

March 13, 2006, *from Jack W. Langford*

To my Christian Brethren,

A SUMMARY ANALYSIS of the "Ministry" Corporation subject:

It would be in order at this time to write a summary analysis of the major factors discussed in this exchange of letters between me and brothers Robert Grove and Bob Harrison. It is proper to make such a summary conclusion because enough facts have been brought to light, and established, that any unbiased person, who has had honest questions, should be able to see what has actually happened and be able to make an enlightened judgment for himself. Especially is this true if one realizes the *relevancy* of the Word of God on the issues discussed. Of course, this summary analysis is going to be from my perspective. That necessitates an awareness that such a report had better be in fairness and accuracy, for our Lord Jesus Christ has said, "For with what judgment you have judged, you will be judged" (Matt. 7:2).

In this connection I will state another interesting fact of history, which many brethren may not know. It is apropos at this time. When we won the Tax case in 1962 the Federal Judge allowed us the opportunity to write the final chapter in that case testimony—the "FINDING OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND JUDGMENT" (pgs. 330-334 of the Tax Case book). Yes, it seemed good in the Judge's eyes to allow us this privilege. So it can be said that *we actually wrote the Law on the matter!!* Of course, realizing that the judge would exercise the final scrutiny of our paper, Dalford, Maurice Johnson and others used every attentiveness to be fair and just, but at the same time factual and in line with the Judge's own decision. When that paper was submitted to the Judge, he made only a very few minor changes, and then signed our document into JUDGMENT.

Now, I am going to once again be quoting from a brief portion of that "Finding of Fact, Conclusion of Law and Judgment," and make a minor addition myself, which I believe is very accurate and conclusive in light of the present factors that have surfaced in these letters. Thus, the original "Finding of Facts, Conclusion of Law and Judgment," with a few minor additions in *bold*, will also serve as a preliminary, concise summary to the present situation as well.

"3. The church members have refrained from adopting a denominational name, *or creating a Ministry corporation*, and any written organizational guide supplementary to the New Testament because they believe that to do so would be to add an arbitrary gloss to Biblical precepts, thus obscuring the Word of God. Adherence to their philosophy binds the members together in an *organized association* within the meaning and contemplation of Section 23 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 and Section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, *and of Section 501(c)(3) of the 1954 Code that was activated in 1959.*"

As was discussed in my previous letter, the 501(c)(3) was only presented as an obstacle if the Judge were to rule in favor of the broader definition of "incorporation" (which he did). Of course this section was not in effect at the time the contributions were made, nevertheless as an "unincorporated association," the Judge postulated that we satisfied the 501(c)(3) code since we did not operate with extensive reserves, and needed no "dissolution statement."

THE SUBJECT OF THE DISCUSSION

Accurately stated, the subject of these letters has been the creation of nonprofit Religious Organizations called "Ministries." These creations involved incorporation with the State of "Religious Organizations," modeled after the requirements and organizational specifications in the IRS documentation. These organizations required "Their own Distinctive Identifying Names," "The Articles of Incorporation," "Bylaws," "Application for Recognition of Exemption—Form 1023," with its "Activities and Operational Information," "Technical Requirements," and a "Sub-filing as Not a Private Foundation," and "Financial Data," and its own "Board of Directors," etc. In addition, in order to receive guaranteed tax deduction status these Religious Corporations must qualify as active, living, working, service organizations, providing a variety of religious instructions, and counseling, and other activity to a specific element in society.

THE PURPOSE OF THESE RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATIONS

These religious creations were initially made for a twofold purpose— First, in order to facilitate receiving tax deductions from the Internal Revenue Service on contributions made to the individual ministers in "the Church which is Christ's body," without fear of being challenged by the IRS; Secondarily, this was also done to receive tax deductions on monies channeled through these "Ministry" organizations for actual donations to the general local church functioning and overall operations (again, without fear of challenge by the IRS).

However, when these organizations were created a sinister Third purpose becomes obvious to anyone who reads the Incorporation Documentation. In this Third purpose these "Ministries" are now overlapping into the *functional operation* of a local church congregation, and in some cases even to a plurality of congregations. What is meant by "functional operation"? If we are to believe all that is clearly spelled out in the Incorporation Documentation, then all the ministry and service activities coordinated and rendered on behalf of the particular group of Christians involved (called, "the church which is Christ's body") are actually performed by this man-made Religious Organization. In this regard, and to this extent, certain of the local assemblies are now *functioning* under what becomes the "Distinctive Identifying Name" and the spiritual management of the particular "Ministry" corporation involved. In other words, these local churches are no longer operating either financially or in spiritual management, "only in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ," as generally advertised. Nor are these local assemblies "only building the church which is Christ's body," as also generally advertised.

See as an example the leading statement on "Bibletruths.org."—"These Bible truths are shared with you by Christians who meet and work only in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. We are not building any man-made religious organization." Now both of these statements are very clear and forceful professions of our historical testimony. However, both Robert Grove and Bob Harrison have admitted in writing (with obvious pain and strain) that they are in fact building "man-made Religious Organizations," with the "Distinctive Identifying Names" of the various Ministries. Therefore we must conclude that many local churches in our association are now operating, not only from a financial perspective, (and potentially from a property perspective as well), but also from a spiritual management perspective, in the name of and under the auspices of a *particular designated man-made "Ministry, Religious Organization."*

However, unlike most religious Ministry Organizations in the world who proudly advertise their organizations, our ministers do not post the name of their corporations on their signs in front of meeting places, nor do they place the Corporation Names on letterhead, or generally advertise their existence in any literature or tracts. Like Christians who hide their TVs in the closet, many only pull the "Religious Organization" out when they are alone with Caesar.

In addition, and in reality, and as far as Caesar is concerned, these man-made "Ministry" organizations are the *real controlling Corporations* that Caesar sees and is interfacing with, and under which Christians (being led) are now choosing to operate as local assemblies.

In addition, we see that these creations manifest the essence of the sectarian (choosing) spirit, by which men set aside the relevance of the Word of God and *choose* the arrangement of certain of their activities by their own human devices and inventions. They have actually created the very Religious Monsters that we have historically and Biblically abhorred! This amounts to another form of "denominationalism." In these cases the local assemblies involved are "De-nominated" in their financial and spiritual management activities by the "Distinctive Identifying Names" of the local Ministry Corporations. Though this is never advertised publicly (certain rare and conscientious small sects never openly advertise their corporations and corporation names, either), nevertheless, it is the factual reality according to the Corporation Documentation.

MY PURPOSE IN WRITING

Consequently these letters, from my perspective, were also for a twofold purpose. *First of all*, the purpose of expressing my disapproval, or rather what I believe is God's disapproval, of these efforts to Religiously Incorporate with the State and thus create man-made Religious Organizations that are not authorized from the Word of God, and which do, in fact, supplant the Word of God on the subject. *Secondly*, initially I needed to discover more carefully just exactly what was in the mind and thinking of my ministering brethren to justify these creations! In this second area of my concern I was originally willing to accept the fact that perhaps I could be wrong, and that my brethren had additional information or biblical reasons of which I was not aware. Thus, I was perfectly willing to give full and honest consideration to their reasoning and to test it, both in the light of the Word of God, and in the light of secular information available on the subject. The fact that all the leadership, and in turn most all in the congregations, willingly accepted this new arrangement, should not have a stifling effect upon any honest investigation encouraged by God's Word.

I did not write these letters as an infallible "know it all" but rather as one, who himself has been stricken by serious mistakes, and who, therefore, realizes the subtle ways of the Devil to divert our concentration from the Head of the church. To think that I am the only one who can be "sifted like wheat" would indeed be a fatal miscalculation. Nor did I write these letters in order to win some kind of "popularity contest," or to "save face" from a past ministry. I knew, even before I put my pen to the paper, that I was seriously in danger of not going to be winning any friends or respect, especially from those in leadership. Had I complimented them in what they were doing, no doubt I could have been raised a notch or two in their eyes. In criticizing them I was certainly sticking my neck out and bracing for analizations that were most unbecoming to me personally and to my situation. So, in one sense, in writing these letters, I felt I must be willing to sacrifice my self-respect on behalf of those in leadership. (Of course, I couldn't go any farther down in standing in their thinking, than where I already was, so probably this worked to my advantage in allowing me to speak rather frankly in some places).

However, I do love my ministering brethren, and I do appreciate their ministry, especially in the areas of the home and family, and I do owe to them my expressions of concern if I see that they are in serious error. I am not writing as one who is opposed to their ministry, but as one who is appreciative of their ministry and service to me and to the saints we know.

From the perspective of Robert Grove and Bob Harrison, by receiving these letters and by addressing them and responding to them, they have allowed me to unburden a responsibility I felt I had before God. Therefore, I am thankful to them for this opportunity to at least hear my concerns and warnings. And I feel I am relieved of a duty that was burdening my own heart. I am free, therefore, in the performance of an obligation to the Lord Jesus Christ, and to my brethren. I have delivered my message! My "day" in court and their "day" in court is coming, for sure (I Corinthians 3:13). Christ will judge according to His Word—and we have that Word right now!

KEEPING THE UNITY OF THE SPIRIT

It has been projected that since I am not together with the majority of my brethren on these matters, therefore, I am not "keeping the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace" as exhorted in Ephesians 4:3. In answer to that accusation I will point out that Ephesians 4:1-6 is not just talking about unity itself, but a very particular and special kind of unity. Therefore, before one automatically refuses my appeal, please at least give consideration to the kind of *Unity* Ephesians 4 is talking about, and then find out if that is my endeavor.

Unity by itself, has always been a very important ingredient in the world. Even Satan recognizes its power and persuasive potential. Therefore Satan has often inspired men to be in Unity against God—as in the Tower of Babel account in Genesis 11. This will also manifest itself in the last days as united rebellion nationally against God (Rev. 20:7,8). Likewise, in sectarian denominationalism they demand Unity, and speak of its virtues in keeping their organizations together. To the degree that carnal, compromising Christians are involved in sectarianism they too demand Unity, and extol its virtues—in their carnal walk of disobedience against Christ's will in their lives. Oh, yes, how beautiful and thrilling large "unity" rallies can be in modern Christendom. And yet, I and others have often stood on the outside of these gatherings, and passed out literature and endeavored to talk to believers about the "One True Church" of our Lord Jesus Christ. Most often we are viciously attacked and accused as not keeping unity and only causing trouble and divisiveness.

Of course, as I said above, we recognize from the Scriptures that the "unity" designated for believers is a very particular kind of unity. Actually Eph. 4:3 has nothing whatsoever to do with being together with a crowd, or united in numbers. Strange as it may seem, individually, we sometimes might be the only person, in the midst of a vast crowd that is professing unity, who is really "endeavoring to keep the *unity of the Spirit* in the bond of peace!" Since this "unity" in Eph. 4:3 is qualified by "of the Spirit," we know, therefore, that this is a *unity* that derives from the Holy Spirit of God. There is none other like it on earth. It stands unique! The Holy Spirit has given us the "inspired" Word of God. When we are in *agreement* with the inspired TRUTH in the Word of God, then we will be in agreement with every other brother who is in agreement with those same inspired TRUTHS. Consequently, the next statement is highly important—

One must never compromise or sacrifice TRUTH in order to gain Unity, for then that "unity" is not the "unity of the Spirit."

To thus be in agreement with the Spirit's Word and the Spirit's revelation about our Lord Jesus Christ is the "endeavor" that every believer is obligated to make. This alone qualifies as the "*unity of the Spirit!*" And quite often it may mean that we must stand alone in the midst of a crowd.

As an example, the very first statement of fact in the "*keeping the unity of the Spirit*" is the revelation that "There is One Body" (verse 4). That Body, of course, is "the church which is Christ's body." Now, if in a group of brethren there is unity in the contention that there are other functioning "Religious Bodies" made by man which Christians should observe and implement in their functioning together, and one brother stands up and opposes this, who is actually "*keeping the unity of the Spirit*"? Is it the group that is in *unity*? Or is it the man who is in keeping with the Spirit's teaching that is actually observing "*the unity of the Spirit*"? Of course it is the latter. A man, therefore, may not be in unity with a group, but in perfect *unity with the Spirit*.

What a person needs to determine, therefore, before he can know whether or not a brother is "endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit" is, what is the truth of the Spirit's Word! When one has the truth of the Spirit's Word, and is willing to walk in it, it will become a burning fire in his breast, and he will want to share it. In addition he will become bold in its defense. Consequently, "Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty" (II Cor. 3:17). I knew I had spiritual liberty and a spiritual obligation to my brethren. Thus, in writing these letters my soul was stirred repeatedly by the precious truths from the Word of God, and in remembrance of the victorious events in the past testimony before our civil government and before sectarian brethren.

I have no doubt whatsoever that the vast majority of my Christian brethren in these local assemblies, in which I have lived and ministered, have little or no realization of the serious implications of this subject matter. This is primarily true because careful public scrutiny of the matter has been kept from them. This being stated, I will now launch into a summery annalization of the situation, as I see it, and as it unfolded to me.

RED FLAGS !

- Because of my early involvement in the Tax case testimony, the first "red flag" went up the moment I heard the ministering brethren were incorporating with the State some sort of non-profit organizations for tax exemption purposes. If there ever was an area, I thought, that was well established, it was most certainly in the area of not incorporating religiously with the State in order to receive tax exemption. I was shocked, almost to the point of unbelief, to hear there had been a change in their outlook on this subject. I wondered, "What in the world could it be?"
- The second "red flag" went up at the meeting where Robert Grove was presenting their conclusions as to why they are creating certain organizations recognizable by the IRS for tax deduction purposes. Robert Grove repeatedly separated the ministering brethren from the rest of the church by diagrams and reasonings so as to incorporate "Ministries" in order to be recognized by the IRS and to therefore receive tax deductions without fear from the IRS. I knew instinctively from the Word of God that one cannot so manipulate the real "ministry" and organize or incorporate it aside from the "body of Christ."

- Another "red flag" went up at this meeting when I remembered that we had specifically rejected forming "ministry" corporations back in 1961, and were thus propelled into the Tax Case testimony. Apparently Robert didn't know that fact of history.
- Another "red flag" went up after this meeting when I realized these creations would contradict statements on our tracts, such as "Should Christians Incorporate With The State," which tract was right before us on the tract rack.
- Another "red flag" went up when I told Robert of the IRS offer to form "ministries" and the lawyer used Billy Graham as the example. And Robert responded by telling me he had actually written to the Billy Graham organization to get their incorporation papers, and that our "Ministries" are now in the very same category as the Billy Graham organization. With that disclosure the "red flag" began to "wave."
- The final "red flag" went up, and began to "wave vigorously," when I asked for copies of the material Robert presented either in the form of copies of the charts or copies of the taped message. Robert answered that there would be none available or handed out under any circumstances. I was dumbfounded to say the least. Those brethren said they spent "years" studying this subject and now they expect some of us to swallow it in an hour! Robert explained that he didn't want any law suits. (That answer, at least two years after 1999, most certainly, does not satisfy an honest inquiry, to say the least).

I heard later that the reason Jim Maurer came to that particular presentation of Robert Grove was to be a check on me in case I was to get "out of hand." Thank you, brother Jim.

Robert Grove, Jim Maurer and I discussed the subject for a little while at the back of the auditorium. Tom Collins was passing by and heard some of the conversation, and interjected that he would be willing to discuss this issue further with me at a later date. I thanked Tom and said that I would be waiting for the time of his convenience. *Of course, it never came!*

Probably, it was about a year later that I asked Tom in his office, in the presence of other brethren in leadership in the Fort Worth area, about his promise to discuss this issue with me and his failure to do so. Tom's response was "*Jack, you should have known I would never discuss that issue with you; I'm no match for you on this issue!*" Of course, I wasn't looking for a "match" on the issue, I was simply looking for more complete answers as to why they did what they did. Perhaps I should have thanked Tom for finally letting me know what he really meant, but quite frankly, I was disappointed to say the least.

In other words, for me there would be no opportunity of checking up on this action. They all knew I wanted to get answers! I also realized that there was no spirit in them to give answers to one who was knowledgeable on the subject.

This tells me that there is something WRONG on the face of it! So if one was to wonder why it took me so long to openly challenge the issue, now you know. However, the time finally came over the representation concerning Maurice Johnson made by Robert Grove in his notes on Alan Hemenway's "Preserving our Heritage" letter, when I challenged it openly and boldly in a personal letter to brother Robert Grove (see my first letter).

USE OF DIVERGENT TERMINOLOGY

From the beginning of the letters I received in response, I picked up on their use of what I call "divergent terminology." This is the coinage of different words and phrases to describe something other than the standard recognizable descriptions that should be used. This has the effect of diverting one's attention from the specific point addressed. This is also a characteristic of people who are improperly defending a particular doctrine or action that has come under scrutiny. Robert used them in his letter and Bob Harrison was almost totally incomprehensible unless you learned his language. This has the effect of distracting one from an accurate recognition of important factors. Bob Harrison must think he is simplifying an issue when in reality He creates that other language which, if not accurate, becomes most certainly a distraction from the actual facts and conclusions you are investigating. These alternate descriptions can be very misleading and have the effect of placing a "guise" over the subject to bring a person to the wrong conclusion. For instance, please notice the following selected examples:

- 1.) In Robert's first letter and first sentence he said, *"I am sorry to be in receipt of your letter regarding the way most of us in ministry are currently handling funds..."* When I first read this, I thought, "What in the world is he talking about?" I had no question whatsoever regarding the way the ministry was handling funds! My whole letter was questioning the building of nonprofit Religious Corporations, and not how they were handling money! If I were to question how a minister was handling money it is implied that I believe he may be wrongfully using funds placed in his trust. If I had a question about how the ministry was handling money I would never have placed money in Robert's hands, nor in the hands of others in the ministry! This is a classic example of a "divergent statement," as it diverts attention from the real subject I was addressing. However, Robert used this divergent statement throughout his response. How to handle funds is only indirectly and remotely the issue.
- 2.) Same letter, same first page, *"...brethren in counsel and study together concluded that we could with a clear conscience, make a change in the way funds are handled."* Not really! What these brethren actually concluded was that they could Incorporate with the State a nonprofit Religious Organization that is not found in, nor authorized by, the Word of God! This divergent statement disguises that fact.
- 3.) On page 2, *"Where I feel that you err in this area is in that you fail to make a distinction between the corporation that Jesus Christ established and is The Head of and a corporation established by Caesar to enable human beings to conduct business."* Of course, I am not against, nor have I ever been against, nor were we in 1961 ever against, *"a corporation established by Caesar..to conduct business."* That is not even the issue! No one in their right mind would ever be against something like this! What we were against in the past, and what I am still against was expressly the **"Religious Incorporation by Caesar."** This man-made Religious Corporation stands in opposition and contrast to, and clashes with God's Divine Incorporation—"the church which is Christ's body," and the true "ministries" of that body.
- 4.) Same page, *"The corporation is a vehicle that can be used for a number of legitimate reasons by spiritually minded people."* Of course, this is true. I know of many, probably dozens, of

"spiritually minded" business men who have used the "corporation" vehicle. But this has nothing whatsoever to do with creating an "Artificial Religious Corporation," called a "Church" or a "Ministry." Divergent statements like this are blinding! And there is no one who is blinded any faster than the *very person* who continually uses this terminology! He literally sells himself on the issue, and he can become insensitive to correction.

5.) Page 4, "...does God's Word teach that the only way to handle funds in this dispensation that is acceptable to God is the way brethren of the past decided to do it at the time?" Of course, "how to handle funds" is only indirectly the subject under consideration. Building Artificial Religious Organizations is the subject specifically under consideration and this continued type of expression diverts one's attention from the true nature of the discussion.

6.) Then Robert says they were left with an important "decision: 1.) *either find a way to satisfy Caesar's right to know what that the money is used for—or 2.) we stop taking tax deductions for contributions.*" Now this implies, on the face of it, that operating as an "unincorporated association," as we were for those many years, was hiding from "Caesar's right to know what the money is used for." In response to this implication, I will borrow a phrase from Maurice Johnson (who would probably use it if he were here) and say, "this is a damnable lie!" As my documentation has proven, both we and many, many other churches operate that way, and Caesar is very happy with them! In no way, shape or form were we trying to impede Caesar's "right to know." The whole court case testified to the fact we wanted Caesar to know!

Then in the very same letter Robert tells us of the way they can "*satisfy Caesar's right to know what the money is used for*" was by filling under a sub-classification, so that, as far as Caesar is concerned, "**We could be providing feed for hungry quail.**" (Pg.8). Now isn't that a fine, honest, Christian way "to satisfy Caesar's right to know!!"

And in the very same context of describing this sub-classification Robert says, "The fact is that what is commonly called religious activities are not a prerequisite to being this type of corporation." (Of course it is a prerequisite to being a 501(c)(3) Nonprofit Religious Organization.) Thus Robert continually tried to disguise the "**religious**" nature of these corporations they are building. He did such an effective job in his first letter that I honestly thought, at first, he must have found some other type of corporation other than a non-profit "Religious Organization."

7.) Robert continuously talked about "*establishing an interface with Caesar,*" and being able to "*meet Caesar's criteria,*" and "*giving Caesar the oversight in handling money,*" But he never one single time called it what it was—allowing Caesar the right to create a man-made "Nonprofit Religious Organization." All of this is "divergent language" to bridge the gap between what really is Caesar's right, and what is NOT Caesar's right, and to hide the facts of what they were really doing! I do not know if Robert was doing this deliberately or unconsciously.

8.) Page 8, "*Possibly to help you see the point that a corporation is a business form that any of us can use to do any type of business...*" Once again, there never was a problem with a mere corporation for doing business. By not properly designating the type of corporation being discussed, the whole problem was effectively disguised.

Examples of Divergent Terminology from Bob Harrison

9.) Bob Harrison repeatedly refers to the non-profit Religious Organization as only "*the 501(c)(3)*," and never one single time, in the text of his first paper of 13 pages, by its actual and total identity. To never actually define in detail what he is talking about, in an important subject like this, but to only designate it by numbers is to effectively obscure the nature and character of the creation under discussion. It is, no doubt, true that a few people know what he is talking about in toto, but on the other hand most people would only have a vague idea. In addition, at the time I didn't know for sure if Bob meant this was a Religious creation or not. This was because at the time Robert Grove appeared to be in denial of that fact in his first letter to me.

10.) Creating the expression "**INDEPENDENT EXISTENCE**" as the definition of what was established in the court case of 1962 can be as befuddling as trying to sort out the differences between "**Position**," "**Key Issue**" and "**Stance**." When one focuses on these definitions he can easily be swept along and prevented from recognizing apparent contradictions in spiritual principles and realities that are otherwise described, unless he is alert. I am not saying Bob is deliberately trying to do this; I am saying this is the danger!

11.) He talks about having to use "*finesse*" in times past in order to qualify for tax exemption and then turns right around to use "*finesse, par-excellence*" in justifying the creation of these "Ministry Religious organizations," without ever really identifying them as such!

12.) He talks about the "*collective person*" having to properly "*interface*" with Caesar, and Caesar providing the "*501(c)(3)*" for this "*collective interface*," so that we will not have to "**UNDO**" the "*established fact of acknowledgement of independent existence*." But just in case you don't fully and immediately comprehend this menagerie of words, he explains further that the, "*Independent and equal (in the sense of autonomy) parties (in this case a portion of the Body of Christ and Caesar) may (but not must) enter into mutually acceptable arrangements*." In the end you look at all these words and wonder if you're really reading language from a purported Bible teacher, who is supposed to make things simple, or rather from some kind of science fiction writer who seems to enjoy placing puzzles in our brain.

Brother Harrison has some prize winning paragraphs to be sure. Quite frankly, it reminds me of a politician who was publicly fielding questions from some reporters and obviously seemed to enjoy hearing himself talk. A reporter asked him a simple question and the politician launched into a long explanation, by way of fancy rhetoric, and by the time he had decided to conclude his ballet of words he realized he had forgotten what the question was. So, pausing, he asked the reporter to briefly repeat the question. The reporter, having also been enthralled by the rhetoric, had a funny look on his face and said, "I don't know; I can't remember the question either." Of course, the audience was caught up in laughter! Something similar to this happen to me once [without the fancy rhetoric] and I was embarrassed and had to laugh at myself as well.

13.) The constant use of the expression "*this lifeless legal entity*" to describe what is in fact a "**living, vital, active Religious Organization**," is a classic example of the use of "**DIVERGENT TERMINOLOGY**" to disguise what in reality has been done! The IRS simply does not give tax exemption to "lifeless legal entities." This is actually a total misrepresentation!

14.) Bob states that the "501(c)(3)" *"demands the disclosure of the use of funds and the business interaction of the activity...to public and governmental scrutiny,"* and furthermore, *"this total disclosure is quite a bold stance..."* But this is not necessarily the "bold" truth! Robert Grove seems to think, as we remember, that a sub-classification might lead the government to think *"we could be providing feed for hungry quail."* Should we classify that as "bold"? or truthful??

In addition, this implies that what we have done for years has been to hide from the government our use of funds. And as I said earlier, that is the farthest from the truth. The government was perfectly satisfied with the earlier arrangement, and if they wanted to know anything more specifically we would have obliged them.

15.) Brother Harrison describes the religious organizations they have created in other ways, such as a mere *"business interface"* and a *"legal mechanism."* Again, this type of divergent terminology never tells you the real nature of these organizations. Obviously there is nothing wrong with a mere *"business interface."* However, that is absolutely NOT what these organizations are! Neither is there anything wrong with a mere *"legal mechanism,"* but once again, this is absolutely the last thing these religious organizations amount to!

16.) Notice very carefully the following statement, or equation, from brother Harrison's first paper (pg. 6), because this is another crucially important statement:

"Does a sect that incorporates members of the Body of Christ into itself, represents itself as the Body of Christ or at least a part of it...Is this godly conduct? Absolutely it is not. It is sin as defined in the Word of God." And then brother Harrison immediately adds by comparison, *"Does this make the use of a 501c3 which has no members a sin? No."*

Now this is a highly important comparison. In the first instance Bob accurately describes the RELIGIOUS nature and action of the sect that incorporates members of the Body of Christ, and represents itself, at least, as part of the Body of Christ! He properly labels this as "sin!" and contrary to "the Word of God." However, in the next instance Bob Harrison carefully **ignores** the RELIGIOUS nature of the "Ministry Corporation," and merely describes them as *"501c3s which have no members."* Is this a factual comparison?? Absolutely not!! This is "divergent terminology" combined with a lack of important information!

What Bob does NOT tell you is that, in the first instance, the vast majority of modern sectarian organizations do not have formal membership corporations—it is too cumbersome. They don't incorporate members into themselves at all. On the contrary, they follow almost exactly the same identical incorporation procedures that these brethren have followed, in creating "Ministry" Religious Organizations. In both cases there is a simple "Board of Directors" governing the body, the corporation's "Bylaws," "Articles of Incorporation," "Minutes of Meeting" procedures, and a "Distinctive Identifying Name," etc. They are virtually identical as to the corporation procedure, organizational structure, and religious nature. One functions as a full-fledged Church, and the other functions as a part of a Church, or a "Church Support Organization."

And furthermore, the IRS usually classifies the "Ministries" as *"Para-Church Organizations"* or *"Church Support Organizations."* In other words, these are understood as a "part" of a church Religious Organization. So that in the first instance there is the full "Church" type Religious Corporation, and in the other case it is merely a "Ministry (Part of a Church)" type

Religious Corporation. That is absolutely the only difference! THIS IS A DIFFERENCE IN "DEGREE" AND NOT IN "KIND"! In addition, Bob does NOT tell you that in these modern "Churches" and "Ministries" as well, they absolutely do have what is called the "*membership of the board*" that is governing and operating the activities of the organizations.

Now let us substitute a factual description of the "Church" and the "Ministry Organizations" into a second part comparison of this original equation:

"Does a sect that does not have formal membership, but represents itself as a part of the Body of Christ..is this Godly conduct? Absolutely not. It is sin as defined in the Word of God."

"Does this make a group that allows for incorporation by a portion of the Body of Christ, and though it does not have formal membership, yet represents this as a 'Ministry' of the Body of Christ..is this godly conduct? Absolutely not! It is also sin as defined in the Word of God."

Does the Word of God define the only "Church Corporation" authorized by God? Absolutely! And it would be obvious sin to create another one.

Does the same Word of God define the only "Ministries" authorized by God? Absolutely! Thus, if it is "Sin" to create an artificial Religious Church Organization, it is, of necessity, "Sin" to create an artificial Religious "Church Support Organization" called a "Ministry."

OUTRIGHT MISREPRESENTATIONS!

The constant use of divergent terminology naturally led to outright misrepresentations. This is why Robert seemed to be frustrated with me and finally expressed that we are in two different worlds. Robert was correct in this because we are thinking in two different worlds. Robert was not realistic. He was actually in the world of fantasy. He had on the proverbial "rose-tinted glasses." He had come to view this subject as merely some kind of a business transaction, or a mere name-handle (Robert A. Grove Ministries, Inc.) that the IRS could see. Of course that is not the way the IRS looks at it. They take this subject seriously. They want the genuine article. As we should remember, back in 1960 and 61 the IRS rejected our application as a "non-profit Religious Organization" because they thought we were a "sham organization"! They thought we were just playing games when they were serious. They wanted to see a REAL, LIVE, WORKING organization with STRUCTURE and ORDER and doing actual SERVICE for society. To them we didn't have any of that characterization. However, when examination in court proved otherwise, then under the determination of a federal judge, they had no choice but to accept us.

Now the IRS has not changed! They don't want somebody playing games with them! They still take this thing seriously! They want the genuine article! They still don't want a "sham organization"! They still want a REAL, LIVE, WORKING, SERVICE ORGANIZATION with concrete STRUCTURE and organizational discipline. The last thing in the world the IRS wants is a "*lifeless entity*" handling a mere "*bank account*." And yet this is exactly how Robert Grove and Bob Harrison are now representing these organizations in order to convince their Christian brethren that these "Ministry Corporations" are really nothing to get excited about. They wouldn't dare represent the Ministries in that manner to the IRS because the IRS would instantly recognize this as "sham organization" and take away their tax exempt status.

Now I believe when any responsible Christian brother takes off the "rose-tinted glasses," and examines this subject seriously and factually, he will see exactly what I am contending for.

I believe there were two basic and fundamental outright misrepresentations, stemming from this divergent terminology in the letters by Robert Grove and Bob Harrison. These misrepresentations tend to throw anyone off in attempting to properly analyze and understand their argumentation to justify the creation of these "Ministry Corporations."

- First; one of my main theses in the first letter was the abhorrence of creating a **man-made "non-profit religious organization."** *Not one time in Robert's first letter did he admit to this.* In fact he did the opposite. Robert said, *"I don't know of any of us who use that type of description."* And again, *"I don't know who you are quoting."* And again, *"In addition, the description is not accurate."* And again, *"From a legal standpoint the corporations we are using are described as 'An organization that receives its support... from the general public.' ... The fact is that what is commonly called religious activities are not a prerequisite to being this type of corporation."* And again, *"Your saying it is a lie (for us to say) 'we are not building any man-made religious organization,' doesn't make it so."* And again, *"Saying 'Tom is part of something man-made in religion,' ...doesn't make it a fact."* Robert's misrepresentation about these organizations being, in fact, man-made Religious Organizations, be it intentional or unintentional, actually happened. He fooled me entirely. I was actually ready to say, "as far as I am concerned the subject is settled! If these are not Religious Corporations then I have no qualms about them." "However," I thought "something has got to be wrong!" Had I not investigated these representations, I would have believed exactly what Robert was saying. Therefore, when I called the IRS they said, "Of course these are Religious Organizations!" "Of course," they informed me "the proper legal terminology is 'Non-profit Religious Corporations!'" They actually thought my inquiry was stupid. I was embarrassed to say the least. They said, "Just ask your minister; he will tell you!" (Of course, I didn't tell them the representation my minister had made.) "Do you still call Ministries 'Para-Church Organizations,'" I asked! "Yes" they said, "sometimes we still list them that way." (I must admit my embarrassment turned to anger—justified anger—because I felt like, whether intentional or not, I had been duped!)

Robert, on the other hand, at first seemed to acknowledge that as far as statements on tracts were concerned, "my point is well taken." But then, when I applied it to the Organization itself and to many evidences in actual ministry, he acted as if my charges of contradiction were baseless, and furthermore, my pointing out the contradictory statements of certain ministers was disrespectful to those making such statements. He acted as if I was slandering the ministers who were making what amounted to false statements. In fact, he was even *"sorry that this was the condition I was in."* This is amazing, because, in fact, the ministers were only saying the same things in public that were on the tracts. If what was on the tracts was a "point well taken," then the same misrepresentations that the ministry was making is likewise "a point well taken!" As it turned out I was telling the absolute truth! I was not in fantasy land!

This prompted my second letter to clarify the terminology and, therefore, the reality of what my brethren are actually building. The repeated inaccuracies and falsifications this causes in light of all the statements on our tracts and by those ministering publicly are realistic. That "we are *not building* anything man-made in religion" amounts to a serious lie! There is absolutely no justification for it!

However, when we found out that I was absolutely right and accurate in my words and my observations, did I get an apology?? Actually, it was a conditional apology at best. I got no apology for falsely accusing me of slandering the ministry. What I got was an "apology" that merely stated several times that Robert had "forgotten" to list the other "*categories*," and a further statement that he "*should not have gotten into the question of whether the corporations are identified by the IRS as religious or not because that is irrelevant in our understanding of the subject and is not as issue for us.*" In other words, the leadership is no longer adverse to creating certain **man-made religious organizations**. In addition, he made other qualifications in a further effort to minimize the error. He even tried to place a new definition on what ministers mean by "religious organizations" as just denominational "Churches." It just so happened I had the Incorporation Documentation right before my eyes when I read Robert's letter of what ministers intend to mean by that statement. The Documentation that they all signed and submitted to the IRS states just the opposite—they did not mean "Churches" by the designation "non-profit Religious Organization." Their "Religious Organizations" were "Ministries."

Then Robert writes his last letter and expresses his frustration at me—instead of himself! In addition he goes right on his way characterizing what they are doing as simply "*to use the 501(c)3 corporations to handle funds.*" This totally **ignores** all that was firmly established as to what these non-profit, man-made Religious Corporations really are.

- **Secondly;** Bob Harrison does the very same thing in his first paper, but the prime misrepresentation in both his papers was that these "Ministry Corporations" are actually only "*lifeless entities*," and "*legal mechanisms*" to establish a "*business interface*" with Caesar. Furthermore, he represented that the activities of these entities are *ONLY* concerned with "*the material asset flow*" and "*involve material assets only.*" This is so far out of line with the truth and actual fact as to be cataclysmic to the very existence of those corporations if such were revealed to the IRS as being their true identity and activity!

Actually, every single argumentation that Bob Harrison engaged in, in both of his papers, involving these erroneous misrepresentations (and there were plenty), is thereby invalidated.

Brothers in leadership in the Church of our Lord Jesus Christ must of necessity retain the assemblies' trust. The means of doing that is to avoid making distortions of any kind, to avoid making things look better than they really are, and to avoid the manipulation of "facts" so as to give a misleading conclusion. I believe that only by realistically admitting the truth in this matter, and the error that does exist, can ministers be guaranteed the trust of those who have placed faith in their leadership.

PURPORTED REASONS FOR THE CHANGE

What were the purported reasons for the change that has occurred by forming these Religious Corporations? We have been given a list of considerations that have supposedly brought about the change from our stance in 1961-2 to the present stance in 1999. This involved the following considerations:

- 1.) The law as it presently is and not as it was,
- 2.) The facts as to how we function financially now and not in the past.
- 3.) What the Scriptures teach as to what constitutes the true church of Jesus Christ in contrast to a man-made church, and
- 4.) How we as Christians are to interact with the government

No. 1.) We have found that the law basically has not changed. Though the 501(c)(3) Code was not activated until 1959, yet it was taken into consideration both during the Tax Case briefings and by the Judge's decision. In addition, I think we and the Judge analyzed it better and more accurately in 1961-2 than brethren in leadership did in 1999. The only thing needed in order to comply with the 501(c)(3) code was a "dissolution statement" concerning assets, if the church has changed its habits in handling funds. In actual fact, there are probably many more churches operating as "unincorporated associations" than previously. Additional laws appear to be more lenient today towards churches than it was in our day of 1962. There appears to be a whole lot more churches out there that are openly not incorporated with the State than there ever were.

No. 2.) It seems highly unlikely to me, that our present leaders should ever feel justified in incorporating with the State Religiously simply because now there are more funds in reserve for operating expenses, when, in fact, many of these *"unincorporated churches" and "ministry organizations"* that apparently exist in sectarianism today, are operating with finances that would make our little assembly operating costs look like "chicken feed." In addition, if there are more funds in reserve, then simply comply with the 501(c)(3) Code by making a legalized "Dissolution Statement or Provision" to keep on record.

No. 3.) In their study about the church, leaders totally ignored the Divine Incorporation (embodiment) factor, even though it was the primary theological compulsion to the whole Tax Case issue. Without giving any reasons whatsoever, they simply shoved this TRUTH aside, and thought it irrelevant (more about this later). Obviously, if they ignored the Corporation truth in the Bible about the church of Jesus Christ, then they naturally would never have touched the subject of the "Ministries" that composed the "body of Christ" itself! The true "Ministries" in contrast to "man-made Ministries" is the precise area they should have, but apparently, never did explore! These are the only "Ministries" authorized by the Word of God.

No. 4.) How you interacted with the government to create man-made Religious Organizations called "Ministries" was actually the very same, precise argumentation the denominational Churches used, in order to justify the creation of their church organizations in the first place! Therefore, our ministering brethren absolutely did not PROGRESS in this area of consideration; they REGRESSED! It is quite clear from the Word of God that the areas of delegated authority for Caesar are in "Taxation" and "Restraining Evil." Nowhere is there even a hint in the Word of God that God gave to Caesar the authority to instruct Christians how to build a "church" or a "ministry" in order to facilitate taxation.

WHAT IS THE REAL REASON FOR THE CHANGE?

No. 1.) *The "FEAR" Factor!*

One can see from reading statements in Robert's first response to me that his real reason for the creation of the "Ministry Corporations" was frankly out of fearfulness of non-compliance with the Internal Revenue Service. Of course, that type of fear is enough to make anyone wake up and do something for sure. Robert says, *"I came to believe that we were increasingly functioning illegally ever since the tax case was settled. I believe this was true until we establish some way to interface with the IRS."* And again he said, *"It seems that we thought 'we won the case,' and therefore we didn't adequately look at the law as it stood even at the time of the final judgment was handed down in the Tax Case."* And again he said, *"It is my feeling that at the time of the Tax Case, there may have been too much of an attitude that Caesar was trying to usurp authority over the church when really they were just trying to have oversight over tax deduction—which God says is their responsibility and privilege."* And again, *"The amounts in the past have been small enough that we have not been seriously challenged by IRS."* And Bob Harrison adds, *"If my memory is correct we sought legal counsel on our current posture (accumulated assets and post-1959 operations) regarding our ability to defend successfully against an IRS challenge using the Tax Case judgment. It was the view of those asked that there was no chance of successful defense."*

No. 2.) A Change in Theology!

The other real reason for the change is obviously theological! There has been a theological change from what the ministering brethren believed in 1961-2. This change in spiritual persuasion involves *two* areas. As I brought out in my first letter to Robert Grove, the whole basis for not incorporating with the State some other religious body, other than that found in the Word of God, was first of all due to the fact that they held the truths in the Bible concerning the Church which is Christ's Body to be practical and relevant. The Church was already *incorporated* by Christ and that *included the ministry* as well! Now that is an established fact—as I quoted extensively from the Tax Case to demonstrate that fact.

To Robert Grove and Bob Harrison as well, that truth they agree is "beautiful," yet at the very same time they think it is **"not relevant"** to the subject of Religiously Incorporating with the State. Of course, if it is not relevant to Religious Incorporation by the State *then it is not relevant to anything*—because there is nothing else in existence that even comes close to relevancy to the incorporation of the Church by Jesus Christ. Let me repeat that. If the Divine Incorporation of His people by Christ is not **relevant** to the Religious Incorporation of a Church by Caesar then it is *absolutely not relevant to anything*, because there is nothing else on earth, that I know of, any closer in attempted resemblance! In both cases there is an embodiment for Religious purposes. In both cases there is a designed "Church or Para-church Corporation." In both cases there is a "Distinctive Identifying Name," "Officers," "Organizational specifications," "Laws governing the operations," "specific areas of service and activity," etc., etc., etc.

Furthermore, if the Divinely incorporated church of Jesus Christ is not relevant to the subject of Caesar's attempt to religiously incorporate churches then brother Maurice Johnson and Ed Stevens and Wilbur Johnson and H.G. Ross and many others should be noted as teaching falsely in this area of doctrine because that is precisely what they believed and taught!

And it likewise follows that the Tax Case testimony could never be considered as "great and wonderful," and done by "spiritually minded men," if it was based upon a **false premise** that the truth in the Bible of the "Corpus Christi" was absolutely relevant.

Another, second, theological change was in the area of abhorrence of creating any type of artificial, man-made religious organization! Brethren in leadership just don't believe that any more! There are certain artificial man-made religious organizations that are perfectly all right to build, they now believe! Of course, that theological change left them exposed to embarrassing statements on many of our tracts, statements that often stem from our Tax Case testimony, that we are "not in the business of building any man-made religious organization." They sometimes continue to say "they are not a part of anything man-made in religion," and if they continue to do this in light of these exposures then this amounts to a hypocritical lie, because they know very well that they are a vital part of a man-made Religious Organization! In addition, another way in which we have said this is the following, "we are only building Christian lives, and homes, and the Church which is Christ's body." Of course, we all know that is no longer true! I have documented many of these statements, and there are many more that I could have added! To also continue to say or advertise that "We are only meeting in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ," when in fact we are *financially* and *spiritually managed* by such names as "Jeff A. Grove Ministries" Corporation amounts to another blatant dishonesty.

Of course we don't print this fact on our sign in front of a meeting hall! Nor do we openly advertise it. Nor is it talked about except on very rare occasions. And all of that concealment is obviously because it is a bonafide contradiction to our open testimony, and an embarrassing contradiction at that. Therefore, it is ignored and hoped that no one will notice!

Once again, in consistency, they should openly indict the older ministers of the 50's & 60's on the subject of religious incorporation with the State, because if ministering brethren today are accurate, then they taught falsely back in 1961-2 that all man-made religious organizations are carnal and of the Devil! It is absolutely the height of hypocrisy for the present ministry to applaud and honor the decision of the ministry in 1961-2 on that subject, when the present ministry totally rejects the basic theological premises those ministers contended for!

AD HOMINEM ARGUMENTS

"Ad hominem arguments" are simply attacks against the character of the person presenting the criticism rather than honestly dealing with the subject matter under discussion—in this case how bad Jack Langford is. I have not responded to these arguments. If there was any validity to this type of argumentation we would probably set aside a whole lot that is in our own Bibles. In the very heart of the Scriptures is the book of Psalms. Yet the book of Psalms was primarily written by King David who was an adulterer, and guilty of murder and with his family was in serious chaos. One son raped a sister. Another son raped his father's concubines in public and tried desperately to kill his own father. Has anyone therefore ripped the Psalms out of his Bible? The people of Israel used "ad hominem" arguments against Samuel the prophet. How could they follow Samuel, after all his sons took bribery, perverted judgment, and did not follow in the ways of their father—at least that was the argument of carnal Israel. Even the first five books of Moses would come under doubt if such tactics were used against Moses. Moses' wife in a fit of anger cast the foreskin of their youngest son at the feet of her husband, and cried out, "you are a bloody husband to me because of the circumcision." The clash was so strong that Moses sent her back to her father. She never experienced the exodus out of Egypt with her husband. None of these men ever tried to cover for their weaknesses. But did this deter the truth they gave?—absolutely not!

"IF WE COULD" JUST "AVOID..."

When I forced the issue by the proper identity of the Ministry Corporations as man-made "non-profit Religious Organizations," it was finally acknowledged, "this same conclusion would be drawn by anyone else observing what we are doing" (Robert's 2nd letter, 6/28/05). However, Robert next tries to make their creation acceptable if they avoided establishing a "church," as if that would justify the creation of a man-made "Non profit Religious organization." (2nd letter, 2/28/05, page 2). However, Robert forgot that a "Ministry" is actually a vital "part of a Church."

- ◆ **avoid starting** a church,
Yet, what they did do was start a "PART OF A CHURCH."
- ◆ **avoid naming** a church,
Yet, what they did do was NAME a "PART OF A CHURCH."
- ◆ **avoid joining** believers to a church,
Yet, what they did do was join ministers to a "PART OF A CHURCH"
- ◆ **avoid joining** believers and unbelievers together in a church,
Yet, what they did do was join Caesar in creating a "PART OF A CHURCH."
- ◆ **avoid** establishing a **statement of faith or doctrine** other than the Bible.
Yet, what they did do was establish a statement of "Bylaws" and "Articles of Incorporation" and a "Governing Body" other than the Bible.

WHAT "FACTS" HAVE BEEN ESTABLISHED BY THIS DISCUSSION?

- 1.) The representation that ministering brethren today are "building on the testimony of 1961-2" is false, and must be rescinded! It is not factual; ***it is the opposite of the truth!*** Caesar no longer looks at that testimony. Instead, they look at the various nonprofit "Ministry" Corporations. In addition, our testimony in this regard to *sectarians* is essentially dead!
- 2.) The "Ministry" Organizations are in fact "***man-made, Nonprofit, Religious Organizations,***" differing only in *degree*, and not in *kind*, from regular denominational church corporations. (No wonder our ministering brethren are not "bold" and "courageous" in the propagation of this stance.)
- 3.) The representations that these "Ministry" organizations are mere "***artificial, lifeless entities,***" that "***are only concerned with material assets,***" is blatantly false!
- 4.) That God delegated to Caesar the authority to design and incorporate these Religious Organizations is also blatantly false, and a *perverse use of Romans 13:1-7*. Christ said, "Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's" (Mk. 12:17). To allow Caesar to incorporate a "Church" or a "Ministry" is to "render to Caesar," ***that which is exclusively God's.***
- 5.) The refusal to recognize or acknowledge the ***relevancy*** of the doctrine of the Embodiment of the Church by Jesus Christ led to an allowance of creating other "religious bodies" that are NOT authorized in the Word of God. "Walk..in the unity of the Spirit..There is ONE body!"

6.) One *cannot divide* the "Ministry" from the "body (corporation) of Christ" to form another "body (corporation)," anymore than a person can take a "finger" or "toe" from his own "body" and form a separate, distinct "body" around that member.

7.) The failure to not even take into consideration or recognize the *relevancy* of the Biblical doctrine of the "Ministries" led to the creation of "artificial, man-made Ministries" that are now controlling a substantial part of the *financial* and *spiritual management* of local congregations, according to the Incorporation Documentation. ***The only "Ministries" authorized by the Word of God are those revealed in the Word of God.***

8.) To attribute, as done in the Incorporation Documentation, *extensive Religious value and service* to these ***man-made Religious Organizations*** is clearly a modern form of ***IDOLATRY!*** A Religious Organization may possess and use "Personal Property" such as stationary, pencils, light bulbs and all kinds of operating items. These items are obviously not idolatrous in and of themselves. On the other hand, these organizations may possess and utilize, Icons, Rosaries, Sacred Cloth, and any number of other items of specific religious value including their buildings. These are idolatrous. The fact is, any Religious Organization that man can build, be it a "Church" or a "Ministry (Para-Church)" that has extensive religious value attached to its service and ministry is, itself, a form of idolatry. Everyone of us who professes to know and walk in ***Biblical truth*** should know that! I have given the Biblical definition of idolatry in my letters.

9.) ***"Spiritual Adultery"*** is another Biblical and common description we have historically used to designate those who dabble in "man-made Religion." It is properly so designated because it is an *illegitimate mixture* of elements God never intended to be mixed! Like the adulterous woman of Proverbs 30:20, those who get involved in spiritual adultery "eat and wipe their mouths, and say, 'I have done no wrong.'"

10.) To allow Caesar to Religiously embody "Ministries" is a denial of the effective and exclusive ***"Headship"*** of Jesus Christ over His ministering servants. In addition, for our ministers to be vitally connected to these "man-made Religious Corporations" makes them subservient to ***"two masters."*** On the one hand they are subject to Jesus Christ as members of His body. On the other hand they are also subservient to the State that created their "Religious Ministry Corporations." Interestingly enough, a good illustration of this is a recent (February) court ruling against the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Portland, Oregon. The Judge used the following terminology—"Once civil law status (incorporation with the State) has been acquired, the entity (the Archdiocese) then has ***TWO SOVEREIGNS*** (emphasis mine), canonical (Church law, God) and civil (Caesar), and is subject to the provisions of the two legal systems."

11.) To thus become the "Religious Creation of the State" is to become "unequally yoked with unbelievers (i.e. **the State**)" in disobedience to II Cor. 6:14 & following. This certainly qualifies as *"filthiness of the spirit"* (II Cor. 7:1).

12.) Our ministering brethren and their fellow "Board Members" are now ***"Officers" and "Members"*** of two different religious organizations; on the one hand that Organization designed by God and called "the church which is His body," and on the other hand, that religious organization

designed and embodied by Caesar and called "This and that Ministry."

13.) Thus, when they advertise or say, either in tract form, or from the pulpit, or on the internet as in the case of "Bible Truths.org," that "*We are not building any man-made religious organization,*" it now amounts to a "***boldfaced lie***!" Most all our ministers are also now "building man-made 'Ministry' Religious organizations."

14.) In addition, using ***other names*** in "*Religious Organizations*" and in "*the work of the Lord*" is clearly forbidden by the Word of God (Col. 3:17). This is basic truth. No one should want to argue with this other than those who are supplanting revelation by human logic. In the case of "Bible Truths.org" it says that the sponsoring Christians, "*meet and work **only** in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ,*" and this has become blatantly false. They now use many other names. The names of these Religious Ministry Corporations are no more comparable to the name of a bank account than the names of the Church Corporations are comparable to the names of bank accounts.

15.) The failure to abhor the creation of anything "***man-made in Religion***" led to these many incidents and occasions for "*confusion,*" "*contradictions,*" and "*lies.*" In addition, as to "*testimony,*" right now on the internet Robert A. Grove Ministries and Larry Balderson Gospel Ministries are listed in the middle of about twenty denominational sects and numerous other 501(c)(3) non-profit charitable organizations in order for "**the general public**" to donate their car, truck or boat to, in order to get tax deductions. (<http://www.localcardonors.com/donate-a-car-in-va.>) Likewise, Weyman Zelder Ministries is listed as a non-profit which "*receives a substantial part of its support from...**the general public,***" (melissadata.com/lookups/np.asp).

16.) To call this a "***Sickening Compromise***" is a very apropos way to describe it!

17.) ***Following Billy Graham*** in creating these "man-made Religious Organization" is following Billy Graham in his *trail of Religious Confusion* and compromise.

18.) Those in leadership have manifested a "***Sectarian spirit (the choosing spirit)***" by, in fact, choosing their *own human wisdom and ideas*, over and above those distinct Truths from the Word of God. This form of sectarianism merely hides beneath our historic testimony.

19.) ***Section 501(c)(3)*** of the Tax Code of 1954 (implemented in 1959) no more forced the creation of Nonprofit Religious Corporations than did Section 170, nor the Tax Code of 1939.

20.) Ministering brethren may not see the application of Biblical truths I have given because they do not want to see it. The various attempts to justify this carnality amount to a worst sin—***Stubbornness and the refusal of a "broken and contrite spirit," also called "PRIDE."***

I concluded my last letter of December 1st, 2005, with a quote from the Biblical account of King Saul's prideful disobedience to the command of God. Soon after this at our December camp (Dec. 24, A.M. meeting) brother Tom Collins, who probably had not yet read my last letter (*most brethren in leadership have not even read it to this date—isn't that "noble"!?),* gave a strikingly clear exposition of that very story. It would be fitting to conclude with a few excerpts:

"Saul totally forgot whose the battle was—he totally forgot!"

1 Samuel 15:1, "Samuel also said to Saul, 'The Lord sent me to anoint you king over His people, over Israel. Now therefore, heed the voice of the Words of the Lord.'"

Now let's remember that admonition. And let's remember what Samuel reminds Saul of later, after the battle against Agag and his people...Destroy all the animals! That was the Lord's command through Samuel. But they were unwilling to utterly destroy them. Unwilling to obey God's Word! But everything despised and worthless, that they utterly destroyed. **That's interesting how human reasoning came in there...**they were going to save "the best."

15:10-11, "Now the Word of the Lord came to Samuel saying, 'I greatly regret that I have set up Saul as king, for he has turned back from following Me, and has not performed My commandments.' And it grieved Samuel, and he cried out to the Lord all night."

What do you think Samuel was thinking? Why did it grieve him so much?... I bet he was thinking about what was going to come upon the children of Israel because Saul didn't lead them in righteous judgment and procedure at that time. I bet you Samuel was concerned about all the folks that were going to be effected by Saul's disobedience, and therefore, with his lack of leadership, (and) the disobedience of others around him. What a sobering thing that Saul had to face, because you know, when we don't do the Lord's will we suffer...When we refuse to obey the Lord there are consequences. 'Be not deceived, God is not mocked, for whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap.'

15:12, "So when Samuel rose early in the morning to meet Saul, it was told Samuel saying 'Saul went to Carmel, and indeed he set up a monument for himself.'"

In commemoration of a victory that was not a victory. How deceived!...

15:13-15, "Then Samuel went to Saul, and Saul said to him, 'Blessed are you of the Lord. I have performed the commandment of the Lord.' But Samuel said, 'what then, is this bleating of the sheep in my ears...' And Saul said, 'they have brought them from the Amalekites; for the people spared the best of the sheep and the oxen to sacrifice unto the Lord your God, and the rest they have utterly destroyed.'"

That is not one bit different from **religion today!—the religion of mankind today!** People that profess to know the Lord Jesus Christ as their Savior, some that do, and that are in the various divisions, their various denominations around... But the Lord didn't say to do that! (like Christmas). **It is not a part of God's Word. It is nowhere in here!** Oh, that's OK because we're honoring the Lord! **We are doing good for the Lord!** Oh boy! Saul had it all set up. He was going to tell Samuel why he did not obey God's Word! **Can you imagine! Can you imagine the audacity, the pride, the arrogance of this statement—"That's OK, we're honoring the Lord—it's all right! It's for the Lord. It's for His sake!" It can't be for His sake when it doesn't match His Word! There's no way!** **"Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by what?—the Word of God! It is right here for us! It is the Living way, It's the Lamp we have, It's the Light for our feet! ..."**

15:24, "Then Saul said to Samuel...*I feared the people...*"

We are told that fear brings what?—A SNARE!...Saul forgot who he was really supposed to fear—the One whom he was serving, the One who put him as king of Israel..."

This commentary by brother Tom Collins epitomizes what has actually happened in this immediate situation of ministering brethren destroying all the bad "church" organizations, but saving the best "para-church" organizations with which to somehow honor our Lord Jesus Christ. The confusion that has resulted is directly against the testimony that God wanted to be established against man-made religious organizations in this age of increasing compromise and apostasy.

IN CONCLUSION

I believe I have endeavored to handle this subject in a manner that demonstrates I am desirous of working with my brethren in understanding the issue and in applying a proper remedy from the Word of God for a settling of the issue. Mitch Casler gave a very simple and clear statement at the May camp in Oklahoma (2005)—"*To be separate from man-made religion is a clear line.*" Only the Devil would want us to think that it is a complicated and contingent. Everyone involved in this discussion admits that the Scriptures "thoroughly furnish us to every good work" (II Tim. 3:16 & 17). Likewise, everyone of us must admit that these "artificial," "lifeless," "man-made," "religious organizations" are nowhere authorized by the Word of God.

The marvel of the Bible is that if we adhere to its literal teachings and principles it sufficiently answers all rationalizations and modifications of mere human invention. The simple truths that emanate from the pages of the Scriptures, and that are directed to be implemented for this Age of Grace, when properly understood by the Spirit of God, are the most understandably beautiful and practical truths revealed. Like a sharp "two edged sword," these truths when applied to mere human logic will expose every argument of uninspired reasonings to an inglorious death.

What have I been contending for?? Very simply, I have been contending for the full implementation of the Biblical truths concerning the body of Christ and its functioning in relation to Caesar. Our historic position of strength and courage was, briefly stated, *the realization that believers in Jesus Christ are embodied by Jesus Christ through the Holy Spirit, and therefore, we should never seek to be re-embodied (incorporated) by the State; for to do so would only produce a **human creation** in contrast to the **Divine creation**, be it a "church" or a "para-church" organization.* Any modification of this position is clearly not the mere "removal of ancient landmarks," but an obvious departure from the Word of God. Everyone should also see that to do otherwise, as has been done, will only be productive of "divergent terminology," "outright misrepresentations," "misuse of the Scriptures," and multiple examples of "confusion in testimony." "*Confusion*," by the way, is not a result of the "wisdom that comes from above," but rather a natural result of rejecting the truth which would produce "good fruits" (James 3:13-18). "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom" (Prov. 9:10).

Yours in the Name of the Lord Jesus Christ,

Jack W. Langford