

1955

A Review of Thomas B. Warren's Tract on "Cooperation Between New Testament Churches"

Cecil B. Douthitt

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.acu.edu/crs_books

 Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#), [Christian Denominations and Sects Commons](#), [Christianity Commons](#), and the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Douthitt, Cecil B., "A Review of Thomas B. Warren's Tract on "Cooperation Between New Testament Churches"" (1955). *Stone-Campbell Books*. 278.

http://digitalcommons.acu.edu/crs_books/278

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the Stone-Campbell Resources at Digital Commons @ ACU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Stone-Campbell Books by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ ACU. For more information, please contact dc@acu.edu.

A REVIEW OF THOMAS B. WARREN'S TRACT

on

**"Cooperation Between
New Testament Churches"**

CECIL B. DOUTHITT

P. O. Box 67

Brownwood, Texas

CHAPTER I

"THE PROPOSITION"

In defense of the sponsoring church type of centralized control and oversight of church funds, Brother Thomas B. Warren wrote a tract which he calls "Cooperation Between New Testament Churches".

Since more than two churches are involved in the kind of "cooperation" he advocates, the word "*among*" would be better in his caption than the word "*between*".

1. "The Proposition".

Under this topic heading Brother Warren writes as follows:

"Following is the proposition which it is proposed to prove:

"The scriptures teach that one church may (has the right to) contribute to (send funds to) another church which has assumed (undertaken) the oversight of a work to which both churches sustained the same relationship before the assumption (undertaking) of the oversight."

Brother Warren is vague and obviously uncertain in nearly everything he has written in his tract. And the equivocal structure of his sentences makes his meaning doubtful and difficult to readers who are not informed already on the centralization issue, and who do not know in advance what he is trying to prove.

For example, the introductory statement to his proposition contains the pronoun "it". But what is the antecedent of "it"? Does "it" have an antecedent? If any reader thinks he knows the antecedent of "it", just let him try replacing "it" with its antecedent, and hear how the sentence sounds. Sentences similar to this run throughout his tract; therefore, he may be misunderstood easily. "Following is the proposition which *it* is proposed to prove." Who or what is "it"?

Since the purpose of Brother Warren's tract is to convince his readers that a church may contribute funds to another church for the work of evangelization, why doesn't he state clearly his proposition like this: "The scriptures teach that one church may contribute funds to another church for a work to which both churches are related equally", then present a passage of scripture that teaches it? For two reasons he does not do that: (1) there is no passage of scripture that so much as remotely indicates that one New Testament church ever sent a contribution to another church for a work of evangelization, or for any other work to which both churches were related equally; (2) a clear and unequivocal statement of the issue would not help his unscriptural theory at all; therefore, like other advocates of false doctrines, he resorts to superfluous, parenthetical, equivocal, complicated utterances

which are of no value at all in the study of any subject.

2. Two False Impressions.

In his "proposition", Brother Warren shows that he is laboring under two erroneous ideas regarding the work of the overseers in a church of God.

a. He thinks that the elders of a church may "assume" at their own discretion the oversight of a work to which all the churches are related equally. That is not true. He must learn these two facts: (1) all the work to which all the churches are related equally was *assigned* by the Lord to every church on earth, simultaneously with its establishment, and its responsibility to that work is coeval with its existence; (2) elders may neither "assume" nor "undertake" at their own pleasure or discretion, at some future time after their appointment, the oversight of any work to which all churches sustain the same relationship; because the oversight of all the work which the Lord has assigned to a church was assigned to the elders of that church simultaneously with their appointment, and their oversight of that work is coeval with their tenure of office.

b. He thinks that a church's "assumption (undertaking) of the oversight" of a work to which all churches sustain the same relationship automatically changes the relationship that the churches sustained to that work "before the assumption". He thinks that "this work then becomes, peculiarly and exclusively the work" of the "assuming" congregation, and so declares in his "Elements of the Proposition" which will be examined in the next chapter of this study.

According to the theory of Brother Warren's proposition, congregation "A" may "assume" the oversight of evangelizing a certain city, or county, or state, or nation, or the whole world; by that "assumption" the work of evangelizing the selected area "becomes, peculiarly and exclusively, the work of congregation 'A' — congregation 'A's' own work"; congregation "A" then sustains, "peculiarly and exclusively", a relationship to that work, that no other church sustains.

If that is not a defense of the diocesan concept of the work of evangelization, then no man has ever made a defense of it. If a church can say "dubs" on one city, and thereby create a relationship, rights and privileges that other churches do not possess in the evangelization of that city, then that same church certainly can say "dubs" on the whole world and from henceforth sustain a relationship to the entire field of evangelization that no other church sustains.

In his tract Brother Tom Warren frequently makes a statement and then turns right around and teaches the very opposite. He says, "Every congregation has the right to preach the gospel in any geographical area of the world", and he warns against taking "a position which would base all cooperation upon geographical area

—a diocesan concept of the church”. Yet his proposition declares the very thing he warns against.

On page four of his tract Brother Tom presents what he calls an “illustration”. He says that congregations “A” and “B” sustain the same relationship to the work of evangelizing “area (field) ‘D’”. So far neither “A” nor “B” has done any evangelizing in this “area (field)”. But congregation “A” ‘decides to undertake’ the task; then congregations ‘A’ and ‘B’ no longer sustain an equal relationship to “area (field) ‘D’”. According to Brother Tom, when Congregation “A” began work in “area (field) ‘D’”, it became “peculiarly and exclusively the work of congregation ‘A’”. Here are Tom’s own words:

“Note this point carefully: at *one* time the two congregations sustained an *equal* relationship to this work; at a later time, they did not sustain an equal relationship to that work, but it became the *exclusive* work of congregation ‘A’ — its own work!”

What had congregation “A” done to make that “area (field)” the “exclusive” diocese of congregation “A”, and to change the relationship of all other churches to that “area (field)”?

Tom says that congregation “A” decided to build a meeting house in that “area (field)”: that’s what did it! If congregation “A” decides to build a meeting house in every unevangelized “area (field)” in the world, then according to Tom the evangelization of the whole world by building a meeting house in every “area (field)” becomes the “exclusive work of congregation ‘A’”, and congregation “A” can say to all congregations from “B” to “Z”, “This is our work—not yours; we cannot do our work; we bit off more than we can chew; but Tom says it is scriptural for you to send us your money so we can do our own work; therefore rush it to us, brethren, for it’s a good work; please don’t cut out every single bit of cooperation between churches; don’t be an anti; we have the ability and leadership; do you have the money?”

3. Why The Egregious Blunder?

Why did Brother Warren plunge head-long into the abyss of diocesan oversight in the field of evangelization? The reason is obvious: he knows the scriptures authorize contributions from a church to a church for a work to which the receiving church sustains a relationship that the giving church does not sustain, when the receiving church is unable financially to do that work; he knows also that the scriptures do *not* authorize donations from a church to another church for a work to which both churches sustain the same relationship. Therefore, in order to produce any semblance of defense for the sponsoring church hobby, he first must ‘assume’ that an eldership can say “dubs” on an area, and thereby create a relationship to the evangelization of that area

that other churches do not have; and therefore other churches may send donations to the church that said "dubs" on the area, since the work is "peculiarly and exclusively" its own.

Of course, Brother Warren did not know when he wrote his tract that he was advocating diocesan oversight in evangelization work, and he may not know it yet; but others do know it, and he could learn it if, instead of playing games with Brother Roy Deaver, he would use more time in meditating on these two passages of scripture:

Acts 20: 28. "Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock, in which the Holy Spirit hath made you bishops, to feed the church of the Lord which he purchased with his own blood."

I Pet. 5: 1-3. "The elders therefore among you I exhort, who am a fellow-elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, who am also partaker of the glory that shall be revealed: Tend the flock of God which is among you, exercising the oversight, not of constraint, but willingly, according to the will of God: nor yet for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as lording it over the charge allotted to you, but making yourselves ensamples to the flock."

By a careful and sincere study of these two passages, every student should be able to learn these four gospel facts:

a. The Holy Spirit made the elders to be the sole overseers of all the work and resources of the one congregation of which they are members, and of nothing else; therefore they have no right either to "assume" or to accept the oversight of any work of any other church.

b. This obligation to exercise the oversight of all the work and resources of that one congregation was *assigned* to them simultaneously with their appointment; therefore they can "assume" nothing later at their own discretion.

c. They have no authority whatever to limit or to restrict the evangelistic rights and obligations of any church in any area any where in the world; therefore the diocesan or geographical concept of an eldership's jurisdiction in the work of evangelization is totally false and Romish to the core.

d. Since "filthy lucre" is ill-gotten gain, when elders use their office to obtain money for themselves or for the church in any way, except as the scriptures authorize, they violate God's prohibition—"nor yet for filthy lucre"; therefore they sin against the Lord and his church when they lead the church into the operation of secular business for profit, or when they solicit and accept money from other churches for evangelistic work, or when they obtain money for the church in any way for which there is no scriptural authority.

CHAPTER II

"ELEMENTS OF THE PROPOSITION"

On page 2 of his tract, Brother Thomas B. Warren lists six assertions which he calls "Elements Of The Proposition".

The "proposition" to which he refers is quoted in Chapter I of this study. Though worded poorly, the "proposition" means that Brother Warren thinks that a church scripturally may send contributions to another church for the work of evangelizing an area over which the receiving church has said "dubs" and thereby made that work "peculiarly and exclusively" the work of the receiving church. If this is not what his proposition means, it is not related to the issue at all.

Here are his six "Elements Of The Proposition".

1. The existence of a need (a work to be done) in a field to which the two churches sustain the same relationship."

Yes, the "existence" of a three-fold need is obvious: (1) every creature in the world needs the gospel; (2) every church in all the world needs to preach it; (3) Brother Warren needs a passage of scripture, and not six assertions, to prove that "the scriptures teach that one church" may contribute money to another church for evangelistic work in an area over which the receiving church has said "dubs" and thereby changed the relationship of all the churches in the world to evangelistic work in that "diocese".

2. Congregation 'A' assumes the oversight of the accomplishing of this work. This involves the right of congregation 'A' to act in such fashion."

The work of preaching the gospel in all the world was *assigned* by the Lord to every church from "A" to "Z" (I Tim. 3: 15; I Thess. 1: 8), and the word "assumes" in this connection is erroneous and misleading.

The "oversight" of this church work was *assigned* by the Lord to the elders of every church from "A" to "Z" (I Pet. 5: 1-3), and the elders of no church from "A" to "Z" have any scriptural right to give or accept money from one church to another for the work of evangelization which the Lord has *assigned* to every church from "A" to "Z". When they do "act in such fashion", they go beyond what is written; they violate God's law of exclusion; they sin against the authority of heaven (II John 9).

Not only congregation "A", but every congregation from "A" to "Z" has the "right" to "act" in the work of preaching the gospel to the world, and it *must* "act" or lose its New Testament identity. Congregation "A" has neither a duty nor a "right" in the field of evangelization that all the other churches all the way to "Z" do not have.

"3. This work then becomes, peculiarly and exclusively the work of congregation 'A'—congregation 'A's' own work."

This assumption No. 3 is totally false. The work of preaching the gospel in any area never becomes, "peculiarly and exclusively", the work of congregation "A", regardless of what congregation "A" assumes or says "dubs" over. After congregation "A" says "dubs on", or "assumes" the work of evangelizing a given city, or state, or nation or the whole world, all the other churches from "B" to "Z" sustain precisely the same evangelistic obligations to that area that they sustained before congregation "A" did any "assuming" at all.

If congregation "A" can "assume" the work of evangelizing one city, and thereby make the work of evangelizing that city, "peculiarly and exclusively the work of congregation 'A'", then by that same process congregation "Z" can "assume" the work of evangelizing the rest of the world and thereby make the work of preaching the gospel in all the world, "peculiarly and exclusively", the work of congregation "Z". Brother Warren and the other riders of the sponsoring church hobby would be able to see that this is true, if they would get off of their hobby horse long enough to exercise as much as one grain of reason or common sense.

"4. The total accomplishing of this work exceeds the ability of congregation 'A'. Congregation 'A' is unable to do its own work."

Unto every church from congregation "A" to congregation "Z" the Lord has assigned the work of preaching the gospel to the world. "The total accomplishing of this work exceeds the ability" of any one congregation from "A" to "Z". Now, according to Brother Warren, no congregation from "A" to "Z" is able "to do its own work"; therefore every congregation from "A" to "Z" must become a sponsoring church, and every one from "A" to "Z" must beg all the others for funds with which "to do its own work". The profundity of Brother Warren's logic would make old Socrates ashamed of himself!

"5. Congregation "B" may contribute to (send funds to) congregation "A" to be used by congregation "A" in the accomplishing of that work."

When this "element" No. 5 is considered in the light of the three "elements" immediately preceding it, one wonders how a sensible man like Brother Warren can let a false doctrine or dangerous hobby lead him into so many ridiculous absurdities.

According to Brother Warren's "elements", "congregation 'A' assumes the oversight of the accomplishing of this work" of evangelizing "area (field) D". Congregation "Z" assumes the oversight of evangelizing all the rest of the world. But both "A" and "Z" bit off more than they could chew, therefore neither is able "to do its own work."

Brother Warren "assumes" that congregation "B" may send its money to congregation "A" to be used in evangelizing "area (field) D", then of course all the congregations from "C" to "Y" can send their money to congregation "Z" to be used in evangelizing the rest of the world. Then it necessarily follows that no congregation from "B" to "Y" will have anything to do in the field of evangelization, except to send money to congregations "A" and "Z", because "A" and "Z" have "assumed" the work of evangelizing the whole world, thereby making the work "peculiarly and exclusively" their own. The word "exclusively" leaves no field of evangelization on earth for congregations "B" to "Y". If they ever evangelize anywhere, they must pick out a spot for themselves on the moon or some other planet and say "dubs" on it before congregations "A" and "Z" decide that the earth is too small for their "ability" and "leadership" and beat them to it.

There is not one word of truth in Brother Warren's "element" No. 5. That congregation "B" may contribute funds to congregation "A" to be used by congregation "A" in evangelistic work is a false assumption for which there is no support any where in all the sacred writings. That is the very thing that his "proposition" demands that he prove; instead of trying to prove it, he chooses to "assume" it. Does Brother Warren know the difference between proving a thing and *assuming* it?

"6. A congregation may have the right to do a work for which it has no specific obligation—that is, it may not be obligated to do this work in just this specific particular way, but at the same time it may have the *right* to do so."

The first statement in No. 6 is not true. No congregation has a right to do *any* work for which it has no "specific obligation". Every church has a "specific obligation" to do every work which the Lord has assigned to it, and it is in open rebellion against God, if it neglects to do that work. If a church plunges into a work which the Lord has not assigned, it goes beyond what is written (II John 9), and violates God's law of exclusion.

After making this false statement, Brother Warren hastened to explain that he did not mean at all what he said. He explained that he meant that a church "may not be obligated to do this work in just this specific particular way". Well, why didn't he say that in the first place, and entirely omit the false statement? Does he not know the difference between a "work" and a *method* of doing that work?

Why does Brother Warren write so many false, contradictory and equivocal utterances which necessitate so much explaining? Is it because he has not learned how to express his thoughts on paper? Or is it because he knows that he must dodge, cover up and confuse in order to present any semblance of proof of his "proposition"?

Of course a church may not be obligated to employ a particular method in doing a work; but is Brother Warren trying to say that

a missionary society or a sponsoring church is a "way" or method of preaching the gospel? If that is the impression he is trying to create, he needs a lesson on "God's Law Of Exclusion"; if that is not his purpose, then his "element" No. 6 is not related at all to his "proposition".

In this list of six assumptions which he calls "elements of the proposition", the most of which are false, Brother Warren completely ignored one "element" which is named specifically in his proposition—"the scriptures". His proposition says, "The scriptures teach"; but in his list of "elements" he made no reference whatever to the "scriptures". Does Brother Warren think the scriptures are too insignificant as proof of a "proposition" to be mentioned as an "element" at all? If "the scriptures teach" the sponsoring church hobby, some one should be able to give the reference: the verse, or the chapter, or the book. If six assertions, without any reference at all to the scriptures, prove that the sponsoring church racket is scriptural, then every damnable doctrine in existence can be proved to be scriptural.

The silly syllogism which evolved from Brother Warren's six "elements" will be examined in the next chapter.

CHAPTER III

"THE SYLLOGISM"

On page two of his tract, Brother Thomas B. Warren presents a syllogism under the topic heading, "The Syllogism by Which it is Proposed to Prove the Proposition".

He again uses superfluous and meaningless words which tend to confuse readers who may not know what he is trying to prove. By this topic heading he simply means, "The Syllogism to be Used in Proving the Proposition".

Why is he so persistent in his use of that pronoun "it" in clauses in which "it" has no antecedent? The structure of his sentences makes him sound more like a babbler than a student.

1. The Syllogism.

Here is the syllogism by which he proposes to prove his proposition.

- "1. Major Premise: All total situations the constituent elements of which are scriptural are total situations which are scriptural.
- "2. Minor Premise: The total situation described in the above proposition is a total situation, the constituent elements of which are scriptural.
- "3. Conclusion: The total situation described in the above

proposition is a total situation which is scriptural.”

By this syllogism Brother Warren is trying to prove that his “total situation” of evangelism is scriptural by merely *assuming* that all the “constituent elements” of his “total situation” are scriptural. By a careful study of the wording of his proposition he should be able to see that his proposition requires his proving that two component parts of his “total situation” of evangelism are scriptural. The two unscriptural “elements” are: (1) one church may contribute money to another church for a work to which both are related equally; (2) a church may assume the oversight of that same work to which both churches are equally related, and thereby make the two churches unequally related to that work. The Bible does not contain one verse of scripture in support of either of these “constituent elements” in Brother Tom Warren’s proposition.

The “total situation” in Tom’s proposition is a plan for evangelizing the world. He can never prove that his “total situation”, or plan for evangelization, is scriptural, until he proves that these two “component parts” are scriptural.

2. A Negative Syllogism.

Here is a syllogism which proves that Brother Tom Warren’s “total situation”, or sponsoring church plan of evangelization, is unscriptural.

- (1). Major Premise: All total situations the constituent elements of which are unscriptural are total situations which are unscriptural.
- (2). Minor Premise: The total situation described in Tom Warren’s proposition is a total situation, two constituents elements of which are unscriptural.
- (3). Conclusion: The total situation described in Tom’s proposition is a total situation which is unscriptural.

The only “possible way” that Tom can overthrow this syllogism is by presenting a passage of scripture which teaches that his two unscriptural “constituent elements” are scriptural. His *assuming* that they are scriptural will not suffice.

In the preceding chapter of this study, five of the six “elements of the proposition”, as listed by Brother Tom, were shown to be unscriptural.

3. Parable Of The Three “Total Situations”.

The “total situation” of Brother Tom shall be likened unto the three “total situations” of Tom, Dick and Harry.

a. Harry’s “total situation” was a system of worship. His proposition obligated him to prove that instrumental music, one of the “constituent elements” of his “total situation”, is scriptural. He could not prove it, but he could *assume* it. Therefore, he created a syllogism, and in the minor premise he *assumed* that *all* the “con-

stituent elements", including the music "element", in his system of worship are scriptural. Harry then boldly announced: "For one to prove the minor premise to be false, one must show that a single, specific constituent element of this total situation is an unscriptural one". Poor Harry was so determined to ride his instrumental music hobby that he could not see that he himself had proved both his "minor premise" and his "total situation" to be false by his own failure to produce a passage of scripture in support of the music "element" of his "total situation".

b. Dick's "total situation" was a system of salvation from alien sins. His proposition obligated him to prove that the mourner's bench, one of the "specific constituent elements" of his "total situation", is scriptural. Poor Dick could not prove that the mourner's bench is scriptural, but he could *assume* it. Therefore his fertile imagination hatched a syllogism, and in the minor premise he *assumed* that *all* the "constituent elements", including the mourner's bench "element", in his system of salvation are scriptural. Poor Richard was so much in love with his mourner's bench hobby that he thought the whole world ought to accept the assumption of his minor premise that the mourner's bench "element" is scriptural without any scriptural proof at all.

c. Tom's total situation was a system of evangelization. His proposition obligated him to prove by the scriptures that one church may contribute money to another church for the work of evangelization. This was a "specific constituent element" of his "total situation" or system of evangelization. Poor Tom could not find one word of scripture to prove this "constituent element" of his "total situation", but he could *assume* it. Therefore, Tom's prolific imagination brought forth a syllogism identical to every jot and tittle with the syllogism of Dick and Harry. In the minor premise of his syllogism he boldly *assumed* that *all* the "constituent elements" of his system of evangelism are scriptural, including the "element" of donations from a church to a church for a work to which both churches are related equally.

Having justified their three hobbies by the same syllogism, Tom, Dick and Harry were very happy that they had conceived and brought forth a syllogism that would soothe the conscience of every heretic on earth; therefore they issued the following joint proclamation: "For one to prove the minor premise of our syllogism to be false, one must prove that instrumental music in worship, the mourner's bench and contributions from a church to a church for the work of evangelism are unscriptural".

In the Abilene and Indianapolis debates, Brethren Ernest Harper and Guy Woods, like drowning men grabbing at a straw, tried to prove their propositions by Brother Tom's "elements" and syllo-

gism. Like Tom, Dick and Harry, Guy tried to justify church contributions to human benevolent societies and Ernest tried to justify donations from a thousand churches to Herald Of Truth by *exactly* the same syllogism.

Tom certainly hatched some syllogism! By that same syllogism, Tom proves that the diocesan oversight of an eldership in evangelization is scriptural; Dick proves that the mourner's bench is scriptural; Harry proves that instrumental music in worship and church contributions to a man-made missionary society are scriptural; Guy proves that church contributions to a man-made benevolent society are scriptural; Ernest proves that donations from a thousand churches to the Highland church for the Herald Of Truth evangelistic project are scriptural; and they all prove their various erroneous doctrines by exactly the same syllogism. *What A Syllogism!*

His minor premise is totally false. His own interpretations of the most of his assertions (which he calls "constituent elements") are unscriptural, and he did not cite (much less quote) one verse of scripture to prove that his "constituent elements" are scriptural. If they are scriptural, why doesn't he quote the passage that makes them scriptural?

CHAPTER IV

"THE CONSTITUENT ELEMENTS OF THE TOTAL SITUATION"

Brother Thomas B. Warren's "proposition", his six "elements of the proposition", and his "syllogism", have been examined in previous chapters of this study.

For some reason Brother Warren presents in his tract a second group of "elements", which consists of eight assertions, the most of which are wrong. He calls this group of assertions, "The Constituent Elements Of The Total Situation Described In The Proposition." And here they are.

- "1. Every congregation has the right to preach the gospel in any geographical area of the world."

This is true, and Brother Tom Warren contradicts himself by his unintentional defense of the diocesan concept of evangelism when he teaches that the work of preaching the gospel in "a certain large area" became "peculiarly and exclusively" the work of congregation "B", because congregation "B" "began to contemplate starting a work in that area" before congregation "A" "began to contemplate starting a work in that area".

- "2. Every congregation has the right to seek to accomplish its own work."

Every congregation not only "has the right to seek to accomplish its own work", every congregation is obligated by the Lord "to seek to accomplish" it. Brother Tom may not know it, but the Lord has legislated relative to how a congregation may obtain money with which to do "its own work". Therefore, in order to prove his "proposition", he must find a passage of scripture that teaches that one church may donate its money to another church for a work to which both sustain an equal relationship.

3. A congregation has the right to assume (or undertake) the oversight of the accomplishing of a work to which another congregation sustained an equal relationship prior to the assumption (undertaking) of the oversight."

Brother Warren's erroneous and unscriptural usage of the words "assume", "undertake", "assumption" and "undertaking" has already been pointed out in these articles.

In his comments under this "element", Tom shows clearly that he is laboring under two erroneous ideas, and therefore is confused miserably on the work of the churches. (1) He thinks that congregation "A" can make the work of evangelizing "area (field) 'D'" peculiarly and exclusively the work of congregation 'A', and create a relationship that no other church sustains to that work, by setting up or utilizing some physical factor to facilitate the accomplishing of that work. As he explains it, congregation "A" decides to undertake" to buy a lot, or build a brush arbor, or sign a contract with a radio station, or set up a soap box for the preacher to stand on and a public address system for him to speak through, and thereby makes the work of preaching in "area (field) 'D'" "peculiarly and exclusively" its own. A great many people know that congregation "A" could do this in every "area (field)" in all the world and thereby make the whole world "peculiarly and exclusively" her own diocese, if she can do it in "area (field) 'D'"; but Tom does not know it, of course. (2) In the second place, Tom does not know the difference between a *work* of the church and the *factors* employed to facilitate the work. He calls a broadcasting station, a meeting house and even a song book works of the church. If he could learn that the "stairs" on which Paul stood to preach to the mob (Acts 21: 40), and the "chariot" in which Philip rode while preaching to the eunuch (Acts 8: 29), and the "boat" in which Jesus sat while teaching the multitudes (Matt. 13:2), and the microphone and broadcasting station through which a man speaks are not the work, but only facilities used in doing the *work*, then he might be able to free himself from the net-work of error into which he has tumbled. As Tom sees it, if congregation "A" "decides to undertake" to place a boat in the Sea of Galilee or the Gulf of Mexico for the preacher to sit in while he preaches, then the relationship that all churches in the world sustained to the Sea of Galilee or the Gulf of Mexico automatically changes, and then

congregation "A" sustains a relationship to this "area (field)" that no other church sustains; this is "A's" diocese.

- "4. A congregation (through its elders) has the right to oversee the accomplishing of a work, the total accomplishing of which exceeds its financial ability."

When a church is unable to supply the needs of its own poor members, or unable to provide an adequate place for its own members to meet and worship God, then that church is an object of charity, and other churches must send money to it to enable it to do this work which strictly is its own. And the receiving church must retain the oversight of its own work, regardless of how poor it may be. This is taught clearly in Acts 11: 27-30 and II Cor. 8. If Tom could find one little passage of scripture that even remotely indicates that a church that is not an object of charity may receive donations from other churches, then he would have all the "constituent elements" and "total situations" he would ever need. Without that passage of scripture, there are not enough "constituent elements" and "total situations" on earth to prove his "proposition".

- "5. One church may help another church to meet a want."

One church may send donations to another church under the conditions described in the fore-going topic. But Brother Tom is trying to convince his readers that all churches in the world may send their money to one church, if they want to do so, regardless of conditions. If that is not what he is trying to teach, then let him state plainly the conditions under which one church cannot send money to another church, and why it cannot send it.

- "6. A church's own work (which another congregation may help them do) does not necessarily have to involve a catastrophe."

In his comments under this "element", Tom explains that congregation "B" may send a preacher to congregation "A" to teach in a vacation Bible school, when neither "benevolence" nor "catastrophe" is involved. To this, all agree. But when Tom teaches that congregation "B" may scripturally launch a campaign of begging money from churches all over the world, with which to hire and send preachers selected by congregation "B" for vacation Bible schools in churches all over the world, then Tom is dangerously unsound and totally wrong. Even Brother Tom ought to be able to see that congregation "B" can accept money from all other churches to enable congregation "B" to select, hire and send teachers for vacation Bible schools in all the churches, if it can accept money from other churches to enable it to select, hire and send a teacher for a vacation Bible school in congregation "A". If not all,

then for how many can it select, hire and send to other churches?

Yes, "Jerusalem sent Barnabas to Antioch". Now, if Tom can find one little verse of scripture that teaches that Jerusalem received funds from other churches, with which to send "Barnabas to Antioch", or that Jerusalem sent funds to the Antioch church with which to pay Barnabas, his proposition will be proved, and he will have no need whatever for "constituent elements", "syllogism" and "a total situation".

"7. Evangelism as well as benevolence may be involved."

Then Tom adds: "This was set forth under point number six". Everything that he "set forth under point number six" was answered "under point number six".

"8. A church may have a right to undertake a work for which it has no specific obligation."

There is not one word of truth in this "element" number 8, and the reason why Tom makes this totally false assertion is because he does not know the difference between "a work" of a church and the factors employed to facilitate the work. In explaining what he means, Tom says, "A congregation has the *right* to use song books but it is not under *obligation* to have song books". In his illustration, "singing" is the work; and no church would "have a right to undertake" to sing or to do any other work, if it had "no specific obligation" to undertake it. "Song books" are not a work; they are factors used to facilitate the work of "singing". But his illustration is in no way related to his proposition, unless he is trying to prove by it that a thousand churches may send contributions to one church that it "may have a right to" select and supply song books of its own choosing to all the other churches in the world.

Tom uses another illustration to show what he means by "element" number 8. He says, "So it is that a church has the right to have a radio program, but it is not under obligation to carry out its work in just that specific way". The radio station through which a preacher broadcasts a sermon is no more a "work" of a church than the "stairs" on which Paul stood to preach to the mob is a "work" of a church. A broadcasting station and the "stairs" or soap box on which the preacher stands are not a "work" of any church; they are implements used to advance the work. Preaching the gospel is the "work" that these elements facilitate; every church has a "specific obligation" to do this "work", otherwise it would have no "right to undertake" it.

More than a thousand churches have sent hundreds of thousands of dollars to one church to make it possible for the elders of that one church to be the sole authority in selecting and employing preachers and controlling all the factors and implements of preaching the gospel on a national scale. Brother Warren has not offered one word of proof to show that such centralized control of the

work and resources of the churches is scriptural; he has not even approached the issue; he has dallied with little hypothetical borderline incidents, and completely ignored conditions as they exist today among the churches. He cannot face the real issue like a man, and make any headway at all in defense of these Romish practices.

Tom did not quote one line of scripture in his tract; he did cite a few scripture references. Every passage to which he made any reference at all will be examined in the next chapter.

CHAPTER V

SCRIPTURE REFERENCES AND QUESTIONS

Brother Thomas B. Warren did not quote one line of scripture in his tract which he wrote to try to prove that "the scriptures teach that one church may (has the right to) contribute to (send funds to) another church which has assumed (undertaken) the oversight of a work to which both churches sustained the same relationship before the assumption (undertaking) of the oversight". He gave a few Bible references, but he did not quote a line of any of these references.

Nowhere in his tract did Brother Tom claim that any of these references teaches that one church may send money to another church for a work to which both churches are related equally; he did not cite these references for that purpose; he gave other reasons for presenting them.

1. Scripture References.

Here are all the Bible references that Brother Warren gave in his tract, and the reason why he gave every one of these references is stated in his own words.

(1) Rom. 1: 15 is the first scripture citation in his tract, and here is the use he has made of it in his own words: "It may be pointed out that according to Romans 1: 15 Paul was ready to preach the gospel to the members of the church at Rome".

(2) He gave Mk. 16: 15; Matt. 38: 19; Lk. 24: 47; Acts 1: 8; to prove that "Jesus plainly set forth the fact that the gospel is addressed to every creature".

(3) Rom. 1: 18 - 3: 23, to show the "universal need of man to be saved."

(4) Rom. 1: 16, 17, to prove that "the gospel is God's power to save".

(5) He gave II Thess. 1: 7-9 to show "the terrible alternative to obeying the gospel".

(6) He pointed to I Tim. 3: 15 to prove that the "church is the pillar and ground of the truth".

(7) He referred to II Cor. 8 to show that "the work which confronted the Jerusalem church in this instance exceeded her material ability to accomplish", and that "Jerusalem had the oversight of the accomplishing of this work".

Providing for its poor members is the work of every congregation. The Jerusalem church did not have the "material ability" to take care of its own poor members. The Lord commanded other churches to send contributions to the Jerusalem church to supply the needs of the poor saints in that church (I Cor. 16: 1-13; II Cor. 8: 14). When the needs of the poor saints in the Jerusalem church were supplied, the contributions from other churches stopped right there.

Does Tom think that I Cor. 8 teaches that other churches were sending contributions to Jerusalem because Jerusalem had set herself up as a "sponsoring church", and was gathering up the poor from other churches, and had *assumed* "the oversight" of collecting money from other churches all over the world in order to enable her to operate a brotherhood charity project? Does he think that II Cor. 8 teaches that a "sponsoring church" was a "constituent element" of the "total situation" of that charity work in the Jerusalem church? If he does not think so, then why all this double-talk and babble about Jerusalem's having the oversight of a work that "exceeded her material ability to accomplish"? If he *does* think so, then he does not know enough about the word of God to teach anybody anything, and he has no business trying to write a tract on any religious subject.

(8) Tom gave II Cor. 8: 14 to prove that "one church may help another church to meet a want". This passage teaches that one church may send money to another church to help the receiving church care for her own poor, when the receiving church does not have the "material ability to accomplish" the job herself. But neither this passage nor any other passage in the Bible teaches that "one church may" become the controlling agency for either a brotherhood benevolent project or a brotherhood missionary project.

Brother Tom's proposition obligates him to prove that the scriptures teach that one church may send contributions to another church for a work to which both churches are related equally. Does he think that the receiving church and the contributing churches sustained the same relationship to that charity work in Jerusalem, which the Holy Spirit discusses in II Cor. 8?

(9) The last scripture reference given in Brother Tom's tract is Acts 11: 19-23, and here is all that he says about this passage: "Jerusalem sent Barnabas to Antioch. This involved teaching (not benevolence) and it involved no catastrophe."

Of course "it involved no catastrophe"! Is Tom insinuating that

somebody believes that a church cannot send a preacher into a distant town or country, unless it involves a catastrophe?

Of course "this involved teaching (not benevolence)"! If the Jerusalem church had operated like Broadway in Lubbock and a few other sponsoring churches, it certainly would have involved a lot more "benevolence" than teaching. When some of these modern sponsoring churches decide to send a preacher into a distant land, they send a heavily loaded gravy train along with the preacher, and the first work "involved" is benevolence (not teaching). If Tom continues his double talk long enough, he might convince Broadway in Lubbock and a few others that they are not doing it like Jerusalem did it.

If any one or all of these passages can be made to teach that one church may send contributions to another church for a work to which both are related equally, they can be made to teach anything that any man might want them to teach.

But Brother Tom said nothing in his tract to indicate that he thinks these references that he gave prove his proposition. He did not quote one line of scripture to prove anything, and the scripture references that he cited were not for the purpose of proving his proposition; he cited them for other purposes as stated in his own words. He tried to prove his proposition by "total situations", "constituent elements", a "syllogism" and more than fifty foolish questions, and not by the scriptures. And when a man becomes so confused that he does not know the difference between a song book and a work of the church, he is incapable of handling aright the word of God, and he should stop trying to prove anything by the Bible (like Tom did), lest he wrest the scriptures to his own destruction.

2. Tom's Questions.

More than one-fourth the space in Brother Tom's tract is given to a list of more than fifty questions presented in eighteen groups. Some of these groups are preceded by, and based upon, hypothetical conditions so absurd that they sound moronic.

For example, he bases a group of exactly twelve questions on the following foolish hypothesis:

"Congregation 'A' (a struggling group) decides to have a preacher to spend his full time working within an area to extend no farther than fifty yards from the meeting house of congregation 'A'."

Elders who decide "to have a preacher to spend his full time in working within an area to extend no farther than fifty yards from the meeting house" do not have sense enough to be elders, and a preacher who would agree to work under such restrictions should be "institutionalized" to a padded cell; a radius of fifty

yards is entirely too much territory for that kind of preacher to roam over. Under the limitations of Tom's hypothesis, that preacher could not participate in a funeral service, or tell a lost soul what to do to be saved, or visit the fatherless and widows, unless it all could be done within an area extending "no farther than fifty yards from the meeting house". Can any man think of a sillier hypothesis on which to base twelve questions? When anything more ridiculous is found, Tom will find it, and print it in a tract and publish it in the Gospel Advocate.

This tract may be obtained at 15 cents
single copy; or 100 copies for \$10.00

Order from

CECIL B. DOUTHITT

P. O. Box 67

Brownwood, Texas