

Dear brother Robert Grove, (This is my third letter to Robert Grove, 8/30/05)

This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter dated June 28, 2005, (Postmarked Aug. 11, 2005). Your concluding statements were "Let us be 'peace makers'," "Let us keep the unity of the Spirit...", and "let us not forget that 'we are brethren.'"

I said in my first letter to you that I have a deep appreciation for your ministry, and I really meant that. I also indicated that I was approaching you as my "brother" who I believe is in error on the subject before us. I also indicated that because you are my brother in Christ, and if I really love you, I have an obligation to fulfill, and that is to point out your error (Lev. 19:17). If I do this in a proper Biblical manner then I will be "endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace" (Eph. 4:3). I hope you realize that I have been trying to be very careful and systematic in laying before you my initial concerns and findings. I also realize that there is very little in me to draw your respect. Therefore, I am primarily depending upon your spiritual love for the truth, in your evaluation of what I am saying.

I have not responded to the accusations that you have made that I automatically classify you brethren as being wrong simply because you haven't "lined up with my understanding," or that "I am unwilling to bend my opinion," or since "I didn't come to the new understanding first, I would have less value," or "since I am no longer leading I refuse to follow," or "I am sitting in the seat of the scornful," or I place myself as "the final judge and jury," or that "I am proud," because even if I was guilty of all these things, it would be a distraction from what I have set before you. I have honestly examined myself before God and I am not the issue! The truth that I have presented before you is the issue! The actual concluding words of your first letter were, "**Jack, do you have biblical reason to feel that the Holy Spirit is guiding you—and not us?** To which I answer, Yes! Listen please to the Biblical and factual reasons I have presented, and will present, on this particular subject.

"JEFF GROVE NON-PROFIT RELIGIOUS CORPORATION"

First of all you state in your recent letter an acceptance of the accuracy of my "research," but with qualifications—you say, "unless further research on my part or the part of brethren involved indicates different." Therefore, I would like to add to this "research" so we can be more concrete in settling this important aspect of the subject, if possible. In doing this I suggest strongly that you read your own *Incorporation papers*. If they are similar to those of Jeff Grove, and if all of the other "Ministries" are similar to those of Jeff Grove, then our joint research should be very conclusive. A few weeks ago I received a copy of Jeff's Incorporation papers from the IRS and they are, indeed, revealing on the question of the expression I used, "*Jeff Grove Nonprofit Religious Corporation.*" Consequently, I will quote from them. Here is a list of most of the major items I received:

- 1.) Form 1025, Application For Recognition of Exemption (9 pgs)
- 2.) Articles of Incorporation Of Jeff A. Grove Ministries (6 pgs)
- 3.) Bylaws of Jeff A. Grove Ministries (5 pgs)
- 4.) Letter of Jeff A. Grove (May 4, 2001) to the Internal Revenue Service, relative to Form 1023 Application For Recognition of Exemption. (2 pgs)
- 5.) Instructions from the Internal Revenue Service for Applicant (4 pgs)
- 6.) Certificate Of Incorporation by the State of Texas (1 pg)

Under the--

**"ARTICLES OF INCORPORATION
OF
JEFF A. GROVE MINISTRIES**

ARTICLE I, NAME

The name of the corporation is ***JEFF A. GROVE MINISTRIES***.

ARTICLE II,

The corporation is a ***nonprofit corporation***.

ARTICLE III, DURATION

The period of its duration is perpetual.

ARTICLE IV, PURPOSES

The purpose or purposes for which the corporation is organized are:

1. ***Religious purposes as defined in Section 501(c)(3)...*** (Bold italics mine)

Remember, the question researched was where did I get this description, "Jeff Grove, non-profit Religious Corporation," and/or "Who am I quoting from?" Well, I could have been quoting from Jeff himself, because that is precisely the language he is using in his Incorporation papers! ***Thus we have-- "Jeff A. Grove Ministries, nonprofit corporation (for) religious purposes."*** This is essentially identical as I stated in my letter of 6/18/05. Like I said, Robert, I first heard this terminology in the office of the two IRS lawyers back in 1961. They wanted us to form "some kind of *Nonprofit Religious Corporation*." In specific, they talked about the "*Ministry*" corporation. In addition, it was obvious they were using the language of the "*501(c)(3) Code*."

Once again under--

"BYLAWS

of

JEFF A. GROVE MINISTRIES

ARTICLE I

PRINCIPAL OFFICES AND PURPOSES

2. **Purposes,**

A. The ***Corporation*** has been created solely for religious purposes as a ***religious organization*** intended to qualify ***under Section 501(c)(3)...***
(Bold italics mine).

Thus we have again-- "Jeff A. Grove Ministries, religious organization and/or corporation."

Again Jeff wrote under--

"Jeff A. Grove Ministries

May 4, 2001

I have enclosed on behalf of ***Jeff A. Grove Ministries***, a Texas ***nonprofit corporation***...

The Organization is seeking recognition as a ***religious organization*** under ***S 501(c)(3)...***

I believe the responses in the Application ***clearly establish*** the Organization as a ***religious organization*** in satisfaction of the requirements..." (Bold italics mine).

Thus we have for a third time-- "Jeff A. Grove Ministries, nonprofit, religious corporation and/or organization"

1.) Now Robert, if this does not "***clearly establish***" that such a description as "Jeff Grove non-profit Religious Corporation," is **positively accurate** then you need to question your own language, and that of Jeff Grove, and that of all the other brethren, **because you brethren wrote these**

statements! apparently, in all your Applications for exemption! *I hope this will complete and finalize "our joint research."* This is the very same language we heard in 1961, and it is still being used by those seeking nonprofit incorporation status today.

2.) The next statement that you make is that this description "**is not accurate as stated here, as it is not complete**" (1st pg, 2nd par.). Of course anyone should know very well that as this description stands in these documents it is perfectly accurate and complete!! Tell me in which case in any of these documents I just quoted from above where this description is not, in and of itself, both "accurate" and "complete"???

3.) The next statement you make about this description is, *"that is not a description any of us use to describe what we are doing"* (same par. Italics mine). What do you mean "it is not a description any of us use to describe what you are doing."??? Jeff used it at least three times in his Application, as you see above, and it tells what you are doing!. You have ALL used it!!! **You had better use it**, or else the IRS would never have given you non-profit corporation status!!! That is the description they demand that you make in accordance with that tax code, and you, yourselves, carefully made it!

I am not going to try and second guess why you denied using this expression, when in reality every one of you used it! However, Robert, if what you meant was that you don't use that description before the brethren you minister to, or even among yourselves, then I would ask, why don't you??? "Taking support from the general public" certainly doesn't say much, if anything, about what you are doing. If the description above "Jeff Grove non-profit religious organization" is good enough for the IRS and the government that you want to "interface" with, why isn't it good enough for your brethren??? Does it, perhaps, subconsciously carry an unsavory implication??

4.) Perhaps this is another case (hard to believe, but possible) where you forgot to "**recall**" that you and the other ministering brethren have used this precise description yourselves.

"MAN-MADE RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATION"

Now the only thing we need to add to this description is the term "Man-made." As I stated in my second letter, we added "man-made" to this "Non-profit Religious Corporation" in order to distinguish it from that which is the "God-made Non-profit Religious Corporation," "the church which is Christ's body."

You acknowledge in your letter that "everyone knows that a corporation...is **authorized** by Caesar, and is **formed** by **men** and **directed** by men." (Emphases yours). In the case of the Jeff A. Grove Ministries, Jeff states, *"I (Jeff A. Grove) am the founder and President of the Organization."* And the documents state that Thomas E. Collins and Jack W. Hobson along with Jeff A. Grove form the *"Board of Directors,"* and also act as the *"Incorporators."* Of course, The State of Texas issued the *"Certificate of Incorporation."* No one should, therefore, doubt that this "Organization" is "Religious" and is "man-made," just like every other "man-made Religious Organization."

Thus we have conclusively proven, demonstrated and affirmed that such organizations as "Jeff A. Grove Ministries" have identified with and joined the lists of all the other "MAN-MADE RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATIONS." Of course, we all know that there is a great variety of these organizations, and they all have a variety of sub-classifications, but they all come under this very

same heading and description.

From 1961 on we have used the expression "Man-made non-profit religious organization," or simply, "man-made religious organizations" to designate the general religious inventions of men in contradistinction to that Divine organization that Christ is building in this Age of Grace. And furthermore, this has never changed meanings for the last 40 or more years—that is until your last letter, second page, 4th paragraph. Here you are trying to answer my charge, that when such statements are made, and are written on the back of your own tracts that we hand out, that "'We are not building any man-made religious organization,' it amounts to a lie, because you are, in fact, building the 'man-made religious organizations' called 'Ministries.'" You answer this by saying, "In the statements you are quoting most of us would understand 'man-made religious organization' is being used as a synonym for a man made church having members, and/or causing division among Christians." In other words, you no longer mean "Ministries" by these statements, only "churches."

But in the very same breath you admit, "This is not the way the words religious or organization are being used in the tax code—as churches are a specific sub-category and there are many other types of organizations."

Furthermore, Robert, these tracts have been printed and distributed by the hundreds of thousands to the general public, who only go by the common definition of words, or by the standard understanding of the tax code and the civil government. And I am quite sure you are not spending your time running around to all of these hundreds of thousands of people and telling them, "now don't misunderstand me, I am not talking about 'Ministries' but only churches having members, and/or causing divisions."

Since the major part of this statement, as being used by us; (a) originated in the tax office of two IRS lawyers; (b) and since it is clearly understood by the government and IRS department who have employed the original terms in reference to the 501(c)(3) tax code; (c) and since that very code is still very much in effect today; (d) and since they have not changed the meaning of its terminology in the least; (e) and since it has been used by us for the last 40 or more years without changing meaning; (f) and since it is generally understood by the very definition of words; *as to mean any type of religious organization*, and not merely churches; (g) and since you are not trying to chase down all the hundreds of thousands of people we have handed out those tract to, and carefully explain to them what you really mean; then, Robert, your argument falls flat. For the overwhelming majority of people who read these statements, it amounts to a lie!

I know it is handy for us to re-define words when those words get us into trouble but, since your name is not WEBSTER, and since you did not originate the 501(c)(3) Tax Code, and since you are not the author of the expression, we must go by the generally accepted **rules** of language and law and circumstances, and consequently say with confidence that these statements amount to LIES!!! At the very least, Robert, you will have to admit that hundreds of thousands of people, who don't have the benefit of your unique definition (it is the first time I have ever heard it in my life), have been given the wrong impression. But certainly you know, as well as I do, that most Christians among us haven't connected the "Ministries" as "man-made religious organizations," simply because you have never talked about them as "man-made religious organizations." But the truth of the matter is—that is **precisely** and **exactly** what they are!! by their basic definition!!

I knew that statements like these of "not being a part of man-made religious organizations" or "not being a part of anything man-made in religion" have been on our tracts, and have been preached from our pulpits for years and years. Never one time has there ever been such a qualification, as you have mentioned, that I have any recollection of. When precisely did this change of definition or use come, Robert?? Can you document this??

And now being faced with the dilemma of what to do about the fact that the ministers are now building "man-made religious organizations," you argue that we don't mean "Ministries" when we use these words today. However, is that what you told the IRS when you filled out their forms for incorporation?? Not at all! In fact when you filled out those forms you emphasized that this non-profit "religious organization" is positively "*NOT A CHURCH*" but a Ministry (Jeff's letter to the IRS of May 4, 2001, 1st pg, 3rd par.). In fact, you wanted this emphasized in that paper. Here are the exact words, "The Organization is seeking application as a *religious organization* and not as *a church*." (Italics mine). But then you turn right around and face your Christian audience and say the very same thing, with the added "man-made" in front of "religious organization," and explain, "We don't mean our 'Ministries,' Why of course, we mean '*A CHURCH*,' such as causes division." Robert, I am grieved, because we both know that even the world has choice words for this kind of "doubletalk."

In your first letter you also stated rather emphatically, "you can continue saying '*Tom is a part of something man made in religion...*'—it is your choice. However, remember that saying it doesn't make it a fact." Now, Robert, with all of our "research" completed, we can both go on saying "*Tom IS a part of something man made in religion,*" because it absolutely is "a fact," and furthermore, it would be a LIE to deny this or to say otherwise! And, furthermore this is true regardless of how a few would choose to understand the meaning of "man-made in religion."

When it first began to dawn on me that ministering brethren were still making these very strong statements about "man-made religious organizations" in their messages, I wondered how in the world are they exempting themselves?? They are now adopting "man-made religious organizations" just as those in sectarianism. These are among the little "religious corporations," of course, but never-the-less the same thing. To one younger person who faced me with the fact that we have now allowed Incorporation with the State religiously, I said rather cautiously that it was only "Ministries" and not "churches." And they responded simply, "twiddle-de, twiddle-dum." And, in the honesty of my heart I had to say, "you're right!"

Thus I brought it up in my first letter. Your letter of response to me indicated that ministering brethren don't regard themselves as "non-profit Religious Organizations." Such a description is "not true" of their corporations. They are in a different category you argued. And furthermore, you indicated this would not be "legally accurate." Where in the world did I ever come up with that description? you asked. Who am I quoting? etc.

I will honestly say that my first thoughts about these responses that you made was, "Great!! Robert must have found some kind of incorporation that doesn't have the stigma and unbiblical implications of a man-made Religious Organization." But then, I scratched my head and thought, "but, how can that be??!!" As I began to research the facts, Robert, the sad reality unfolded that you were misrepresenting the truth of the matter! And what is sadder still, is the fact that, even with your

admissions, you are really still doing it! And you are only making more contradictions!

"RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATIONS"

The next step you take in your arguments is actually a natural one, and a "must" if you are going to maintain your position that creating these "Ministries" was the right thing to do—you say, "**It was not** our goal to avoid...(being) classif(ied) as a *religious* corporation." (2 pg. 1st par.). And again, "whether the corporations are identified by the IRS as *religious* because they are funding religious activities and religious teaching *is not the issue*." (2nd par., Italics mine). So, in the final analysis, it really does not make any difference to you whether or not they are "religious" in the first place! In other words, "man-made religious organizations" are no offense to you, unless they are "churches." Apparently "Churches" are the only real bad, unbiblical things among all of the varieties of "man-made religious organizations."

I can't help but be curious, Robert—what about all the other many varieties of "man-made religious organizations" that are not classified as "churches"???? Are they in some kind of limbo? How would you answer that!! In fact, what about all of the other varieties of "Ministry" corporations? Are they all O.K., like Billy Graham's?? Or, are they all bad, except the ones that you brethren have created??? Really, out of consistency, you must answer that. And on what basis are they good or bad?? Is it only if they have membership, and/or are causing division somehow?? Are we now going to go to the garbage can of "man-made religious organizations" and dig around and be selective of what is good and bad??

"SENSES EXERCISED TO DISCERN BOTH GOOD AND EVIL" (Hebrews 5:14)

Actually this position of not abhorring all the "religious" creations of man is a natural consequence of your earlier position of rejecting any value of the "body of Christ" as a "Divine corporation," as it relates to this subject. "All of the discussion about the church being a corporation really isn't relevant," you said. And now, on the other hand, a "religious" creation is not offensive to you! The "body of Christ as a corporation" has no *relevance* to this subject, and now somehow "man-made Religion" is not necessarily *irreverent* in your mind as well!

Robert, I firmly believe that if you, for one second, saw the relevancy of the truth about Christ's body as a "Divine corporation," you would have no problem whatsoever in totally abhorring any man-made religious creation. You would see the truth in the Bible of the "embodiment of Jesus Christ" in the world today as an all encompassing reality (not just a figure of speech) and then recognize that there is nothing that the natural man can create in religion that does not infringe upon that wonderful all-incompassing creation of God. Christ has embodied Himself in His people to form one MAN or Person (not an artificial person, but a real person) so that this Body does not act and speak of themselves, as individuals who compose the body, but singularly of Christ! To one who believes this TRUTH of GOD is **practical**, must believe it is also **applicable** to this issue.

In addition, the church of Jesus Christ has a "ministry," and it is a *vital* to the church. If creating an "artificial" church is sin, then most certainly creating an "artificial" Ministry, which is *vital* to the church of Christ, is a sin as well. You can't have a church without a ministry! and you can't have a ministry without a church! I say again, If creating an artificial church is wrong, then

creating an artificial ministry is wrong as well, because the ministry is a *vital part* of the church! You can't have one without the other! You say you don't want to create a CHURCH, but then you turn around and create A PART of a church—the Ministry. Apparently, you don't realize that if this is alright to do, then it follows that creating A WHOLE church is alright as well!

As I indicated in my very first letter to you, the reason Maurice M. Johnson and the other ministering brethren would never change their position, is precisely based on these two spiritual principles. When the IRS proposed the 501(c)(3) solution, we totally abhorred, on the one hand, any kind of "man-made Religious organization," and on the other hand we presented "the church which is Christ's body corporation " as our solution! In Hebrews it says that believers need to have "their senses exercised to discern GOOD and EVIL," It is a fact that when a believer fails to discern the relevance of the "good," it follows that he will not see the irreverence of the "evil" either. This was the whole spiritual basis for the original Tax Case. I am quite confident, no one in their right mind, who knew the brethren back then, would ever conclude that they would change this fundamental spiritual basis in order to accommodate some mere accumulation of funds!

"IDOLATRY"

I have already indicated that in avoiding creating a "church" you ran smack into a form of "idolatry." This apparently has not yet registered in your thinking. Allow me to prove it to you from the Word of God.

The word "idolatry" comes from two Greek words, *eidolon* (idol) meaning **form**, and *latreia* meaning **service**. (See W.E. Vine's Expository Dictionary, and/or Webster's Unabridged Dictionary). Now first of all **form** simply meant "an idol," not the real thing but, "an image, a form, a specter, an apparition, a phantom, etc." We could easily and properly add another synonym—"something artificial." Idols were also defined as "man-made, false, pretended, unnatural, fake, unreal," etc. But then to this artificial man-made creation is brought "**service**" as to religious adoration of some kind. Now Robert, I know you are not going to like this, but just watch and see how you have added Divine "religious service" to these man-made, artificial "Ministry" corporations. To add "religious purpose or *service*" to a "man-made form or *idol*" constitutes "IDOLATRY"!!

Number 1.) Shortly after saying that these Ministries are "formed by **men** and directed by **men**" (page 2, 3rd par.) you add, "The activities are religious, but in our case unknown to the IRS it is about the *'true religion and undefiled before God and the Father.'*" In other words, you are attributing to your "artificial," "man-made ministries" the *"true religion and undefiled before God."* But the Biblical reality is that *"the true religion and undefiled before God"* has absolutely nothing whatsoever to do with "man-made, artificial ministries," but only with the magnificent "Church which is Christ's body." Robert, Brother Johnson and others used to say this is "PARASITE" language. Religious teachers do it all the time. They draw out, borrow and attribute Divine religious qualities to their artificial creation! That is exactly what you did in that statement! And this is precisely what idolatry is all about!

Number 2.) "The Organization is seeking recognition as a religious organization under 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code... **The Organization has been formed to facilitate the preaching and beliefs of the Church which is Christ's body.**" (Jeff Grove, Letter to the IRS, dated May, 4, 2005, with the incorporation papers, emphasis mine). Again, brother Maurice Johnson would use

the expression, this is "PARASITE" language! There is no "man-made Ministry" on the face of this whole earth that can "facilitate the preaching and beliefs of the Church which is Christ's body." By reading the Bible we came to see that The God-ordained, and Divinely equipped "ministry" that began on the day of Pentecost and will continue until the rapture, is set within the Body of Christ, **and is the only organization formed to facilitate the preaching and beliefs of the Church which is Christ's body.** Anything else that man creates and then says they can do this is but a form of idolatry. You are attributing to a man-made creation the attributes and work of the Divine creation.

Number 3.) Same letter, (last par.) "**The Organization has been formed to facilitate these teachings and religious practices on behalf of the Church which is Christ's body...**" In reality God already has a beautiful and vital organization to facilitate the teachings and practices of the Church which is Christ's body. To attribute this Divine work to an artificial corporation is Idolatrous.

Number 4.) The whole creation of the "artificial person," the "Ministry Corporation," is summed up in the "ARTICLES OF INCORPORATION"-- "ARTICLE IV PURPOSES" "The purpose or purposes for which the corporation is organized are: 1. **Religious purposes** as defined in Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code." Hence, we have the man-made creation (the form or *eidolon*) for Religious services (for service-*latreia*), hence, *idolatry*.

We have said, and heard it said, many times in the ministry of the truth, that there is as much idolatry in the world today as there ever was in past centuries. People don't recognize it today because their senses are not exercised to discern good and evil, in the light of God's Word. Today it comes in different "forms," such as "man-made religious organizations or corporations," "church buildings," "denominational institutions," "Seminaries," all kinds of "Ministries," "icons," "Crosses," "beads," "statues," etc, etc, etc. Man has never changed in his efforts to create artificial things and attribute "Religious value" or "religious service" to them. When we tell people this or that is idolatry they are shocked, because they didn't realize it, and usually they refuse to believe it. Need I go further?

As I mentioned previously, brother Tom Collins has recently stated, "In the last days there is going to be apostasy...**man-made religion!** They are all joined up in **something, somewhere, somehow!** And yet there are Christians in these organizations that are endeavoring to serve the Lord...but what they are in *greatly hinders them!*" These artificial religious organizations created and invented by man don't "facilitate" the truth of the gospel of Christ, nor the practice of the Church of Jesus Christ for one second. Rather they add confusion. As I demonstrated in my letter to Bob Harrison, by the creation of these Ministry Corporations you have very effectively destroyed the testimony of "the Church which is Christ's Body," as testified to in the Tax Case. And now what to do with statements in most of our literature we must eventually determine as well.

"MEMBERS or MEMBERSHIP"

How many times has this "membership" argument been put forward as the determining factor for what is objectionable or not! When I first heard your presentation in 2002 brother Jim Maurer was careful to tell me repeatedly that there is no "membership" in these Ministry corporations as if that made them OK. But I thought to myself that there has to be some kind of "membership" or else there can't be a "body." Any kind of a collective body has to have "parts" to compose the body. I

thought to myself that the term "member" must be used in two different senses in the legal terminology. When I saw more of your arguments in writing, I thought it is time for some "research." And sure enough, I found that "members" and "membership" as they relate to corporations are used in two different senses.

First of all, there are the "formal Membership Corporations." Many of the older denominations used to have formal membership corporations. However, that is rarely done anymore as it is too burdensome and cumbersome in the normal functioning of the organizations. The problems created when you have to wait or arrange for all the members to be present in order to conduct business, or to elect new officers, or to choose a new direction of activities, became discouraging for the operation of the corporations. Now, very few religious organizations including churches use the formal "membership organization." Most churches have a simple "board of directors" type corporation with no "formal membership." So "membership" churches are no longer a common description of the sectarian church corporations.

However, by no stretch of the imagination does this mean that the rest of the nonprofit religious corporations don't have "members" and/or "membership." Because in place of the "formal membership" is the normal "membership" of the board of directors who constitute the corporation and run the organization. There is therefore, the board of directors "membership," whose "members" direct the affairs of the organization. For instance, Tom Collins, Jack Hobson and Jeff Grove are named as the "INCORPORATORS" of the Jeff A. Grove Ministries. The official and legal definition of "incorporator" is, "A *member* of a corporation, One of the persons who are the original organizers or promoters of a new corporation." (Black's Law Dictionary, Seventh Edition, and the reason I quote from this is simply because it is the standard in the legal field). The rest of the dictionaries give the same definition; "incorporator, a *member* of a corporation." "incorporator, the *member* that incorporates," "incorporator, A *member* or stockholder of a corporation," etc.

Thus, in the library, I picked up a book devoted just to the "Nonprofit Corporation" field, and in particular, turned to the "Religious Nonprofit" section. For those organizations that were not the formal Membership corporations it used the words "**members**" and "**membership**" of the organization, or of the board of directors repeatedly. "**Members**" is commonly used to describe the Officers in these organizations.

In addition to this, and serving as an example, are the incorporation papers of the Jeff A. Grove Ministries. I counted the word "*members*" of the organization used three times, "*members*" of the governing body or board of directors used some four times, and "*membership*" of the directors used twice. That is a total of approximately nine times in your own organizational papers the term "**members**" or "**membership**" is used.

So, saying that there are "*three members*" to these "ministry corporations" is not at all inaccurate, nor does one thereby "*show his ignorance*" in saying that. Your own incorporation papers say it! The fact that you are not a formal "Membership Corporation" does not for one moment extract your organizations from having its "*members*."

Therefore, once again, an argument like this crumbles!

Here is what I believe we can concluded from my last two or three letters:

- 1.) These "Ministries" are properly designated as "Non-profit Religious Organizations."
- 2.) These "Ministries" are properly designated as "man-made religious organizations."
- 3.) To attribute *religious* value or "service" to the "man-made religious organizations" is to participate in a common modern form of "*idolatry*."
- 4.) Our ministers are "*Officers*" in, and "*members*" of, two different religious organizations. On the one hand—the "church which is Christ's body," and on the other hand—the "Ministry, man-made Religious Organizations."
- 5.) To say our present ministers considered "new laws," not the "old laws," is false. The brethren in 1961-2 and in 1999 gave consideration to the very same 501(c)(3) Code.
- 6.) The creation of these "Ministries" effectively destroyed the 1962 Tax Case testimony. In addition, it compromises our stand against "man-made religious organizations."
- 7.) This is not merely a departure from the "old paths," it is a departure from "The Truth."

Your brother in Christ,

Jack Langford
8/30/05

Copies to John Morey
and Bob Harrison