

#### More on Organization#4

Former president Ronald Reagan philosophized concerning our national difficulties which plagued his time, that, "government is not the solution to the problem, government is the problem". While we ourselves do not altogether know about the strategy of Mr. Reagan concerning the problems of our nation at that time, we do know about the problems of the P. F. B. H. church, and we are firmly convinced that, the organization is not the solution to the problem, the organization is the problem. We say that, control of the organization, is the catalyst in the development of all the strife which has shaken this movement down through time.

It is certainly true (as we have heard from time to time) that God is a God of order and organization. He absolutely has his work organized. The problem arises whenever man tries to organize the Lords work. We say without flinching, that there will be no eternal reward to be gained by fighting to hold together a man-made organization just for the sake of preserving the organizational name, especially when some of the doctrinal principles are not supported by a rightly divided application of the Scriptures, (check out our piece on the unsound doctrine of Sabbath change). I do not deny that the Lord will reward us for standing either individually or collectively for the true principles of Holiness. When we fight to preserve an organizational name, this is not the Lords battle, this is our battle. It appears that most of the conference members regard the organization as nothing less than the oracle of God.

We will now "use great plainness of speech". As long as this organization continues to kill our writing ministry, we will (by our writing ministry) continue to kill this organization. What we ask, will be the style and manner of our efforts to kill this organization? Chiefly by convincing the people that there will be no eternal rewards for labours exerted toward the creation and preservation of organizational structures, (such structures of which provide fertile grounds for factionalization and superiority illusionism) but rather much loss to be incurred. It seems (as we stated in a former work) that we are labouring under the impression that our Lord Jesus Christ cannot effectively maintain his work and move it forward without the use of our schismatic organizational structures. As it concerns such fallacy as this, we need to commit ourselves to an intensive study of Mat. 16:18 in its relation to Acts 2:47. (Mt. 16:18 is in the theological nature of prophecy and Acts 2:47 is in the theological nature of implementation of the same prophecy). Whenever folks fail to acknowledge the absolute sovereignty of God it inevitably follows that they will surely fail to erect the mighty theological bulwarks which can be constructed upon these Scriptures.

Some may have observed how that we dwell much on eternal rewards, however let none think that we have ourselves marked out for any special rewards, for we were "delivered unto Satan" which thing under the Sovereign providence of God produced our conversion, and which thing, (for all we know) could disqualify us for the reception of any eternal reward. Everything dear friends, is going to affect our eternal reward.

Awhile back the Faith&Truth editorial board shot down five of our pieces at one time, as well as other pieces at other times. Common sense tells us that these rejections were the fruits of some form of carnality, whether jealousy or some other. One of these pieces was titled "THE LORDS WELCOMING COMMITTEE". Those who voted against this piece would seem to be at enmity toward the Lord and his Church. We do have a small gift which seems to stir up a fairly great degree of jealousy. We say also that those who are truly athirst for the truth will accept the truth.

R. Corn

P. S. The former resolution against the printing of controversial materials in the Faith & Truth paper was a blatant signal of disrespect toward the gospel ministry and therefore toward him who ordained the gospel ministry. If this organization was doctrinally infallible and/or inerrant we would then have a corresponding measure of censorship authority. We are not however doctrinally infallible and/or inerrant and by reason of our presumptuous authority of censorship we are lying much closer to the bed of the harlot than we would care to admit.