



The Grace Proclamator and Promulgator

“To testify the gospel of the grace of God.” Acts 20:24

PUBLISHED AS A MISSION PROJECT OF CENTRAL BAPTIST CHURCH

KALAMAZOO CHURCH REMOVES PASTOR OVER EMDA

By J. C. Settlemoir

The New Hope Missionary Baptist Church of Kalamazoo, Michigan, in the latter part of August, 2006, asked their pastor Elder Dale R. Hart to resign. For what reason? Because he does not believe in EMDA (Essential Mother Daughter Authority) for the constitution of a church.

EMDA is a tradition which requires a group of saints in *gospel order* [saved and scripturally baptized] to get authority from a mother church to constitute. EMDA teaches that without such a mother church, no scriptural church can be established. It also claims that all churches started without EMDA are false churches. It

especially contends that *self constituted* churches are not true churches in any sense [Cf. Medford Caudill. *Self Constitution a Misnomer*. Voice in the Wilderness. Mar 9, 2006, p. 1]. It is also claimed that EMDA is the essence of Landmarkism. [Doug Newell III, BBB September 5, 2006, p. 407-9]. We believe these claims are false, Mt 18:20. See *Landmarkism Under Fire*, for the defense of self constitution and the refutation of EMDA. Whether EMDA is a true doctrine or not, it is not the purpose of this article to consider.

When the New Hope Church asked their (See KALAMAZOO Cont. Page 2, Left Col.)

AN ANSWER TO SOME CHARGES CONCERNING SCRIPTURAL CHURCH CONSTITUTION

PART 2

By Wayne Camp

In the October issue of the paper, I dealt with several of the charges made against me in correspondence with a Brother from Caldwell, Kansas, as he wrote for himself and the church he pastors. Here are other matters that I wanted to deal with from our correspondence.

1. In his last letter to me this Brother wrote: In fact, you still haven't answered my question as to what you believe about the organization of a church.
2. In the same paragraph he contradicted

himself when he wrote: Your beliefs on the matter have been declared. I do not agree because I cannot find it in the Bible.

3. In this same paragraph he wrote, I am satisfied with what has been transacted and see no further need to communicate on the matter . . . Here endeth the matter.
4. Concerning the article in the July issue of *The Grace Proclamator and Promulgator* (See ANSWER Cont. Bot. P. 3, Rt. Col.)

THE GRACE PROCLAMATOR AND PROMULGATOR (USPS Standard Mail Permit Number 876) is published monthly (subscription free) by the authority of **CENTRAL Baptist Church, PO Box 876, Grenada, MS.** Postage paid at Grenada, MS, 38901.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to **THE GRACE PROCLAMATOR AND PROMULGATOR, PO Box 876, Grenada, MS 38901-0876.**

COPYING PRIVILEGES

Any articles or messages in this paper may be copied and used as the reader sees fit unless otherwise specified before or after the article or message. Our desire is to disseminate the gospel of grace as widely as possible.

CO-EDITORS' ADDRESSES, PHONE NUMBERS AND E-MAIL ADDRESSES

Editor, Eld. Wayne Camp, may be reached at the address given above, or at his home address. His home address at present is: 3809 Strider Rd, Scobey, MS 38953.

Home: (662) 229-9578

E-mail address: rwcamp@gpp-5grace.com

Visit our Home Page on the Internet

<http://www.gpp.camps-computer.com/>

Editor, Eld. Bill Lee may be reached at PO Box 876, Grenada, MS 38901-0876.

Editor Lee's phone number is 662-226-2715.

E-Mail Address: billandjan@cableone.net

PLANNING TO MOVE? If at all possible, please notify us three weeks in advance of your change of address so that we may keep your paper coming. It costs us up 75 cents to get your new address from the Postal Service and that may take long enough that two papers are returned at a cost of up to \$1.50 before we get the correction. This will mean you miss one or two papers. Your help in saving us this expense will be appreciated.

IF YOU ARE IN Grenada, MS, we invite you to attend our services:

Bible Study 9:45 A. M. Sunday

Worship Service 11:00 A. M. Sunday

Evening Service 5:00 P. M. Sunday

Mid-Week Service 6:30 P. M. Wednesday

You Are Welcome!

(KALAMAZOO Cont. From P. 1, Rt. Col.) pastor to resign over EMDA, one would assume they had such authority and had verified they had it for their own constitution in 1963. Did they have authority to constitute? No, they did not.

The New Hope Missionary Baptist church was constituted about 1963. Some people in Galesburg (a small city near Kalamazoo, Michigan) wanted to constitute a church in Kalamazoo. They contacted my brother who was pastor of Antioch Missionary Baptist Church in Battle Creek, Michigan.

This work began and was a mission of Antioch for about a year or more. The mission then decided to constitute. Accordingly, the group set a day for their constitution. Letters were granted from Antioch. On the day of constitution, several churches were represented there. But one may ask, how do you know the church was self constituted without EMDA from the Antioch Church?

The answer is easy, because I was the first pastor of this group and I personally planned the constitution and used Bogard's *Baptist Waybook* to do it. Here is what this book says:

The first step necessary in the organization of a new congregation or church is for as many as three baptized disciples to agree to meet stately for worship, for mutual edification and united effort for the evangelization of the world. The object of a church is two-fold, viz., that the membership may be mutually helpful to one another and to work for God's glory in the evangelization of the world.

The agreement to meet regularly for worship and work is commonly called a 'Church Covenant.' The word 'covenant' means agreement. This covenant should be in writing, lest some misunderstand the terms. When this covenant has been entered into the church is fully organized. This covenant is the organization. Bogard. *The Baptist Way-Book*, p. 69.

This is exactly what we did.

This is how New Hope was constituted!

This was the only way ABA churches constituted in those days so far as I know. I was present in two or three other constitutions in those days (both ABA and independent churches) and not one of them ever asked any church for authority to constitute and I never heard of any other method of constituting a church at that time. In some of these cases, no other church even knew of the organization until after the fact! My brother who was at that time a recent graduate of the Missionary Baptist Institute of Little Rock, Arkansas, founded by Ben M. Bogard, never mentioned to me any need of a mother church to constitute.

Of the other churches invited to the constitution of New Hope Church and present that day not one pastor, preacher, deacon or church objected to the fact that we constituted ourselves into a church that day! We formed a circle, held hands and agreed to constitute ourselves a church and those present thought this was a valid constitution. There were no complaints about spontaneous combustion; about not having a mother; about not having organic connection—or any such thing. No one present thought the letters granted attempted to convey such authority. We who constituted that day had no idea of such an authority and of course that being the case, did not seek any. Nor did the Antioch Church think they were granting any authority in their letters! There was no authority sought. None tendered. None projected—except that of the Lord Himself according to His express word in Mt 18:20.

Thus, for New Hope Church to dismiss their pastor for this reason shows the power a tradition of man [Mt 15:9] has to transpose itself into a law of God—a false law! It also shows how men are willing to accept in history what they deny today. This church would absolutely and flatly reject the constitution of a church today constituted exactly as they were constituted! Did time season this self constitution turning it into EMDA? If not, then how did they get authority? And if they did not have it then, what is their status now? If their pastor is correct, then they may be a true church. But if he is wrong, then they are not a true church. Let them determine which way it is!

This information would be enough to convince the stoutest defender of EMDA that this church did not have any mother authority. Most EMDA brethren would demand this church be reorganized with a designated authority from another church and all the baptisms and ordinations repeated. And according to the theory, it necessarily follows, the New Hope Church is not a true church as they did not have EMDA when constituted. They were never in the mouth of Christ at all! [Re 3:16]. They never were on Christ as the foundation [1 Cor 3:10, 11]. Consequently no act of worship performed by this Church ever was accepted in Heaven. No ordinance performed by it or its

representatives is valid. This means that all of those baptized by this Church were never baptized at all. All their baptisms are null and void! All of its efforts to serve God are totally void of any value whatsoever!

However, what happens so often in cases like this is absolutely amazing. Such churches will often say something like this: “Well the authority is transmitted through church letters.” [Cockrell. *Scriptural Church Organization*, p. 17-19]. Some say, the authority is transmitted through baptism. Or they will say: “Well, so and so, told me our Church got authority from X Church in Z and I accept it by faith.” Several churches which I know of when they learned the doctrine of EMDA reconstituted but some of them, to tax the outer limits of credulity, did not rebaptize their members nor reordain their deacons or elders! And these churches sell EMDA to others but do not have it themselves! [Cf. Elder Thomas Williamson in *GPP*, April 1, 2004]. This article may be found at: http://www.gpp-5grace.com/graceproclamator/pp0404_complete.htm#Got%20Perpetuity

EMDA is an essential or it is not. If not, then New Hope Church has misrepresented the Scriptural way to constitute a church and dismissed their pastor under false charges contrary to the Word of God. If it is true then they are not a true Church and never have been! They did not obey the gospel, [1 Pet 4:17].

They must determine if they ever had a candlestick or not. The right solution will not be obtained unless they renounce the false doctrine of EMDA and repent!

Remember therefore from whence thou art fallen, and repent, and do the first works; or else I will come unto thee quickly, and will remove thy candlestick out of his place, except thou repent. Re 2:5.

(ANSWER Cont. from bot. Page 1, Rt. Col.)

he wrote, 1) It was an article on the scriptural church organization and yet you wrote for some 8 pages and did not once quote a single scripture.

5. The Brother further wrote: We believe that

one church organizes another and the scriptures, which is our final and only rule of authority, do bear this out.

6. I was a little amazed at the following presumption of the Brother when he said, But the fact remains I could not find one scripture in your article that you cited to support your belief because you did not quote one scripture. And even if you had, it would have been taken out of context.
7. He then accused me of being shady in the article in the July paper. The second reason I was disturb at your article is because you started with "Historical" things that man has done. If the Bible is our Sole rule of faith in practice, why did you not start with it? It seemed quite shady to say the least to me. If a man wants to know what I believe, I do not turn to commentaries, but to the Word of God!
8. The Brother further wrote, You do not believe that an unbaptized person can constitute a church, but you do not believe in a link-by-link decension as we (I and the Sovereign Grace Baptist Church of Caldwell, KS) do believe. As I understood your article that you wrote in July, you do not believe in one church organizing another church into a mission and then that mission into a church.

The Brother and (according to him) his church indicate that I am in error for not believing the following: As I understood your article that you wrote in July, you do not believe in one church organizing another church into a mission and then that mission into a church. My Dear Readers, I believe in churches that are divinely tempered together bodies. The Brother and his church believe in humanly severed bodies. They believe that one church should organize another church into a

mission and then organize that mission into a church again.

I would remind the Brother that I have used many Scriptures in this article. When I wrote the article in the July issue I had intended to write another in which I would use most of the Scriptures that I have used in this article. The Brother's accusations of my being in error gave me the occasion to write much of the same material that I would have written but I have just used a different approach in dealing with the matter.

I will now continue with further evidence that a true, divinely tempered church body is one local body meeting in one locality. That being true, the practice of severing off some members to meet in another location is not true to the word of God. Paul clearly stands for a local body that meets in one place as he so often stated. Notice this passage from the Epistle to the Ephesian congregation. ***Ephesians 2:19-22*** ***Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellowcitizens with the saints, and of the household of God; 20 And are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone; 21 In whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord: 22 In whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit.*** First, Paul calls the church at Ephesus ***the household of God.*** Each local church is ***the household of God*** in a given locality.

My wife and I have four sons. At one time in our lives these four sons were all a part of our household. Now, each of these boys have their own household. Tim, our oldest son, and his family have a household located on Brookview Terrace in Valdosta, Georgia. Mark, our second son, and his family make their household on Homer Laurence Lane in Denham Springs, Louisiana. Neil, our third son, and his family, make their household on Schorer Place in Valdosta, Georgia. Ron, our fourth son, and his family, currently make their household on Tompkins Lane, Millington, Tennessee. To still be a part of my household, these boys would have to live with me. They are a part of my family but not a part of my household. To be a

true household of God, a church must meet together in one place.

According to Paul, a true church is a **building fitly framed together**. I have done a lot of building work during my life. I built my first dog house when I was five years old. I have led in 6 building programs in churches I have pastored. I have added to houses and built houses. I have known a number of builders. I can tell you without equivocation, I have never heard of someone building part of a house in one city and part of a house in another city and arguing that his house was a **building fitly framed together**. A church cannot be a **building fitly framed together** if part of that church meets in St. Louis and another part of it meets in Los Angeles and another part of it meets in Brazil. Such a church, if it could even be called that, could not claim honestly to be a **building fitly framed together**.

Paul also declares that the church in Ephesus was **buildded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit**. It was not buildded apart. Part of it in one city and part of it in a city half a world away.

Dear Readers, I will contend for the New Testament kind of church that comes together in one place. I will contend for the New Testament kind of church that is a **building fitly framed together**. I will contend for the New Testament kind of church that is **buildded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit**. I will contend for the New Testament kind of church that is divinely tempered together as the human body is. I will contend for the New Testament kind of church that assembles **with one accord in one place**.

I will stand with Bro. Cockrell's declaration. **"In order to have a church, baptized saints must come together in one place at the same time."** I will stand with Bro. J. R. Graves declaration. **"The ecclesia of the New Testament could, and was required to assemble in one place."**

I will leave it to others to teach, practice and believe in one church organizing **another church into a mission and then that mission into a church**. I do not agree with this concept of mission work because I cannot find it in the

Bible. I will be waiting for the Brother from Kansas to give me book, chapter and verse where the Holy Spirit taught that in the Holy Scriptures.

Notice that in the first two items listed at the beginning of this part of this message, the Brother wrote, In fact, you still haven't answered my question as to what you believe about the organization of a church. Then, in the same paragraph he contradicted himself when he wrote: Your beliefs on the matter have been declared. I do not agree because I cannot find it in the Bible.

On the one hand he accuses me of not saying what I believe about church organization. Then, almost in the next breath he declared that my beliefs on the matter have been declared. Then he declares he does not agree with what I have declared because he cannot find it in the Bible. But, I assure you, Dear Reader, he never gave one verse of Scripture to support what he believes nor did he give a verse of Scripture that contradicts what I believe. More than once he rebuked me for not using Scripture in the July article but in his letters he never once cited Scripture for what he and his church believes.

In the same paragraph from which I just quoted he also wrote, I am satisfied with what has been transacted and see no further need to communicate on the matter . . . Here endeth the matter. Two things need to be noted here.

First, the Brother started the exchange on church organization but when the pressure started building on him, he quit the discussion abruptly. Notice again what he said, I am satisfied with what has been transacted and see no further need to communicate on the matter . . . Here endeth the matter.

His attitude reminded me of an experience about 25 or 30 years ago. A man had attended the church I was pastoring at the time several times. He asked me to come to his house and discuss the Scriptures with him. Even though he lived about 40 miles from where I did, I drove to his house and took another brother with me. We started discussing the Word of God and he became very agitated and then angry when I was showing him from Scripture that he was

wrong on the matter we were discussing at the time. I was being very respectful because I was in his home. Suddenly he jumped up out of his chair and said, "Get out of my house. Just get out of my house now." I said, "Sir, I will leave as you wish. But before I go I would remind you that it was you who invited me here to discuss the word of God. I did not ask if I could come. The visit was totally your idea and at your invitation. This brother and I have taken the time to drive 40 miles down here at your invitation and my expense and now we will drive 40 miles back. I think you are very rude to invite us here and then abruptly order us out of your house when we were discussing a subject that you introduced and you apparently can't take the heat. The brother and I started for the door and, to his credit, the man apologized for his attitude and asked us to stay. We sat back down and had a good discussion in a very considerate manner. Though he never came back to church because of differences in doctrine, we parted friends.

Second, he had written earlier, If you have any further questions, feel free to ask. You have my contact information. Earlier when I had apologized for writing two letters in one night I apologized for bothering him again and he replied, Do not worry about bothering me. These two statements are why it surprised and puzzled me when he abruptly called an end to our correspondence on the subject.

Concerning the article in the July issue of *The Grace Proclamator and Promulgator* the Brother wrote, 1) It was an article on the scriptural church organization and yet you wrote for some 8 pages and did not once quote a single scripture.

I beg to disagree. In no way did I suggest that I was writing on *Scriptural Church Organization*. I was answering an article written by another Brother in which he called what a good number of brethren and churches hold "the new method" of church organization. Since, as mentioned last month, I intended to write another article on Scriptural church organization, all that I was doing in the July article was showing that self-constitution was

not a new method. Here is the title of the article. ***IS SELF-CONSTITUTION REALLY A NEW METHOD OF CHURCH ORGANIZATION?*** I only mentioned the word Scriptural one time. The author of the article to which I was responding had said that it was not Scriptural for two churches to act as sponsoring churches for a new church. I asked, "Is it Scriptural for two churches to delegate church authority to a new church?" I then proceeded to show that the oldest Baptist Church in America with a continued existence for a little over 300 years was started when two churches simply advised them they should ***form themselves*** into a church before leaving Wales and coming to America. How in the world this Brother or any one in his congregation got the notion that the theme of the article was ***Scriptural Church Organization*** I cannot imagine.

The Brother further wrote, We believe that one church organizes another and the scriptures, which is our final and only rule of authority, do bear this out. But, even though he claims the Scriptures bear out what they believe he did not cite one single verse of Scripture that shows where one church in the New Testament organized another. If the Scriptures do teach that one church organizes another, why not give Scripture—book, chapter and verse—where the church at Jerusalem organized another church? Why not show us chapter and verse where Paul and Barnabas or Paul and Silas ever contacted the church at Antioch to get them to send their pastor to come and organize one of the several churches they gathered during their missionary journeys. It is obvious that they did not do this for it was only when Paul and Barnabas returned from their journey that the church at Antioch even learned of what had happened on the journey. ***Acts 14:26-27 And thence sailed to Antioch, from whence they had been recommended to the grace of God for the work which they fulfilled. 27 And when they were come, and had gathered the church together, they rehearsed all that God had done with them, and how he had opened the door of faith unto the Gentiles.*** If, in order to be Scriptural, a mother church must vote to organize another church into a mission and then

that mission into a church, one wonders how that could have happened since the church at Antioch did not even know what had happened on the missionary journey of Paul and Barnabas until they returned and rehearsed before the gathered church all that the Lord had done with them.

I was a little amazed at the following presumption of the Brother when he said, But the fact remains I could not find one scripture in your article that you cited to support your belief because you did not quote one scripture. And even if you had, it would have been taken out of context.

It appears that this Brother thinks I cannot use Scripture without taking it out of context. I suppose he got that information from the same folks who told him the untruth that I believe in "**Spontaneous Generation**" of churches. Without provocation and without any grounds whatever, he has the illimitable impudence and impetuous impertinence to say that even if I had used Scripture in the July article, "it would have been taken out of context." Perhaps that is the reason he did not use any Scripture in his correspondence. He knew that if he did he would have to take it out of context to try to make it say what he wanted it to say.

He then accused me of being shady in the article in the July paper. The second reason I was disturb at your article is because you started with "Historical" things that man has done. If the Bible is our Sole rule of faith in practice, why did you not start with it? It seemed quite shady to say the least to me. If a man wants to know what I believe, I do not turn to commentaries, but to the Word of God!

This Brother never ceases to amaze me. First, he falsely accuses me of believing in "**Spontaneous Generation**" of churches. Second, he brashly charges that if I were to use Scripture I would take it out of context. And now, thirdly, he accuses me of being **shady** because I used Historical references in the article. The word "**shady**", as the Brother used it here, means "**of dubious character**" and "**rather disreputable.**" Some of the synonyms of "**shady**" are "**dishonest, crooked,**

underhanded, suspicious, devious, and dubious."

Perhaps some of our readers may feel I have been a little too direct and candid with the Brother from Kansas in the two parts of this message. But this Brother started off this correspondence by first falsely declaring that he had "heard" that I believe in "**Spontaneous Generation**" of churches.

Second, he rebuked me for not using any Scripture in the July article. But, without any known reason he presumptuously declared that even if I had used Scripture I would have taken it out of context. Here are his exact words, "And even if you had, it would have been taken out of context. Notice that he did not say that I would probably have taken it out of context. He declared unequivocally that I would have taken any Scripture I used out of context.

Third, he accused me of being "**shady**" in the article I wrote for the July paper. As I pointed out above, this is an accusation that I was "**dishonest, crooked, underhanded, suspicious, devious, and dubious**" in the article in the July paper. I thought I was rather straight-forward and candid in the article.

Fourth, the Brother even misrepresented the them of the article saying that it was about Scriptural Church Organization when that was not the subject at all. If he had read it with any discernment at all he would have known better.

For the four reasons that I have listed here I felt that some pointed, candid corrections were in order.

The Brother further wrote, (1) You do not believe that an unbaptized person can constitute a church, but (2) you do not believe in a link-by-link decension as we (I and the Sovereign Grace Baptist Church of Caldwell, KS) do believe. As I understood your article that you wrote in July, (3) you do not believe in one church organizing another church into a mission and then that mission into a church.

I have numbered the three things to which I will reply. The Brother is correct on all two things with which he has charged me and the

one thing he has mentioned.

- (1) You do not believe that an unbaptized person can constitute a church. The Brother's false declaration that he had heard that I believed in "**Spontaneous Generation**" of churches and my response prompted him to make this statement. He is correct. I do not believe that an unbaptized person can constitute a church. In fact, **I do not believe a scripturally baptized person can constitute a church. One person cannot compose an assembly.** It takes two or more Scripturally baptized persons to compose an assembly.
- (2) You do not believe in a link-by-link decension as we (I and the Sovereign Grace Baptist Church of Caldwell, KS) do believe. Again the Brother is right. I do not believe in a link-by-link decension of the Lord's churches. And, I am sorry to hear that this Brother and his congregation believe in a link-by-link decension of the Lord's churches. It is most unfortunate that they believe this. As I pointed out in the October issue in Part One of this message, "The word "decension" is an archaic word that means, 'the act of going downward; descent; falling or sinking; declension; degradation.' According to the dictionary on the Internet the word is **archaic**. The Brother's reference to the "***link-by-link decension as we (I and the Sovereign Grace Baptist Church of Caldwell, KS) do believe***" is very interesting. According to this statement the Brother and the SGBC of Caldwell, KS, do believe that the churches of the Lord Jesus Christ in a link-by-link decension have gone downward since the first church was organized by Jesus Christ. They have fallen and have sunk into a state of declension and degradation. I am extremely sorry to hear that they believe this.
- (3) You do not believe in one church organizing another church into a mission and then that mission into a church. The Brother is correct again. I have never believed in one church **organizing another church into a mission.** If it is already a true church of the Lord Jesus Christ why would any church want to

organize it into a mission so that they could then organize it back into a church. Further, I do not believe in organizing any group of Scripturally baptized believers into a mission. To use the words of the Kansas Brother, "***I do not agree because I cannot find it in the Bible.***" As I write this, I am still waiting for the Brother to send book, chapter and verse where a mission is mentioned in the Bible. As I write this, Bro. Bill Lee is still waiting for the Brother to send book, chapter and verse where the Holy Spirit taught us in the Holy Scriptures to organize Scripturally baptized believers into missions.

But, Dear Reader, I doubt the Brother will be sending the Scripture reference for which Bro. Lee and I are asking. I suspect Lazarus will dip his finger in water and cool the tongue of the tormented rich man in hell before the Brother will send the Scripture—book, chapter and verse—where the Holy Spirit teaches us in the Holy Scriptures that a group of Scripturally baptized believers are to be organized into a mission, rather than into a church. And I certainly suspect that Lazarus will cool the tongue of the rich man long before the Brother sends us the Scripture—book, chapter and verse—where the Holy Spirit has taught us in the Holy Scriptures that one church should organize another church into a mission so they can organize it back into a church.

CONCLUSION

There are other things that I could have dealt with in this message but I will stop here. I will again say that I will stand with that old Landmarker, J. R. Graves. "***The ecclesia of the New Testament could, and was required to assemble in one place.***" And with Brother Milburn Cockrell. ***In order to have a church, baptized saints must come together in one place at the same time.***"

And, I will stand with Luke's record concerning the church at Jerusalem. ***Acts 2:1 And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place.*** And I will stand with the Apostle Paul. ***1 Corinthians 14:23 If therefore the whole***

church be come together into one place, and all speak with tongues, and there come in those that are unlearned, or unbelievers, will they not say that ye are mad?

If the Scriptures are to be our rule of faith and practice we will stand for the local church being a congregation of baptized believers that comes together in one place for worship and service. Two uninspired but respected men—J. R. Graves and Milburn Cockrell have been quoted in this conclusion affirming that to have a true church it must assemble together in one place. Two inspired men—Luke the Physician and Paul the Apostle to the Gentiles have been quoted in this conclusion and they show that churches of the New Testament each assembled in their one locality for worship and service. In Part One of this message I quoted more uninspired men and more Scriptures that affirmed that a true local church of the Lord Jesus Christ is one that regularly assembles together in one place for worship and service. That is the truth of God's word.

A church that operates a mission violates the Scriptures that teach that a church is local in nature and therefore should come together in one place. Yet, the Brother in Kansas and his church consider me to be unscriptural because I do not believe "in one church organizing another church into a mission and then that mission into a church." I am still confounded by the notion that a church ought to be organized into a mission so that it can then be organized into a church. I never cease to be amazed at the confusion of those who seek to support the idea of "missions" being a biblical institution. **Scripture please. Just one will do.**

Generational Blessings Genealogical Case of Jonathan Edwards

Jonathan Edwards was a committed Christian who married a godly young lady. Some 1,394 descendants of his were traced through genealogical studies. Family records reveal that of the 295 who graduated from college, 13 became college presidents and 65 became

college professors. Three were elected as United States senators and three as governors. There was one who became dean of a law school, 100 were lawyers, and 30 were judges. One hundred were missionaries, preachers, or prominent authors, 80 held some form of public office, of whom three were mayors of large cities. One became the comptroller of the U.S. Treasury, 56 practiced as physicians, and one was the dean of a medical school. One became vice-president of the United States and 75 were officers in the military.

Ezekiel 16:1-14

By Bill Lee

It does not really matter where I read from or study in the Word of God, I always am able to see the sovereign grace of our God. This is especially true concerning the doctrine of Salvation. It is literally everywhere in the Scriptures. God has repeatedly revealed unto us in His Word that salvation is always an act of His sovereign grace. And we are constantly reminded that salvation is reserved for sinners and only sinners. It is for all types of sinners. For sinners are the only ones who stand in need of any salvation at all.

In the sixteenth chapter of Ezekiel, God is speaking to Jerusalem through the prophet. It is in these words of God to rebellious and sinful Jerusalem that I find another revelation of God's wonderful salvation. First, I see the natural condition of the sinner set forth. Verse 4, the sinner is unclean and unwashed. The sinner is filthy and all of his righteousnesses are as filthy rags. And God said; **"neither wast thou washed"**. In this unclean condition there is none that pity the sinner to him any good. Verse 5 states; **"none eye pitied thee"**. It is recorded in ***Psalms 142:4; "I looked on my right hand, and beheld, but there was no man that would know me: refuge failed me; no man cared for my soul"***. Back in Ezekiel 16, verse 5, it is stated; **"but thou was cast out in the open field to the loathing of thy person"**. The unwashed, unpitied, and uncared for sinner is totally exposed. He is a loathsome individual. He is **"polluted in thine own blood"**. The sinner is in a terrible condition,

both helpless and hopeless.

But then there is the Saviour. In verse 6; **"I passed by thee, and looked upon thee, behold thy time was a time of love"**. It is always a time of love when the Saviour passes by. But note, the Saviour did not simply pass by. He said; **"Live!"** Just another reminder that Jesus came both to **"seek and to save"**. In verse 8 the Saviour shelters the sinner and in verse 9 the sinner is both washed and anointed. In verse 10 the sinner is clothed and in verse 11 and 12 **"girded"** for the service of the Lord. And also in verses 11 and 12 this individual who was by nature **"polluted in thine own blood"**, is now adorned with the ornaments of salvation. And it is said of this one who was delivered from the terrible condition of natural pollution; **"And thou renown went forth among the heathen for thy beauty: for it was perfect through my comeliness (glory, beauty, excellency) which I had put upon thee, saith the Lord God"**, verse 14.

What a wonderful picture we find in Ezekiel 16 of those who are saved by grace and grace alone.

DEATH

By Bill Lee

Webster's dictionary gives a very brief definition of the word "death". Death is defined simply as "the end of life". There have only been two, Elijah and Enoch, who have been exempt from death. Those two certainly are exceptions since "it is appointed unto man once to die". There will be others who will also be exempt from death; those living when Jesus Christ returns. These will not die, they will simply be changed.

But we all understand that death is basically the common lot of all mankind. I can think of nothing more common in the human experience than death. Death is no respecter of persons, for we see it in both young and old, rich and poor. Death is not limited to the sick and frail, for we see many in their prime and best of health who also experience death.

Just the mere thought or mention of death

ought to cause all to consider; "What then?" I know of no better question than these little words, "What then?" It is common for both saint and sinner to live their lives today as if they were guaranteed a tomorrow. Without a regard to future judgment or eternal consequence, people live day unto day, many not realizing that today is their last day. Their theme seems to be, **"eat, drink, and be merry, for tomorrow we shall die"**, as if death were the end of all things. It is certain that those who have already experienced death know far better than we that death is not the ultimate end. They know by experience, whether in glory or in torment, that there is something that follows physical death.

Several years ago as I was walking through a cemetery in Alabama, I noticed these words engraved on a very old headstone:

**"Remember friend as you pass by,
As you are now, so once was I.
As I am now, you soon must be,
Prepare for death, and follow me."**

In obvious response to these words someone had roughly scratched on the other side of the stone these words:

**"To follow you I will not consent,
Until I know which way you went."**

What a great blessing to know which way we are going when we leave this world. There are only two ways. One leads to eternal glory and the other leads to eternal death. The only way to be sure of the one that leads to glory is to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ.

Central Baptist Church Grenada, Mississippi

Our Church Covenant

As we trust we have been brought by divine grace to embrace the Lord Jesus Christ, and by the influence of His spirit to give ourselves up to Him, so we do now solemnly covenant with each other, that God enabling us, we will walk together in brotherly love, that we will exercise a Christian care and watchfulness over each other, and faithfully warn, rebuke, and admonish one another, as the case shall require; that we will not forsake the assembling of ourselves together, nor omit the great duty of prayer both for ourselves and for

others; that we will participate in each other's joys and endeavor with tenderness and sympathy, to bear each other's burdens and sorrows; that we will endeavor to bring up such as may be under our care, in the nurture and admonition of the Lord; and that we will seek divine aid to enable us to walk circumspectly and watchfully in the world-denying ungodliness and every worldly lust; that we will strive together for the support of a faithful evangelical ministry among us; that we will endeavor by example and effort to win souls to Christ; and through life amidst evil report and good report seek to live to the glory of Him who hath called us out of darkness into His marvelous light.

Adopted June 6, 1894

MANY SHALL COME

"There is a period known to God,
When all His sheep, redeem'd by blood,
Shall leave the hateful ways of sin,
Turn to the fold, and enter in.

At peace with hell, with God at war,
In sin's dark maze they wander far,
Indulge their lust, and still go on
As far from God as sheep can run.

But see how heaven's indulgent care
Attends their wanderings here and there,
Still hard at heel where'er they stray,
With pricking thorns to hedge their way.

Glory to God, they ne'er shall rove
Beyond the limits of His love;
Fenced with Jehovah's *shalls* and *wills*,
Firm as the everlasting hills.

The appointed time rolls on apace,
Not to *propose*, but to *call* by grace;
To change the heart, renew the will,
And turn the feet to Zion's hill."

Author Unknown

PATIENCE

By Kathryn Parrish

Great is His faithfulness,
Yea, exceeding great;
He will keep His promises-
None will He break;
My heart can safely trust in Him,
In my God, divine;
Completely I must yield to Him,
His will be done, not mine.

'Tis but mine to wait on Him,
Yea, wait patiently,
For He has promised to perform
A good work in me;
Let patience have her perfect work,
I must not fume or fret;
By His predestination,
I'll be victorious yet.

One day I'll soar above the clouds
Like an eagle on the wing,
Be higher than the angels,
As redemption's song I sing;
This earthly nature of my flesh,
Forever vanquished then,
Will not be there to plague me,
As life in heav'n begins.

Oh, when I see that glorious place
My Lord has gone to prepare,
When eyes have seen and ears have heard
All that awaits me there,
When I have seen
His nail-pierced hands
And His smiling face, so dear,
Then earth's little cares will fade away,
How small they will appear!



PRISON MINISTRY

One of the very important aspects of the Thailand Mission Work is the prison ministry. Each month Bro. Anond takes about four of the preachers/students and goes to a prison for services. Here they have broken up into groups after the general service for special instruction.



**PASTOR G. C. KELLY
AND
MISSIONARY WAYNE CAMP**

It was a real joy to be with Bro. G. C. Kelly and the Eddy Missionary Baptist Church, Sunday, October 1, 2006. Bro. Kelly and the church recently celebrated his 90th birthday. The church was organized in 1952 and Bro. Kelly has been the pastor during its entire existence.

I preached on their one hour radio broadcast from 8:00 AM to 9:00 AM. Then we went to the church building where from 9:30 to 11:00 AM. Then I preached in the 11:00 service. Some families in the church then served us a meal in the fellowship hall.

We returned for the evening service at 5:00 PM and I preached there after which they graciously served us another meal. It was truly an enjoyable and special day to be with this great man of God.

**The Grace Proclaimator & Promulgator
PO Box 876
Grenada, MS 38901-0876**

Non-Profit Org.
Presorted Standard
U. S. Postage Paid
Grenada, MS 38901
Permit No. 876