

When the Role Is Called-Up, Yonder, Where I'll Be Or the Modest Newsletter Made Solid

A Solid Guide for Finding a Solid Church
by Brother Billy-Bob Joel, Evangelist. 1611 AV.

Folks, we live in a day and age when solid, fundamental, Bible-believing, straight-shooting, gospel-preaching, soul-winning, King James-using, gospel song-singing, chicken-eating, old time religion folks have got to be careful when it comes to picking a church. It used to be that a Christian could call up Bob Jones University and they'd tell him where the good churches were at in any area. But now that they've gone full-blown apostate (not sticking to the King James) one simply can't do that. We need a guide. So here it is, plain and simple, and solid.

- Make sure they use the King James. Any other version is coming straight from the pit of hell. It's the sign of the last days that we have so many apostate translations lying around, and a sign of compromise and apostasy and modernism and charismatic hoopla that one-time, solid, gospel-preaching, soul-winning churches don't use it. Let's get it straight; either God preserves it or he doesn't, and you can't argue with that unless you are a son of Belial. Make sure that the church you go to is solid on the King James. The King James comes to us straight from the Received Text which was universally recognized as the very one that God had breathed out. But there were other versions even back then, for the world was under the sway of the Catholic church. The pope had a version called Vaticanus which was made up just to propagate Catholic doctrine. It denied the deity of Christ and established the worship of Mary. The monks also had version called Sinaiticus which even they thought was so bad they wanted to burn it (then one of these modernists found it and made it into the established Greek text of scholarship [and that's exactly where that sort of thing leads to]). And the heretics of Egypt (among whom Athanasius is numbered) had one called Alexandrinus (probably in honor of Alexander the Great who was a homosexual) which is the basis for the perverted United Bible Societies text (which is a branch of the United Nations used to promote a one world government and Communism). No Bible-believing, solid, Fundamentalist can have anything to do with a church that isn't solid on the King James.
- Make sure they don't teach any of the devil's own Calvinism. No soul-wining, fallout-shelter-having, solid Fundamentalist is going to allow the heresy of predestination to creep into their church and that's certain. It rots out the God-ordained invitation system and causes the visitation to really flag. Nothing pleases the devil more that to see gospel-preaching, soul-winning, on-fire-for-the-Lord places turn to the cold and carnal doctrines of the dark ages before the Protestant Reformation. What is worse is when they try to defend it from the King James. It is a very awful thing to see; but they have no fear or reverence whatsoever (they don't even have fallout shelters). Be very careful of this Calvinism because they like to twist the Bible around to back it up. They like to look smart and smooth and learned because they've been to seminary where it is popular to

believe such things because it gives them prestige. But no Bible-believing preacher of the Word who is solid will ever hold to it.

- Now there is something awfully funny about this next rule, but it is very true and any solid, Gospel-loving, Commie-hating saint of God will testify to its truth. Most preachers that get degrees other than a diploma from a solid Bible school or Bible college are not to be trusted, unless they have a doctorate. But not everybody with a doctorate is solid. There a few men who have been given by God the gift of discernment. They can smell out a false Fundamentalist or a Neo-Evangelical compromiser or a Communist a mile off. They can do it without any need to pray about it or listen to the warnings of God's people. The Holy Spirit just lets them know so they can warn the rest of us. To these men is sometimes given the gift of learning and they get doctorates. Many of them, by God's grace, are nonetheless spared any exposure to the corrosive influence of seminary or higher education in general and still get the doctorates, for which we praise the Lord. But a few of them go through this fiery trial and still come through solid gold (never try this yourself, for these men have a special anointing [if it were not for the value that their testimony has when it comes to sermon illustrations, they probably never really needed to be saved either]). Because they don't like to put on airs, they're usually content to let us call them Doc. But if the church has a fellow with any degree in between, it is time to look for another place, for the winds of apostasy fan the flame of the academy.
- Make sure they don't allow women to wear pants to church because that is the trademark of modernistic apostasy. Now, in Texas, some of the folks that are still solid will allow women to wear pants as long as they have a big belt buckle with "KJV" on it. Only in this case can an allowance be made. Yet, every born-again Christian will have to agree that it would be better if they wore the belt buckle with a dress instead. It's just more solid.
- Make sure they don't have any of the cold, formal practices or songs that come straight out of the Middle Ages when the devil almost had his one world government thanks to the Catholic church and the Communists. Some like to use songs written by unbelieving, pagan saints of the Catholic church. There is no fire in them, no joy of the Lord even when the women sing the first stanza and the men the second stanza. Others like to read the writings of the unbelieving, pagan saints of the Catholic church and sprinkle them in their sermons for prestige. A preacher really doesn't need to read more than the King James, Strong's, solid missionary biographies, and westerns. Now there are a few, Bible-believing, soul-winning men of God to whom God has given the gift of discernment. They are able, because of their special anointing, to read the works of apostates in order to contend for the faith. But even they don't usually do this (being able to exercise their spiritual gift without even going so far as to read the works of those whom they condemn), for it is a dangerous practice and has led many solid, on-fire-for-the-Lord young-people to abandon their churches to attend seminary (being allured by the prestige). Another bad sign is when they don't want to shake hands and mingle as the people of God. This is because they don't have a burden for souls, or they are

Communists.

Many fine folk are struggling today, wandering in the blighted landscapes of our great country looking for one among many. Finding a good church is increasingly hard in a land where there is so much corruption and where we live among so many Communists and modern translations. But those who pray a lot about it and let the Spirit lead, will find that God has a parking place for them, at a solid Bible-preaching, KJV-using, bus-ministry-having, down-to-business altar-calling, kneeling-at-the-front-when-they-pray and saying-Amen-like-they-mean-it church.

Endorsements:

This is solid. - Doc K. James Vicks Sr.

Apostates, Communists, and Neo-Evangelicals beware! - Doc K. James Vicks Jr.

The Bible-based guide that every Fundamentalist in search of a church has been searching for before he began searching for the church. - Doc K. James Vicks III

When I read this, Doc K. James Vicks IV leapt in my womb! - Mrs. Vicks III

A Quotation

Found by Eric White

The classic myths have always had a strong fascination for later writers, and so numerous are both passing and extended references to these in English literature, and especially in the poets, that he who reads without a classical background reads with many lapses of his understanding and appreciation.

From the "Introduction" to Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, 1928 Loeb reprint.

Medicine, Ministry, Arachnids, and AWANA: Part 1

By Todd Mitchell

When you go to the doctor seeking a cure, you probably hope that the doctor is well trained, well informed, and a methodical thinker. You trust that he will recommend a proven course of treatment that will actually work and will not harm you, neither directly, nor indirectly (by keeping you from what you really *do* need). After all, if his recommendations are whimsical and capricious, they are no more informed than those of your coworker, who cannot even change the toner cartridge on the laser printer and won't make more coffee when he takes the last cup!

Unfortunately there are those who distrust the informed physician in favor of the opinions of their coworkers. The rise of the common man in America continues to fuel his hubris. And when his uninformed opinion differs from that of the informed class, he becomes paranoid. How dare they dismiss his uninformed opinions? The informed class must really be out to get him, since, after all, his uninformed opinion must really be right – especially when so

many coworkers agree with him! “Conspiracy!” he cries, with a knowing nod to the other uninformed experts. Thanks to the carpetbaggers and their claque on capitol hill, namely Senators Hatch and Harkin, unproven alternative “medicine” has entered the formerly scientific field of medicine. And why not? The mysterious pills, pollens, potions, and pinpricks of alternative “medicine” must be worth buying, since, after all, so many of your coworkers buy them.

Many hospitals now think they have to offer snake oil or else they will lose customers to other hospitals who do. And so now respected institutions like Beth Israel Medical Center in New York offer tincture of tarantula as a “homeopathic” remedy. Matt Fink, the administrator there, even admits:

My personal view of homeopathy is I don't understand how it works, and I'm personally not convinced that it does work. But that doesn't mean that I would prevent a homeopathy practitioner from working here. We're not supposed to go out and just tell people what to do. They're coming to us for help, and we're supposed to respond to their needs and their requests.¹

So at hospitals like this one, epistemology is in the mind of the beholder. Heaven forbid that the hospital would suggest they know a truth that the carpetbagger and his customer deny!

Perversely, this capitulation to the common man has emboldened him all the more. As Dr. Sampson laments:

There's been a shift in who gets the authority to determine what's done. It used to be that nothing went on with a patient in a hospital unless the physician said so. Science no longer has the authority that it did. People point to hospitals and say, "Oh, they're doing it, so therefore, there must be something to it." But that's just backwards. They're doing it because they think you want it.²

Heaven help the poor saps who have to take over these seeker-sensitive hospitals! Can you imagine being a newly hired hospital administrator? Imagine suggesting a return to proven methods. The board listens to your fundamentalist ravings and points out that if you insist on this intolerant and insensitive step backwards, you stand to lose so many patients that you won't make budget for this year! Gasp!

The parallels between medicine and ministry are obvious. Madame Defarge is still knitting remorselessly, and *la guillotine* is still thirsty, though less conspicuous. The names that appear in that knitting include pastors as well as physicians. Dare you cross the common man, pastor? Dare you suggest that you have studied the scripture while others have waited on tables?

¹ Matt Fink, quoted by Raney Aronson in Frontline:
<http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/altmed/>

² Dr. Wallace Sampson, quoted by Raney Aronson in Frontline:
<http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/altmed/>

Is not the latter task far more *relevant*, after all? Does it not eminently qualify the noble waiters to challenge you with their superior grasp of reality?

Just as some hospitals are lending an air of legitimacy to alternative “medicine,” so have churches lent an air of legitimacy to alternative ministry methods. Alternative ministry methods, like alternative “medicine,” have become so entrenched in the church that pastors today are much like the hospital administrators of tomorrow. Questioning alternative ministry methods which have become *de rigueur* is intolerant, insensitive, and at best a step backwards, if not off the deep end! How many will leave your church when you do so? Will you be one of them? Would you even have been invited to pastor the flock in the first place if they pondered your eccentricity?³

The burden of proof is never on those who embrace the *status quo*. The burden of proof is always on the one seeking change – even change to the way it was *before*. The only way legitimate medicine can combat the entrenched absurdity of alternative “medicine” is to a.) show alternative “medicine” to be directly harmful, and/or b.) show alternative “medicine” to be indirectly harmful by obstructing the truly helpful. Likewise the only way legitimate ministry can combat the entrenched absurdity of alternative “ministry” methods is to a.) show alternative “ministry” to be directly harmful, and/or b.) show alternative “ministry” to be indirectly harmful by obstructing the truly helpful.

As the physician must anchor his arguments in science, so must the pastor anchor his arguments in the Bible. In each case those who share the same epistemology will continue to seek treatment and teaching, while the rest go elsewhere to get the tickling they desire.

The Perseverance of Hope

by Joel Zartman

Do you know how the good people in Jane Austen’s novels usually win through? Think about how Elinor Dashwood in *Sense and Sensibility* wins through. Her dilemma is that she loves Edward Ferrars. Circumstances, which grow increasingly more complicated, prevent their union. She wins through, at last, because she is patient. Elinor does not suffer the way the romantic Marianne does because Elinor is governed by the clear light of reason. Marianne, who cultivates sensibility insensibly, is herself rendered insensible by her insensibleness. Such insensibility, indeed, as approaches death. Happily, she gradually returns to her senses.

I do not think that Jane Austen is advocating rationalism though (perhaps you will think I am). I think she is advocating the use of proportionate or ordinate sensibilities. But when you talk about things being in proportion, and about things being ordered, you have to ask: How do you calculate the proportion, how do you order these sensibilities? There has to be some interplay with reason. The understanding has to have some role in curtailing and arranging one’s sensibilities. Peter Conrad, in his introduction to the Everyman’s edition of *Sense and Sensibility* explains. “Families are dialectical, specializing in interweaving and compounding the most incompatible qualities, and the relation between sense and sensibility ought to be understood in these terms” (xii). I am inclined to agree with his explanation of the relationship of sense to sensibility, that it is somehow dialectical (I am not inclined to agree with his identification of each one with each of the main characters in the novel). What this means is that rather than an explanation of the relationship which assigns to each its part setting them forth distinctly, Jane

³ This is not to imply hiding an agenda from a call committee. Nothing could be more foolish.

Austen helps us understand the relationship of sense and sensibility by telling us a story in which their proper relationship is shown by the effect that it has.

The most remarkable quality of Elinor, at least the one I admire the most after I am done with the novel, is her patience. By being patient, rather than expostulating or scheming or pleading against all of her many setbacks (as the more unhappy characters, or worse, those oblivious to their unsatisfactory life, show by contrast), she is able to win through (and it seems to me that it is good sense, and proper sensibilities that, in turn, result in this patience). Moreover, Jane Austen does not simply drop the desired conclusion on Elinor as a windfall, as it were miraculously rewarding her in the end. While the particular events that lead to the outcome may not be anticipated, I read them with peculiar satisfaction as they fall into place. The satisfaction with which I read the conclusion is due to the naturalness and consequence with which events turn out. Jane Austen does not reward virtue in the world of her novels without leading up to the reward through a chain of events. She portrays a system in which things work themselves out as a consequence of other things. She demonstrates the way providence is built into the world. And, one might say, although I think this might be difficult to demonstrate, it is because of a benevolent providence overseeing all things, in the world of her novels, that things work out as cheerfully as they do.

Take *Mansfield Park* as another example. Fanny Price is perhaps a weaker character than Elinor of *Sense and Sensibility* (although I am not sure that this is something we should hold against her considering the circumstances from which she came and the circumstances in which she finds herself in the story). If Elinor is patient, perhaps it will be allowed that Fanny is passive. Indeed, she has no choice. Again, however, we do not find her scheming or moping or conniving to get her way. She does not resort to whatever stratagems of persuasion or influence might be open to her but meekly submits to the circumstances and is duly rewarded by the end of the book (as is everybody. I know a fellow who made the keen, if general, observation one time about couples, that as a rule, it seems, usually they deserve each other).

This same thing can be said of Anne Elliot in *Persuasion*. Both Anne and Fanny are cast away, so to speak, from the influence of powerful benefactors. When it comes to attainment of the *summum bonum* (marriage, in Austen's world) there is no one in authority to champion their cause, none who with scheming and string pulling will wield influence on their behalf, and the object of their desire, alas, has been turned away from them beyond any sensible hope of return. Once again, there is a benevolent providence watching over them, and to the satisfaction of all readers of good will, we learn that not only do the ladies have characters deserving of praise, but that the misunderstood men also have corresponding characters (though perhaps not as good), and, finally, that a better union could never have been wished.

And this is a good model for us, this patience and endurance at a good task. I speak of the longing for seriousness in worship, of course. If there is a long and fervent desire that we have, that is noble beyond reckoning and that is worthy beyond telling, then it will do not to abandon hope. We may seem like weak women but something deep and very strong governs us. We watch with certain helplessness and sometimes with great vexation. I don't mean we should sit back and let it happen, but we feel too strongly for that. Nor do I think anybody is about to manipulate things. But it does seem to me that we are sometimes fraught with anguish. Instead we should play our part and trust to God. For the providence built into the novels of Jane Austen is no fantasy.