) is yet receiving "the wages of sin" which consummate in natural death and bodily corruption, see Rom.6:23. Our "inward man" has (in the New Birth) been released from the sin curse and already taken on forfeitable eternal life.

We may later write up a long piece under the title, **STILL SINNER'S BY NATURE**, using the many volunteer Scriptures which prove that we are still (by nature) sinners, even after receiving, in our spirit, all the work of Gods grace that is available and/or accessible to us in this present life. One such Scripture is Jas.4:5. For those who assume that this Scripture is concerned only with the unsanctified we say thus. Even 1Thess.4:3 can (without wresting) be used to prove that we still carry the sin tendencies, after we enter the sanctified state. An in-depth study of this Scripture, (also Rom.6:12) should show us that sanctification is not, that the sin nature should be taken away, but rather that we should "abstain" from obedience to it. Only sanctifying grace can fully enable us to do this. Paul and Barnabas in Acts 14:15 give a good self-abasing statement for our Wesleyanistic Holiness preachers to look at very closely...If any shall accuse us of Keswickanism we then borrow words from the prophet Jeremiah; "It is false, I fall not away" to the Keswickans.

We are not teaching against second work sanctification. We will however, cut down any doctrine which attempts to teach to the effect that our "outward man" is now changed from his carnal nature which he inherited through his fall in Father Adam. The outward man (we say) is not changed, (until the resurrection) and therefore he must be mortified in a continuing work of grace called sanctification, which work has a definite beginning, and wherein the will of man and the will of God agree (not progressively, but instantaneously) to terms of complicity in the heart purification and thus the perfection of the individual.

Wesleyanism is (from our observations) unclear on these things... Over>>>

Many times we have heard stated to the effect that being saved changes a persons nature, or that we receive a new nature. This friends is an unthoughtout verdict. It would be more proper to say that we receive a new spirituality. Being saved and/or sanctified does not change our human nature, it only mortifies it. We have, it is true, been made "partakers of the divine nature" which thing does require a spiritual death of the human nature. Folks, we are not yet "as the angels" but we will be made so in "the resurrection of the just". We can almost hear some carnal snipe sniping. Bro.R. must think that everybody is carnal except himself. Okay. We now say this for the record both earthly and heavenly. I myself confess that I am (where the outward man is concerned) 100% carnal, just as a dead pine tree is still 100% a pine tree. (The outward man will not "put on" a spiritual nature until "the resurrection of the just" see 1Cor.15:44 & 54). That which is essentially spiritual, cannot die, see Rom.8:2.

The adoption (which will bring "the manifestation of the sons of God") is concerned with the formal reception of the "outward man" (otherwise called "the creature") into the kingdom, which takes place in "the resurrection of the just", and the conditions for it was met in the stripes which the Lord bore upon his back, for it (the adoption) entails the perfect and permanent healing of the said "outward man" which perfect healing itself entails the laying off of the mortal and corruptible nature acquired in the fall. The New Birth is the formal and celebratory reception of the "inward man" into the kingdom, which takes place at the time of repentance toward God, and faith in the resurrection of Christ, and the price for it was paid in the "water and blood" which flowed from the spear wound in the Lords side. We stated in a former article to the effect that our "outward man" is now only an unnaturalized subject of the kingdom of Heaven. In the resurrection however, he (through the adoption) will become the fully naturalized (or rather spiritualized) subject of the kingdom of God, blink again Wesleyanism.

It appears to us that Wesleyanism and most all other isms completely miss the very significant distinction between the terms "serving sin" and "serving the law of sin". Those who persist (through "the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life) in serving sin will perish as we all should know. On the other hand, when it comes to "the law of sin" we will here record a quotation from a former article. This statement probably failed to penetrate the thick Wesleyan helmet of dogmatism which some of you wear. Quote; "The law of sin and death was initially pronounced in Gen.3:14-19. If we rebel against serving the law of sin, the inevitable result is that we wind up serving sin, (example; a man who will not work and thereby provide for his own).

We ourselves feel that women cannot have a voice (and certainly not a vote) in church business meetings without a setting aside of the commandment of God. Its hard enough to keep emotions under control when brethren try to work things out among themselves, but when women are involved its even harder to do. It appears that we have walked after the example of the world by extending to our women rights which the Bible forbids, namely the previously mentioned voice (and vote) in our church business meetings. It is to our own dishonour that we allow and encourage our good sisters to speak out and vote in our business meetings, thus, presumptuously dispensing with 1 Cor.14:34 & 35. If the sisters are going to participate in any business meetings, it should be all women meetings and not those mixed with men. It also should have to do strictly with those matters which concern women, cooking for families of deceased, arranging for weddings and such like. In the meeting that we were in, there were two or three of the good sisters who stayed calm and only spoke when they were spoken to.

While traveling through Atlanta Ga. recently I saw a sign which read. "Has your religion apologized to women". We answer thus. The "pure religion" of the Bible, (which we endeavor to make our own through conformity to the priceless criterion worded to us in Jas. 1:27 and other Scriptures) has never in any way wronged women, although it does assign them to their proper place under the headship of the man. For this there will be no apology forthcoming from us, nor from the Scriptures.

Those of you who are sufficiently spiritual will feel no personal disturbance at these indictions of carnality. If you are upset by these things it is a good indicator that we are hitting close to where you are living. As far as it concerns indictions we are not imputing sin to anybody, see Rom.8:33. The sovereign right and responsibility of sin imputation belongs to God (we will have to deal with John 20:23 later) and we had all better be glad for the truth as it is stated in Rom.4:8. Only those who are deeply steeped in self-righteousness will see themselves as above the need of Gods sovereign non-imputative grace. If we see ourselves that way we are cloaked with a complex of self-righteousness.

Dear friends, there are none of us who (technically speaking) are living above sin. We may have been delivered from sins power, and we may have a pure heart, (we certainly trust that we have). Sin, in one of its non-Biblical definitions, is "missing the mark". We are all missing the mark set by our Lord Jesus in Mt. 5:48. If he had not set the mark above our reach then Salvation could not be wholly by grace and we might find an occasion of boasting when we land on the streets of glory. We here paraphrase 1Pet.4:18 1st clause 'And if the righteous only be saved by grace'. The straight milk feeding preacher will say, "sin is just sin". Well; Amen to that, nevertheless the word sin is used in the Scriptures in at least four or five different senses, and unless we rightly divide these varying senses we will never fathom the deeper mysteries of the gospel. Who wants to fathom the deeper mysteries of the gospel anyway? The angels certainly do, but they don't have that privilege.

The context in which the word sin is used in 1Jn.3:8,9 is relevant to those who have enmity in their hearts against God, or man, see also Rom.8:7, in other words; 'He that hath enmity in his heart against God is of the devil' or 'he who acteth out the enmity in his heart' this does not necessarily apply to a person who knows "to do good" and does it not. It also does not necessarily apply to a person who has respect of persons not realizing that they are doing it. Once an individual has been fully overcome by an "evil heart of unbelief" they are then in the condition described by John as being "of the devil" (whether they realize they are doing it or not) and are likely to be the cause of "many" being "defiled". Also everything they then do is imputed against their name as sin, even down to the "plowing of" their fields...Over>>>

We also paraphrase 1Jn.3:9 thus 'Whosoever is born of God hath not enmity in his heart against him, for his seed remained in him and he cannot have enmity in his heart against him because he is born of him'. Even thus it is with Jn.8:34. We paraphrase thus; 'He that hath enmity in his heart against God, is the servant of the enmity which he hath in his heart'. John no doubt had this saying of Jesus in mind when he penned 1Jn.3:8,9.

Any who think of themselves as being above all sin, should ask themselves this question. Am I absolutely perfect in every way? No! Okay; If I'm not absolutely perfect in every way then I've got to be "missing the mark" in some way. Now. Praise God for the blood which "cleanseth us from all sin" that is of course, sin in any and every sense in which the word is mentioned in the Scriptures. John himself uses the word sin in different senses in his 1st general epistle but he does not theologize (rightly divide) the matter for us, that is left for us to do, see preceding paragraph. We say also that those who object to our paraphrasing probably have a problem with the truth revealed therein and thereby.

James purposefully penned some of his counsel as though he knew nothing about non-imputative grace. He also wrote as though he knew little about justification by faith "without works", yet he uses the same quote that Paul does in his (Pauls) establishment of both of these truths, compare Jas.2:23 with Rom.4:3.

In order to bring the sin problem home we now say this. If we have boycotted one service due to self-righteous grudging, we technically have sinned. If we have withdrawn the right hand of fellowship from only one brother or sister in Christ just because they are sitting on the other side of the marketplace playground, we technically have sinned. If we have failed (upon reasonable opportunity) to establish fellowship with true kindred in Christ we technically have sinned.

Spiritual pride is certainly sin and many of us are *most manifestly* loaded with it. If we deny this indiction this only compounds the immensity of its sinfulness. Nevertheless, Rom.4:8 still applies to that individual in whose heart there exists saving faith in the precious "blood and water" atonement of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

Concerning the Scriptures purposeful use of the present tense in 1Jn.1:8 and other Scriptures dealing with sin, we are not ourselves going to deviate from the plain import of the Scriptures just to avoid being perceived as a Calvinist. Neither are we going to deviate from the plain import of the Scriptures out of a desire to win acceptance with our Wesleyanist rooted Holiness people, for neither the former or the latter appear to have ever set sin theology in its proper order.

We were in a service fairly recently where the Pastor preached with boldness and good anointing from Pr.1:24-33 dealing specifically with folks "setting at nought" of the truth, folks both past and present. After the altar service we ourself stood up and addressed the much needed subject of the wives subjection to their husbands. Almost as soon as we began to speak the Pastor began to show his vexation and before we had finished he was interrupting us with diversionary remarks. This type of treatment is what we have often experienced (both from this Pastor and others) as we have attempted to address unpopular and undesirable issues down through the years. It is very evident that this particular Pastor has a deep aversion to the Bible teaching of patriarchal rule in the home, which he cannot hide. Thus the brother made of himself a most apt demonstration of that which he had deplored in others. We wonder also how many homes have broken up due to the fact that the ladies have not heard this essential truth preached firmly and without apology. We waded into this dreadful issue by saying that we wonder how many of our good Holiness people who have young daughters who are engaged to be married, sit those young ladies down and tell them plainly, that their going to have to submit themselves to that man whenever they marry him if they want to please the Lord. This is the point where the Pastors vexation began to become visible.

One young married sister listened to us attentively and nodded her assent while we were speaking. She should be commended with the very highest form of commendation, for (((the virtue of wifely submission to the husband, is the most high and holy virtue a Christian woman can practice, see 1Pet.3:6...We say also that if the young sisters want their husbands to love them, then let them submit themselves to him "in everything". If sweet submission doesn't bring it out of him then he has a heart of stone and she made a drastic mistake by marrying him. Those who have made such mistakes are bound to live with them, for there is absolutely no justification for divorce))). We straitly command that this triple parenthesized statement be read or made available to all the young women and men (married or not). Those who refuse to obey this command (we say) will be accountable, not to us but to him who called us and also ordained that the woman should be subject to her husband "in everything" (sin excepted). We say also that to carnal christians the calling of God means little or nothing, especially if it is not crowned with the ordination of a man-made organization. Whiles, (under grace) this type of arrogance may not be dealt with as it was in the case of Moses and his contestants, at the very least such persons can expect to be dealt with according to 1Cor.3:15. We say also that to a man who truly has the burden of his family on his heart, there is nothing to hurt him worse than a wife who will not submit.

The brother preached strongly from Pr.1:24-33 about folks who despise the truth, but then revealed that he himself apparently despises the truth of total male headship in married life. This Pastor often affirms that we can please God. We fully agree, however this same Pastor plainly reveals that he does not acknowledge what it is that most pleases God, particularly in the matter of husbandly dominance "in everything". It ought to be commonly understood that a wife is not to obey her husband should he attempt to seduce (or to compel) her to commit sin... We now say this; We realize that there have been many men who went wrong, who would have done well to have listened to their wives pleadings, however we were not at this time speaking of men who went wrong, but rather of men who are trying to do right, though beset by rebellious wives. The Pastor did not take the time to try to understand what we were speaking of and we fairly well know that he did not want to understand... One young man (a close relative) who heard my remarks, told me later, that if you go strictly by the Bible, then I'm pretty well on track, but said he, most folks are not going to see it that way. He's pretty well on track, see also p.8 fifth paragraph... Over>>>

The Pastors intention was clear. He was desperately trying to kill the effect of what we were saying to his flock. Consider this; The matter of dominant male headship in the home is part of the sin curse upon the woman, even as is the agony of childbearing and therefore they naturally rebel against it. There is no use at all of us appealing to the Scriptures concerning this matter for the Scriptures have long since been "set at nought".

Thus the brother "set at nought" the Biblical doctrine of male dominance in the marriage relationship, and also obliterated his own message (and possibly every other message he ever preached on those lines) which he had just delivered. What will be the manner in which the Lord handles such things. No doubt it will be according to 1Cor.3:15. The brother stated that a saved woman would not resist her husband. Dream on.

This Pastor always opens the floor for testimony before closing the service, with the question, "has everybody obeyed the Lord". Well, we were obeying the written word of the Lord to "exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine" with our remarks this particular service. Some may say that this particular type of exhortation needs to be left to the Pastor. Friends, any Pastor should be standing ready to stamp his/her approval upon Scriptural truth, and how much more so when it is coming through another sincere ministerial vessel. The Lords Church has been given a five-fold ministry, not a one-fold ministry. Some others will probably think of us as if we are grudging against this Pastor. Here again we are simply obeying the word of the Lord as it is recorded in Lk.12:3. We may have to start referring to our ministry as the "housetops" ministry... This Pastor opposes us uncontrollably and we understand the underlying cause of his inability to restrain himself. We have been conflicted by other Pastors, from time to time but never (as we remember) while on the floor. This Pastor has done so several times.

We allowed ourself to become flustered and somewhat rashly stated, (touching female subjection in the home) that, it will "never work any other way". We should have said; it will never please God any other way. We realize that there are functional families where the wife is dominant, but this is blasphemous of the word of God. There's no way that this Pastor could truthfully say that he appreciates the wording of Gen.3:16 last clause with its emphasis on the word "rule".

If mother Eve had told the serpent, when tempted with the forbidden fruit, I must first consult my husband, we fully believe and know that father Adam would have said no, we cannot do this, for "Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression." Friend, I don't care how many good women you know who have low-grade husbands, this does nothing to negate the law of nature which says that the woman is "the weaker vessel" and they therefore have a natural need to be under subjection. We were in a service recently were the speaker related the facts of how fearfully he had charged the young men who had married his daughters concerning any mistreatment they might subject them to. He said nothing at all about having counseled his daughters as touching the subjection which is straitly commanded to wives by the Scriptures. However, we cannot say that this never happened, we do not know.

Nevertheless, having given some thought to the matter we have concluded thus. If we had been one of those young men who married one of this brothers daughters, (and having the mind that we now have) we would have called for a private consultation with the brother and would have spoken on a fashion such as this concerning the matter. Sir, if she will submit "in everything" as the Scripture doth command, then all will be well, but if, when all is said and done she ultimately refuses to do this, you can then expect her to be knocking on your front door for I will be giving her back to you. Some may here think to call upon Mal.2:16 which certainly has its rightful application. However, we say that even as the Lord God hateth "putting away" he also hates that evil spirit which will not allow a wife to submit to her husband.

Folks, you very apparently do not realize that, not only will you (by teaching your daughters submission) be bettering the lives of the young men who marry them, but you also will do a very great service to the young lady herself, potentially sparing her from much heartache in this present life and from loss of eternal reward in the life to come. Married couples with espoused daughters, if you find yourselves unable to do this, then you need never to stand up and say that you have no problem with pride.

It should never be undertaken by the parents of the groom, to counsel her, (the bride) concerning his role as the head of the house, this is much more effective (and appropriate) coming from her parents. Who is that rare parent who is willing to engage themselves in such depths of self-crucifixion?

We also say this. If we ever hear of any of you encouraging your daughters to rebel against their husbands, by telling them that they don't have to submit themselves to them, we will be subject to bring your names before the Church. If we ever hear of any of you Pastors allowing such things to occur under your watchcare, we will be subject to bring your names before the Church. We also say that, those of you who are truly tuned in to "the things of the Spirit" will be glad to have your "pure minds" stirred up as touching this matter. The Apostle Paul tells us that the wife should "reverence her husband". We could be somewhat surprised by the strength of the word here used, but this word "reverence" simply sums up the doctrine of the Apostle Peter when he stated that "Sarah obeyed Abraham, calling him Lord". We feel sure that Paul had this same humble example in mind when he used this word "reverence". It should be noted that Sarah was speaking to herself (not Abraham) when she called her husband Lord.

And now a word to you weak-kneed preachers who are missing the mark of the high calling of God, in that, you will not preach the Apostolic doctrine of male-headship in the home. There are no doubt, many brethren who are striving to do right, who are suffering adversity in the home, in part because the spineless ministry of the present day church will not preach the wives under subjection to their husbands. The woman needs to be nailed to the cross of subjection by the preaching of the gospel, but its not happening where we live and good men are having to allow their wives to follow their head-strong ways, or even worse, to live under female domination, which thing is blasphemous of the word of God. We fairly well know that many men have been regarded as tyrannical husbands simply because they refused to be dominated by their headstrong wives. In homes where deadlock occurs both the husband, the wife and the children suffer. The blame for this lays heavily on the Pastor if he is not preaching the doctrine of female submission... Over>>>

We truly hope that it will not be necessary for us to launch an all-out attack on the spineless ministry of our present day church as touching this matter. We have far grander and more glorious things in view. We also say again, that if we hear of any sniping or if we receive any negative feedback, we will then be subject (at our own discretion) to reveal the names of those who trouble us to the Church.

So-called charisma is the catalyst by which is determined the degree of reception, (especially by the carnal in spirit) to a mans ministry. Very spiritual indeed is that individual who judges a message and /or a ministry strictly by its standing in the light of a well balanced Scriptural analysis.

There have been many times that I have sat under preaching, (with sinners present) where it was strongly implied that folks must live lives of technical perfection in order that they might have a fairly good chance of making it in. As I have sat in such services and under such preaching I have wondered about the potential despair that might be created in the hearts of the lost (and the faltering Christians) as they look at the desperate failures in which they live and wonder how they could ever live a life of perfection. Preacher friends; most of you are actually preaching a doctrine of Salvation by works even while you declare from time to time that you are not. While it may well be true that such despair (created in the hearts of the lost, and the weak Christians) may be conducive to the formation of conditions favorable for true heartfelt repentance and saving faith, this still does not commend us to any misrepresentation of the gospel message. Many times the passage which says "if the righteous scarcely be saved" has been used almost to insinuate that even if we are found righteous we still might not make it. There are many Scriptures which will nullify such thinking. "Say unto the righteous that it shall be well with thee". In 1Pet.4:18^{1st} clause we might regard the word "saved" in the same sense it is used by the Lord in Mt.24:13. Looking at it thus we can then paraphrase it to say, 'if the righteous scarcely endure to the end'. Another paraphrase is, 'if the righteous are still only saved by grace'. The blood folks, the blood is what's going to do it, however heed the warning. **If or whenever we lay down our weapons and armour and cease from striving against sin, we then walk out from under the blood covering and fall from grace, see also 1st paragraph of p.8.**

I myself have heard all I want to about how that they will not endure sound doctrine. Who really expects them to endure sound doctrine, whenever the more immediate problem reveals itself in the fact that, neither will we endure sound doctrine. Added to that many of us are evidently lying to ourselves about it. Friends, we all need to reverently glorify God for his sovereign non-imputative grace, while simultaneously striving to perfect ourselves in every area of life in which we must contend. We will once again define Sovereign Non-Imputability... That element in the sovereign will of God, wherein he has elected not to impute sin to that individual who has saving faith in their heart. This friends, is "the sure mercies of David". David was an Old Testament patternization of the Lords elect even as was Paul in the New Testament, see 1Tim.1:16.

Jumpin to conclusions, (especially habitually) is a sure indicator of a mind laden with carnal corrosion. If we don't realize that there are folks like this who are still truly saved, then we don't really understand justification "by his grace" see Rom.3:24 & Tit.3:7. Nevertheless, a truly spiritual mind will hear the end of a matter before forming a conclusion, and hesitate even longer before pronouncing a judgment.

Dear friends, true wisdom will never direct us into the ways of self-justification. That which we do right needs no justification, and if, and when we justify ourselves in things which (being right) need no justification, we do thereby risk losing any eternal reward which we otherwise might hereafter receive, see 1Cor.3:13-15. Can we lose an eternal reward (for right deeds and actions) simply by reason of self-justification? I myself fear that we can... We are now (in one sense) somewhat out on a limb and therefore find it necessary to say thus; We ourselves take a more vehement stand against "ungodliness and worldly lust" than most any preacher we know, and our *lack of wisdom* in this respect is one of the reasons we are not invited into the pulpits of our churches.

Here we will give an example of a certain careless and thoughtless sin which is rampant among Holiness professing people. You hear folks say; I'm proud of my grandchildren, I guess you are proud of them boys, ect. ect. To these things we say. If pride is sin then its also sin to say, I'm proud, of anything. (If we don't believe in non-imputability, we must believe in something close to it). If we would only substitute the term, I'm thankful, for I'm proud, this would be a black to white improvement. It seems that many of our people are not interested in improvement. This also is carnality.

We laugh about grandparents spoiling their grandchildren, this despite all the horrible things the Bible says about spoiled children, which we seem not to believe. We sometimes laugh about the problems which young people have in their courting endeavors as well as other things which should never be laughed about.

All such laughing is sinful.

Another thing to be mentioned is the careless reference to children as "kids". If and whenever I refer to my children as "kids" (a common practice here in the south) I do therein make of myself a bolly goat and my wife a nanny. In Scripture the goat is used as a symbol of ultimate reprobation. Therefore, if and whenever I refer to my children as "kids" I symbolically reprobate myself and my family. Will Sovereign non-imputability cover such things as this. As long as saving faith remains in the heart it certainly will dear friends. Therefore a two-fold objective plan for the Lords ministry is this; to create and nurture saving faith in the hearts of the Lords flock, while progressively instructing them in the manners of right conduct and conversation, which form of (right conduct) instruction will hardly be tolerated in the church mindset which we ourselves are accustomed to dealing with.

We now say this. Every aspect in which the Scriptures define sin is yet subject to the divine sovereign prerogative of non-imputability versus imputability. David committed murder and adultery, as well as other sins, but it was not imputed to him, see 11Sam.12:13 last clause. This is not to infer that he escaped correction, for both he and his descendants had to suffer as a result of his sin. Where it concerns the different senses and contexts in which the word sin is used in Scripture, we need to examine the passage in Jas.1:15 as it compares to Jas.2:9. The sin mentioned in Jas.1:15 is premeditated (willful sin) while that in Jas.2:9 is not necessarily so, for "respect to persons" is not necessarily a "lust" sin... Over>>>

We do not mean to pet this sin (respect to persons) but we certainly hope that the Master has a special provision in his sovereign grace or else most of you who read these words are not going to make it, for you will almost certainly never confess that you commit this sin, unless perchance you cover it in a 'Lord if I have done anything' styled confession.

When the Lord said to Moses that he would blot out the names of those who sin against him, this sentence (we say, on the authority of other Scriptures) does not take effect unless sin is imputed. We assure our readership on the authority of other Scripture, that even Moses himself did sin, but we also assure you that his sin was not imputed and HIS NAME WAS NOT BLOTTED OUT. This was Sovereign non-imputability. We say also that if sin had been imputed unto him, the rock, (Christ) would not have given forth water. Likewise, if sin had been imputed at the breaking of the tables, Moses we say could have had no power or divine assistance in the elimination of the corrupted faction of the people. We will have to deal with the case of Samson later. As it concerns the breaking of the tables, the Lord (as far as we can see in the record) did not even mention it. The only hint of divine disapproval seems to be implicit in the fact that Moses was required to hew out the second set of tables, whereas it appears that the Lord himself had made the first set.

As it concerns that monster called the internet our preachers have become like unto dumb dogs that cannot bark. They have fallen trembling before the giant, (either in fear of losing their people, or in adoration of its wonders) and non-imputative grace is the only hope. Nevertheless, we say thus to these household-heads; if your wives and daughters wind up on the streets and in the gutters of this ungodly world, you know at whom to point the finger of blame.

On an entirely different note we now identify yet other sins. Many of our people evidently do not realize, that answering with Lord yes, or Lord no, is closely akin to swearing. The Bible says, "let your yea be yea, and your nay, nay, for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil". Also the term "honest to God" is a form of swearing, which entails a setting aside of the commandment of God. We sent a piece to the Faith &

Truth a while back, which dealt with right and wrong conversation but it was not printed.

We have heard preachers (in their Wesleyanistic fervour) insist that such Scriptures as Gal.5:17 are relevant only to the unsanctified, as though a sanctified person would find their flesh totally benign to divine service. Therefore likening "the flesh" to a cancer we say this, he may be in remission, but he (in his nature) is not benign. Paul makes it clear in Rom.1:9 also Rom.7:22-25 that the inward man serves God after that the flesh has been slain. However, the initial killing of "the flesh" (otherwise called the Adamic nature) does not change his nature, this we will discover if ever he is allowed to either wholly or partially resurrect, he comes back to life exactly the same as he was before. Paul also lets us know in 1Cor.15:31 that the battle with "the flesh" is not over when we have received sanctification as an initial experience. The clear implication of 1Jn.5:4 with its use of the unusual word "whatsoever" is that our inward man is that which is now born of God, and it is therefore the inward man that "overcomes" the world, after that our outward man has (symbolically) been nailed to our cross. Jn.3:6 also deals with this truth. When the Scripture says that "ye have put off the old man with his deeds" this means simply that we have put off the dominion of the old man, study deeply Rom.6:14. The spiritual death of the Adamic nature, will only be rendered fully irreversible by the advent of the literal physical death of the outward man. The complete deliverance from the Adamic nature in its every aspect will be attained only in "the resurrection of the just". The doctrine of original sin is based upon the law of cause and effect. If any of us, had experienced the cause exactly as did Adam and Eve, we would also have experienced the effect exactly as they did. Any exemplary individual may get saved, sanctified and baptized with the Holy Ghost, but that individual does not take on spiritual maturity (to the fullest) just by receiving these great blessings. This type of spiritual maturity only comes through much prayer and study of the Scripture, also by the experience gained through trials and tests, and its ultimate manifestation is the ability to digest the strong meat of the word, sovereign election, sovereign predestination, sovereign implementation, sovereign non-imputability, sovereign dispensability, sovereign causability and any other sovereign abilities which may be identified as theological dimensions of that which is commonly called sovereign grace. While we may hesitate to brand as carnal those 2 or 3 year Christians who lack such maturity, we will not hesitate to brand as carnal those 20 and 30 year Christians who do.

Rom.8:21 shows us plainly that the deliverance which Paul sought in Rom.7:24 was not second work sanctification, but rather "the redemption of our body" in "the resurrection of the just". The 1st clause of

Rom.7:23 could be paraphrased thus; But I see another law in my outward man. Rom.8:21 could be paraphrased; Because the outward man himself also shall be delivered. Paul is dealing exclusively with the outward man in Rom.7:23 1st clause and he is also dealing exclusively with the outward man in Rom.8:21.

It is needful that we understand that the sufferings of this present life, which culminate and expire in the advent of natural death, (see also our seventh paragraph of p.1) are the full measure of punishment for original sin. (This factor it is that gives us grounds for the firm establishment of the doctrine, that those who die underaged, having never received a call to repentance are automatically covered by saving grace, for they have reaped the full wages of original inherent sin). This cup our Lord Jesus drank to completion as he suffered the common hardships of life and he wrung out the bitter dregs as he went through the garden, the judgment hall and ultimately on the old rugged cross. Only by their final rejection of the (revealed) grace which was made accessible to all by reason of his immeasurable sufferings do folks incur eternal damnation of the soul. A sin comparable to this was evidently committed by the devil and his angels in their rebellion against the Master. We say again; only by their ultimate rejection of the sacrifice of Calvary are folks (under the Sovereign hand of God) made "vessels of wrath" morally fitted to eternal soul destruction. Some may say, but what about the rich man of Lk.16. We have another piece titled PREDESTINATION, WAS IT COOKED UP BY CALVIN, OR WAS IT REVEALED TO HIS HOLY APOSTLES AND PROPHETS BY THE SPIRIT? In this piece we answer this problem...Over>>>

We say that the earthly mission of Christ (in a nutshell) was the crucifixion of Adam. (Adam sinned, Adam must die). This he accomplished in life and ultimately in death. He hung Adam on the cross, spiritually throughout the course of his life, and physically on the cross of Calvary. Those who insist that Christ did not carry the Adamic nature in his physical body do not realize that they are "missing the mark". Most, if not all places in Scripture where "the flesh" is mentioned, is (in a veiled sense) speaking of the Adamic nature, see SARX in the Strong's Concordance Greek dictionary. Thus 1Jn.4:3 could be paraphrased thus, Every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come with the Adamic nature is not of God. John did not say *come in a flesh*. Also, we are not saying that Christ sinned, see our 1st para. of p.8.

Recently we were in a service where some were speaking about how that God is getting ready to mightily use the Church in these last days. We don't want to contradict this thinking in any form or fashion, but we couldn't help but to reflect on how that in the same service we stood up and called on those who were able, to skip at least one meal per week on behalf of a certain lost heart who most of them know is nearing eternity. Some of them looked at me as if I was some poor goof who just didn't know any better. Friends, there's going to have to be a change in our collective mindset, if we are ever to be used of God in the demonstrative gifts and power of the Spirit in these last days.

Our people are being fed a heavy diet of milk with very little meat. I have at different times heard scornful insinuations directed toward those ministers who go over the peoples heads. This we say, (preaching above folks perception level) should not be deliberately done (the Lord knows whenever there is vainglory involved), but friends, how are we ever going to pull the saints up higher if we never get over their heads. The preacher himself will wind up back on the bottle if he hardens in his self justificational case for milk-feeding. We hear preachers gloat in the dispensing and ingestion of the milk of the word, while directing very thinly veiled stigma toward any who would attempt to deliver meat to those who are spiritually enemic for the lack of it.

We continually have to reassess the fact that we are not dealing with spiritual but rather with carnal Christians. We know that we are trying to give spiritual meat to spiritual babes. If you resent such indictment this is a sure indicator that you are among the carnal in spirit. We here again disclaim responsibility for any who incur injury by seizing upon certain vulnerable statements which we have made as though they are (individually) a summation of all that we have said as touching any particular subject. We have had enough experience with the carnally minded to where we very well understand the working of the Corinthian mind with its system of habitual filtration and selective acknowledgmental blockading. We disclaim any responsibility for those who potentially may (by reason of our assertions) try to exploit non-imputative grace. Our reason for so strongly emphasizing non-imputability and its essential role in personal Salvation is to destroy the complex of self-righteousness which many of you carry, which thing potentially may lighten the weight of eternal glory which rests upon you in the heavenly kingdom. We here want to issue the strongest possible warning to those who might be presumptuously inclined toward the Lords sovereign non-imputative grace. For persons who should attempt to experiment with Rom.4:8 we say that this appears to fulfill the conditions for the "eternal judgment" pronounced in Heb.10:26.

We have heard preachers say in regards to Rom.8:35 1st clause, "sin will separate you". To this we say, they know not what they say. Paul says plainly in Rom.5:8 that "while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us". This proves undeniably that the Love of God (and Christ) prevailed over our sin/sins. Heb.10:26 is a different context on sin and has its proper place in the divine counsel, see our preceding paragraph. We say therefore that sin cannot separate Gods elect from Gods Love, and sin cannot separate the fully committed individual from Gods Grace as Rom.4:8 plainly implies. We say also that the fully committed individual will not and cannot sin willfully. We fear that most Holiness preachers would expunge Rom.4:8 from the Scripture record, if they could remain anonymous while doing so, and if their going to interpret it as did one Holiness preacher, "that's talking about a person who doesn't do anything" they have already expunged it as far as it concerns any edificational value it might have offered. While we do not teach that initial justification clears us of sins which we might commit forward of the time we receive it, yet we will teach that final Salvation (which the Lord has in view at the time of initial justification), is (in the case of

Gods elect) Salvation from sins, past, present, and future. The non-elect also may receive initial justification, but in their case there is no final Salvation in view. The adoption is the climactic end point of the New Birth, that is, in Gods elect. Only the elect are predestinated "unto the adoption of children".

Any attempt to escape or to forbear the sufferings and hardships of this present life, could be imputed as sin, even in the righteous, (and so many of the O.T. saints refused to accept any earthly "deliverance that they might obtain a better resurrection") for all such suffering is intrinsic to the sin curse (otherwise called "the law of sin and death") and is the just and righteous retribution for original sin. Neither initial Salvation nor any other work of grace delivers our outward man from the bondage of the sin curse, (otherwise called the law of sin and death). The exceptionality revealed in the case of Enoch and also to be revealed in the case of all them who "are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord" as it concerns an apparent escape (or bypass) of physical death, must be understood in the light of the fact that the Adamic man will certainly die a final spiritual death in the event of translation, even as "death is swallowed up in victory" and "mortality is swallowed up of life". These two quotations make it very clear that the change will be wrought in and upon this present corruptible and mortal body, rather than the bringing into existence of another hitherto non-existent body.

Negative truth has its proper place in the divine counsel just as does positive truth, and the positive is grounded in the negative. Without a proper treatment of negative truth we will never assimilate the "strong meat" of the word. The "word of exhortation" must be suffered. This also is a suffering that we will hardly endure. When and if we rebel against suffering "the word of exhortation" this is much more sinful than rebelling against the afore mentioned sufferings...Over>>>

There are many angles from which we may "survey" this great plan of Salvation, see Eph.3:18, but one thing is for sure. God did not send his Son into the world to suffer immeasurably and die excruciatingly (thereby receiving in himself the full and complete wages of original sin, of which sin he was never a partaker), so that we (the original sinners, *reference back to the last paragraph of p.one*) might enjoy the pleasures of sin, and yet have the benefits of grace in this present life and a home in heaven hereafter. We are all to a certain degree guilty in the sin of Adam and Eve, (reference back to p.6 para.5, last three lines) but we are covered by non-imputability until such time as we reach accountability. Now this. Many times we have heard it remarked that this plan of Salvation is so simple that a child can understand it. It is true dear friends, that the conditions of Soul Salvation, repentance and faith, a child can understand, but the deepest mysteries of grace will never be fully fathomed by even the most mature saints, let alone little children. It seems that its being implied that we all should be satisfied to remain on the level of children.

1Cor.14:20 sets this matter in order for us.

We will here seek to clarify (in few words) the doctrine of original sin. Therefore we say that, even as Levi paid tithes to Melchizedec, while "yet in the loins of his father" Abraham, even so, we all rendered obedience to Satan while yet in our father Adam. And so, as the law of tithe paying was (in one sense) ordained by Levi's payment of tithes in Abraham, even so, the law of original sin is (in one sense) established by our obedience to Satan while still in father Adam.

Those who cannot acknowledge that we are still fallen creatures even after Salvation and Sanctification, are in a state of carnal denial. Restoration to spotless innocency comes to "the inward man" by the New Birth, exaltation to full incorruptibility comes to "the inward man" at death, and to "the outward man", (the creature) at "the resurrection of the just"... We say also, that the term *serving sin* is not necessarily fulfilled by so-called sins of omission, but rather by sins of commission. Continued sins of omission will lead one out onto an infirm foundation of personal commitment, which can result in a fall from grace.

We would expect there is a high level possibility that the carnal will now (as a result of being touched in this write-up) really let their carnality shine out. We therefore say this, as meekly as we can. Nobody, likes to be challenged concerning their words or conduct. It is absolutely necessary that we sometimes be jolted for this brings on a so-called reality check and can have much spiritual value for the one being challenged. myself have had a good many reality checks, but I also have a priceless testimony to the effect that as far as my memory serves me I have never grugged against a reproof.

Believe this or not dear friends, we were recently in a service where a certain sister, expressed the concept that male headship of the home was a thing that belonged to the old testament dispensation. We corrected her "in the spirit of meekness". Even then she still insisted that its not hardly done that way any more, she's certainly right about that. Nevertheless, we are not going to be overly critical of her as touching the matter but we will be very critical of a ministry which allows or even encourages such ill-begotten conceptions. We can thankfully report that Bro. Ryan and Sister Peggy Powell are doing well in the Lord. We can only hope that lessons were learned (by all of us) and much wisdom laid up in store against the time to come.

Corinthian carnality manifests itself in one form as a lack of respect for the spiritual authority that is conferred by the gifts and callings of God, see 11Cor.13:3 that is, especially if they (the gifts and callings) are not lubricated with a natural gift of so-called charisma in the speaker, see 11Cor.10:10. You may also request our piece titled; **RIGHTLY DIVIDING BETWEEN SPIRITUAL AND ECCLESIASTICAL AUTHORITY.**

Any negative kickback which we may receive (including any from the pulpit) will be subject to our use in future write-ups. As it may concern carnal sniping behind our back, "the avenger of blood" will take care of that if ever they (who snipe) are found without the gates of "the city of refuge". The city of refuge (New Testament) could also be (figuratively) called the city of non-imputative grace.

R. Corn 2011

P. S. We saw (during our stay at Antioch P.F.B.H. church) a spider rise up out of obscurity and then fade out. The spider rose up the second time, coming up higher and faded out again. The spider rose up the third time coming up into full view and began crawling forward. As we observed this spider from a side view position, the eye of our mind focused first of all upon one of the joints of one of the arms, which to us appeared as if it were through a magnifier, we could see it in such amazingly fine detail... Our attention was then attracted to another feature, a certain textured appearance upon the body and the arms of the spider, and touching which we instantly felt a very strong curiosity, I had to know (but could not discern) what this was. I was then moved to a position directly above the spider and looked straight down on its back and I saw what it was that gave it this textured appearance. The spider was written across its body and its arms with Scripture, this was not just any writing but was the written word just as it appears on the pages of the Bible. Having seen and perceived this, we were then moved back to our former position viewing the spider from the side as it continued crawling along for a few more steps and then drew its hands up under its body in death.

If it be that "ye seek a proof" then this dream (and the setting in which it was received) is one of the factors which should furnish it, seeing as the written word was very meaningfully involved, although it would help if we had an interpretation as to the relevance of the spider to the said written word. When however, we are dealing with closed eyes and stopped ears, nothing we can say will avail. While this dream could be regarded as infallible proof of divine ordination upon our calling, we are not claiming infallibility where it concerns matters of faith and doctrine. We received our calling (somewhere around 12 noon, 1-8-80) which calling came with gracious visual appearance of the living word, which living word (figuratively speaking) is the gold foundation underneath the priceless ink and paper currency of the written word. The written word (spider) vision came approx. six months later. The dream interpretation is completely hidden to us. Apocalyptic visions (those showing in symbolic imagery, the rise and/or fall of governmental structures or entities of any kind) seem never to be interpreted other than by events which bring to pass their fulfillment.