

According To The G.O.T., Institutionalism Is Covered Under Romans 14

The fact is, the issues of the 1940's and thereafter HAVE BEEN reborn under new terms. I have a series of articles, which this one will be included with, covering the institutions among "NI brethren" (<http://www.wordsoftruth.net/studyofinstitutionalism.htm>). Please read them. If you are reading this article I want you to have an understanding of what you are going to be seeing. First, you must understand that I have written an article exposing the Guardian of Truth Foundation, as they openly admitted they are a human institution, which began a discussion on Romans 14, etc. (http://www.wordsoftruth.net/g_o_t_humaninstitution.html). This is significant for most of these men have spent a good part of their lives fighting against Institutionalism, now they are admitting their embrace of the error. Once I wrote this article, Tom Roberts sent an email to me (which will be presented below) in which he revealed how far the G.O.T. institution has really gone. Among the things he wrote, he established their view that Romans 14 covers their error of Institutionalism (this was said in the open forum too). Below, I will be showing some of Tom's own words of where he has stood in the past and where he now stands. You will be able to read our entire exchange. You shall see the facts instead of hearsay!

The fact that the Guardian of Truth Institution has appealed to Romans 14 shows us the path they have chosen which has been followed by many false teachers of the past. Sadly, Tom Roberts accused me of following the paths of past false teachers who twisted Romans 14 such as Carl Ketcherside and Leroy Garrett. Though, you will see it is Tom and his human institution that have done as he has charged I will do some day. Most new innovations have begun with a twisting of Romans 14 as the G.O.T. is now doing. Notice that what Tom has written (listed in emails below) is just like the past change agents:

- "Since we all still believe in the deity of Christ, and the necessity of baptism, that we must not dictate where Christ has not dictated, and that some of the brethren who are pushing for division over instrumental music are guilty of murderous stifling of free thought and free speech. We insist that Rom. 14 allow that very large liberty that we have no right to trench on" (Isaac Errett of the "Christian Church" Editor, *Christian Standard*).
- "I close the debate in fellowship and love if we will agree that unless instrumental music is hurting someone else that it may be used just as meat may be used if it don't hurt someone" (J. B. Briney).
- "My comments here will be based on Romans 14:1 -- 15:13. This section of Paul's most sublime epistle deals with doctrinal differences among baptized believers" (Rubel Shelly, "A Call to Action," 11/3/94, ACU).
- "The issue in Romans 14 is precisely the establishment of the right of brethren to differ in matters of faith" (Ed Harrell; *The Bounds of Christian Unity* (3), Christianity Magazine, April, 1989, p. 6).

The fact is, the Guardian of Truth Foundation has changed their views concerning Romans 14 and other matters. Tom Roberts once said: "**Romans 14 is being used by brethren today as a vehicle by which we are urged to accept sinful doctrines and practices.** And, whether lulled by the prominence and respect in which these brethren are held or deceived by the subtlety of the arguments, few alarms seem to be raised, few seem to recognize the danger and even fewer are dedicated to warning brethren of the peril that confronts us... Let me state it

clearly so that none may misunderstand: Some brethren are presently using Romans 14 to defend and embrace sinful doctrines and practices. If successful, the kind of unity that will result is not something conceived by the Lord. Can you envision what the church would have been if the Gnostics had been able to overthrow the teaching of John? **Can you imagine the church if Garrett and Ketcherside had been successful in their efforts? If that scenario bothers you, I urge you to wake up and read what is being taught about Romans 14 for it is, as Yogi Berra is supposed to have said, "Deja vous, all over again"** (Guardian of Truth, February 16, 1995 ~ Volume 39, Number 4). Tom now wants us to let things alone as he says: "I don't believe we should divide about such matters. That was the point of my use of them - "must we divide over every issue" (email provided below)?

The Foundation Once Took A Different Stand On Romans 14

It once was that the G.O.T. Institution would "come after you" if you invoked the usage of Romans 14 to teach unity and diversity (<http://www.truthmagazine.com/arch0.html>). In recent years they have changed their view of Romans 14. For the record, when speaking of the Foundation, I am including all who are part of that human institution, which they now explicitly admit they are (http://www.wordsoftruth.net/g_o_t_humaninstitution.html). When one speaks on their behalf, they act as a body of workers rather than an individual. Therefore, they are all being represented (II John 9-11). In fact, they act in this way as they allow three men to speak in an open forum representing and defending their views as a whole operating human institution (<http://www.wordsoftruth.net/media/truthfoundationopenforum2008.mp3>). This is also shown in that Mike Willis and Dan King published "We Have A Right" speaking for the whole organization (<https://www.akcart.com/truthcart/ProductDetails.aspx?productID=14431>). Their changes, which will be evident below, have been coming for some time.

Their Change On Romans 14 Has Been Coming For Years

Let it be stated from the onset, the Guardian of Truth Institution has not just now begun their change on Romans 14. When Weldon Warnock and Ron Halbrook were exposed for teaching error on divorce and remarriage, the Guardian of Truth Institution changed their view on Romans 14 to excuse their "fellowship" with these two exposed false teachers (<http://mentaldivorce.com/mdrstudies/TruthMagazine-ThenVsNow.htm>). What we are going to see is that they now lump Institutionalism into their new doctrine of unity in diversity via Romans 14. Moreover, we will get to see evidence that their newest Romans 14 inclusion will also allow for Romans 14 to cover homosexuality, abortion, instrumental music, social drinking, etc. How is this so? I will be providing a chart below from Tom Roberts when he included these subject matters together when he formerly taught against what he now argues for. Reader, Romans 14 does not cover the teaching of error, departures from Biblical authority, moral error, etc.

We Cannot Agree To Disagree

We cannot work and worship together when we disagree about scriptural instruction (Romans 16:17-18, I Corinthians 1:10, II Corinthians 13:11, Philippians 1:27; 2:2; 3:16-17, Ephesians 5:11, II Thessalonians 3:6; 14-15, I John 1:3-7, and II John 9-11). We

need to be like Jeremiah rather than the Guardian of Truth Institution (Jeremiah 15:16-17). Read Romans 14 and you will see that this chapter creates unity, not diversity (i.e. Romans 14:1-3; 15:5-6). Establishing a human institution without God's authority (Colossians 3:17), is not a 52nd cousin to a matter of conscience concerning the eating of meats, which God had authorized (Acts 10:9-16 and I Timothy 4:1-5). The G.O.T. cannot prove from the Scriptures that they exist with God's authority! All they can attempt to do is twist the Scriptures (II Peter 3:16-18) and use their own human logic (Proverbs 14:12; 16:25; 21:2, Jeremiah 10:23, I Corinthians 4:6, and Galatians 1:10-12). What they simply cannot see is that their arguments allow for much more than they want them to do, at this point. For this to be a matter of authorized liberty, it actually has to be authorized by the Lord (Ephesians 5:10; 17).

Grace does not allow one to continue in sin (Romans 6:1-2; 15-16). Both moral imperfections and doctrinal ones are sinful (I Corinthians 6:9-10 and I Timothy 6:3-5). There cannot be differences of interpretation (II Peter 1:20-21). The Apostles had one doctrine (Acts 2:42). When there was any disagreement, it had to be settled (Acts 15 and Galatians 2:11-17). It is not good to have any disagreements as we are to be united in one faith (Ephesians 4:1-6; cf. Jude 3). The Guardian of Truth Institution has argued that their existence is a matter of Romans 14. If it is a matter of Romans 14 cease the practice! It should be kept "personal" as Tom Roberts said in 2000 (shown in the chart below). **For those of you in denial over what is going to happen, wake up!** If the G.O.T. is okay with the Lord in teaching the Gospel, consistency demands that church treasuries can and should be used to financially support it (I Corinthians 9:14). You will see below that the Foundation is willing to say others will not have a discussion with them, but in reality it is they who are running from public discussions!

Considering The Evidence

Lest someone accuse me of printing Tom's statements as a deed unbecoming of a Christian, I want to be clear that Tom is fine with me sharing his statements. In fact, he would have it no other way. Notice: "We demand the same right to confront the error as those who claim the right to introduce it. It is not "unrighteous," as has been charged, to quote those who teach error, citing the references, so long as utmost care is exercised to avoid misrepresentation. **It is certainly not out of order to reproduce the exact statements which define that person's position. If there are contradictions between one's written statements and oral preaching, one cannot be right in both instances. If there are contradictions between one's past public teaching and his current private teaching about fellowship, these differences should be addressed and corrected rather than label objections as 'misrepresentations'**" (*Toward a Better Understanding - The Burnet Meeting*; The Preceptor Company; 2000; Page 96).

Tom Roberts In The Past...

Tom Roberts Then: "If Fellowship Permits Matters of Considerable Moral and Doctrinal Import," and "Contradictory Teachings and Practices on Important Moral and Doctrinal Questions" ...

Where Can Fellowship Be Limited On:

Institutionalism

Homosexuality
Profanity
Pornography
Social Drinking
Abortion
Evolution
Premillennialism
Instrumental music
Baptism, etc.

IF Christ accepts us in:

Millenniel Error
Holy Spirit Error
Organizational Error
Instrumental Music Error
Use of Alcohol Error
Public Use of Women Error
Dozens of Other Errors

Why Would Christ Not Accept Us In:

Faith Error?
Repentance Error?
Baptism Error?"

(<http://www.watchmanmag.com/0202/020214c.htm>)

Tom Roberts Then: "Shall the fellowship of Christ be extended to embrace error that divides churches and causes souls to be lost" (*Toward a Better Understanding - The Burnet Meeting*; The Preceptor Company; 2000; Page 96)?

Question: Isn't the foundation issue causing division (B.A.Y.)?

Tom Roberts Now...

Tom Roberts Now: "Sadly, you are a classic example of why "we must divide on every issue." Your view of scripture does not include the biblical category of authorized liberties. You allow no one the liberty to differ from you on any issue. You seem to have no grasp of the Lord's teaching in Romans 14" (evidence below in the emails).

Tom Roberts Now: "Sadly, you are a classic example of why "we must divide on every issue." Your view of scripture does not include the biblical category of authorized liberties. You allow no one the liberty to differ from you on any issue. You seem to have no grasp of the Lord's teaching in Romans 14" (evidence below in the emails).

<p>Tom Roberts Then: “If there are contradictions between one's written statements and oral preaching, one cannot be right in both instances. If there are contradictions between one's past public teaching and his current private teaching about fellowship, these differences should be addressed and corrected rather than label objections as ‘misrepresentations’” (<i>Toward a Better Understanding - The Burnet Meeting</i>; The Preceptor Company; 2000; Page 96).</p>	<p>Tom Roberts Now: “I do not believe that you intentionally wished to misrepresent me, however you actually did” (evidence below in the emails).</p>
<p>Tom Roberts Then: “While it is easy to attribute base motives to those who oppose unity in diversity and fellowship with "considerable moral and doctrinal matters," is it not possible, just possible, to recognize that something other than a "party spirit," or "jingoism," or "extremism," a "cur dog" mentality, motivates those of us who hold to a different view of Romans 14? I ask you to grant to those of us who differ the same noble heart that you envision in yourselves” (<i>Toward a Better Understanding - The Burnet Meeting</i>; The Preceptor Company; 2000; Page 98).</p>	<p>Tom Roberts Now: “I understand that you left liberalism in your search for truth. I commend you for that, but please don't fall into the pendulum effect of swinging from one extreme to the other... Your attitude is one of hate and bitterness, brother Yeager... But "speaking the truth in love" seems to be above your nature” (evidence below in the emails).</p>
<p>Tom Roberts Then: “It is bizarre, to my thinking, that seasoned brethren are discussing how much sin we may fellowship or how much false doctrine is permissible among brethren. The idea is astounding” (<i>Toward a Better Understanding - The Burnet Meeting</i>; The Preceptor Company; 2000; Page 102).</p> <p>“Those willing to have fellowship with or encourage those who teach error ‘share in his evil deeds’” (<i>Toward a Better Understanding - The Burnet Meeting</i>; The Preceptor Company; 2000; Page 102).</p>	<p>Tom Roberts Now: “You seem to have no grasp of the Lord's teaching in Romans 14... Yes, I understand that we are to hate all that is evil, but you certainly go beyond that. In your zeal to rend and tear your brethren, your hatred extends to those who exercise a liberty different from yours” (evidence below in the emails).</p>
<p>Tom Roberts Then: “If consistently applied, the application of fellowship through a misuse of Romans 14 will allow reception of sinful teachings and practices that are "honestly held," or about which the scriptures have not spoken with sufficient ‘clarity’” (<i>Toward a Better Understanding - The Burnet Meeting</i>; The Preceptor Company; 2000; Page 108).</p>	<p>Tom Roberts Now: “You accused me of arguing in favor of "church gymnasiums, fellowship halls, usage of the church's resources for social events such as weddings and funerals (Tom Roberts explicitly stated such in the above forum)”. While I did say that weddings and funerals should not be items that divide us, I certainly did not argue in</p>

	<p>favor of the other items you tied to my lesson, unfairly. <u>You put words into my mouth</u> that I object to and I have preached against these things all my life” (evidence below in the emails)..</p>
<p>Tom Roberts Then: “Please notice carefully the parameters of Romans 14 which will not permit it to include sinful teaching and practices in its "reception." 1) Neither the weak nor strong brothers were practicing matters that were inherently sinful. 2) On the contrary, the subjects of discussion were said to be "clean" (v. 14), "good" (v. 16) and "pure" (v. 20). 3) Both brethren could continue their practice or non-practice of the disputed matter and be in God's fellowship. 4) Each was to be "fully convinced in his own mind" (v. 5) - which is not a liberty in sinful matters. 5) Judging one another was forbidden (vv. 3-4) - which is not a liberty in sinful matters. 6) Each was to keep his personal faith to himself (v. 22) - which is not a liberty in sinful matters. 7) "Serving Christ in these things" (v. 18) is not possible in sinful matters. 8) Toleration of sin does not edify one another (v. 19). They were not to "dispute" about such matters (v. 1) - which is not possible about sinful matters (Jude 3)” (<i>Toward a Better Understanding - The Burnet Meeting</i>; The Preceptor Company; 2000; Pages 108-109).</p> <p>“When matters are injected into Romans 14 that are either commanded or forbidden and treated as though they are authorized liberties, a license to sin has been created” (<i>Toward a Better Understanding - The Burnet Meeting</i>; The Preceptor Company; 2000; Page 112).</p>	<p>Tom Roberts Now: “You seem to have no grasp of the Lord's teaching in Romans 14... Yes, I understand that we are to hate all that is evil, but you certainly go beyond that. In your zeal to rend and tear your brethren, your hatred extends to those who exercise a liberty different from yours” (evidence below in the emails).</p>
<p>Tom Roberts Then: “Those who cannot accept what the Bible teaches about fellowship will draw the line of fellowship against us and division will follow. In that case, they will be the ones responsible for the breach in fellowship because they could not tolerate the preaching of the truth on that subject” (<i>Toward a Better Understanding - The Burnet Meeting</i>; The Preceptor Company; 2000; Page 115).</p>	<p>Tom Roberts Now: “I see no reason to continue our correspondence. I had hoped that a study would be profitable for both of us, but your closed mind and refusal to consider scriptural arguments precludes such an arrangement... (evidence below in the emails).</p>

The Emails Between Tom and I

From: TOM ROBERTS [mailto:tmr1935@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Tuesday, August 26, 2008 11:15 AM
To: Brianyeager@wordsoftruth.net
Subject: Remarks about GOT, etc

Dear brother Yeager:

I have been undecided about the wisdom of responding to your article about the GOT lectures and your personal attack on me and others. However, I do not consider myself your enemy and make it a practice to seek an opportunity to study wherever possible. I appeal to your responsibility as a child of God to respond as befits a Christian.

I do not believe that you intentionally wished to misrepresent me, however you actually did. You accused me of arguing in favor of "church gymnasiums, fellowship halls, usage of ther church's resources for social events such as weddings and funerals (Tom Roberts explicitly stated such in the above forum)". While I did say that weddings and funerals should not be items that divide us, I certainly did not argue in favor of the other items you tied to my lesson, unfairly. You put words into my mouth that I object to and I have preached against these things all my life. You have assumed that weddings and funerals are social occasions. While there are social activities sometimes attached to weddings and funerals, they are not, in themselves, social functions at all. When I preach weddings and funerals, I preach the truth concerning these events. If an engaged couple comes to my office to discuss their marriage, I go over the same truths in my study with them. If this is done in the church building, is that sinful? What is the difference if I teach the same truths in the auditorium and not the office? Does this make me as liberal as Max Lucado, et al? In fact, I have preached with congregations that did not want to use the church's building for weddings and funerals and never made it an issue. I don't believe we should divide about such matters. That was the point of my use of them - "must we divide over every issue?"

Your attitude is one of hate and bitterness, brother Yeager. If I am wrong in any particle of truth, I want to be corrected. I really do want to go to heaven when this life is over. You will be my friend if you will show me any error that I teach or practice. Your criticism does not make me angry with you or make you my enemy. But "speaking the truth in love" seems to be above your nature. I appeal to you to lower your anger and vitriol and address the issue.

You really did not address either Ron Halbrook's agruments or mine. If you want to have a meaningful study, you need to look at our honest and studied agruments and show the fallacy of them. I will listen if you have an argument to make. By the way, I would not hesitate to visit Sunrise Acres and study with you publicly if it would be productive. In the meantime, please read "We Have A Right" and listen to the points of our speeches and address what we had to say. These substantive arguments should not be dismissed with a wave of your hand or a snide remark. Liberalism never is able to make a scriptural argument since it has no scripture upon which to stand. We have addressed the word of God in an attempt to prove that our actions are scriptural. That is a major difference between us and liberals.

I believe that you owe me the courtesy of correcting the accusation addressed above in the quote. I am not liberal - having proved this in battles over the last half century. I hope you will make that correction on your web site at the earliest convenience.

I understand that you left liberalism in your search for truth. I commend you for that, but please don't fall into the pendulum effect of swinging from one extreme to the other. Not all who disagree with you on the use of lectureships are liberal. There are items upon which brethren disagree that are worthy of serious and prayerful study. I am willing to do that, but if I am constantly met with anger and hostility, I will not continue to suffer that treatment.

Your brother, in hope of heaven,

Tom Roberts

From: Brian A. Yeager <brian@wordsoftruth.net>
To: TOM ROBERTS <tmr1935@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Tuesday, August 26, 2008 3:49:22 PM
Subject: RE: Remarks about GOT, etc

Dear Tom:

I will attempt to answer your every point. I will not do this often or maybe even again in email. I truly think face to face discussions are better. My offer to come to El Paso is true. If such an offer were made in return you'd see me to discuss the issues among a congregation as soon as I could get there (within a week here in Texas, maybe even next day).

I tell you with a sad heart, you are an enemy of mine (Matthew 12:30 and Philippians 3:18). Whether or not my response shall be befitting a Christian can be left to the Lord's judgment (II Corinthians 10:18). The article I wrote yesterday was in accordance with Romans 16:17-18 and meant in such a spirit. Am I angry? Yes, most certainly. I stand amazed that so-called Gospel preachers of a conservative mindset (not in my estimation at all, but obviously in the minds of others), would twist the Scriptures to justify their human institution of which you are obviously a part of. How could you sit back while Ron Halbrook used Noah building the Ark and twisting the example to ultimately argue that silence is permissive? Yes sir, you sat back while your friend and fellow servant in the cause of men perverted a very basic principle. The argument Ron made and you endorsed (II John 9-11) allows the other liberals to argue statements just like were made in the lecture forum. Example - Since Noah was not told he could not build a fishing boat he was allowed. Therefore, we are told to sing, but nothing forbids us from playing. The same arguments can be used to justify church sponsored recreation and entertainment. In fact, there is less of a stretch there than for the arguments you've made up. Tom, either you are an honest man blinding by friendships and a severe party-spirit or you are a dishonest man. Either way, you have perverted the word of God (Acts 13:10).

No sir, I did not misrepresent you. I said: " Tom Roberts and Ron Halbrook sound just like every liberal I have ever heard trying to justify their unauthorized practices as a liberty via I

Corinthians 8 and Romans 14. Their arguments allow for church gymnasiums, fellowship halls, usage of the church's resources for social events such as weddings and funerals (Tom Roberts explicitly stated such in the above forum), etc. which are all the language of Ashdod (Nehemiah 13:24 and I Peter 4:11)." As you admitted below, you in fact DID justify the social works of weddings and funerals using the church's resources. Again, maybe you cannot see your inconsistency (Proverbs 21:2). You see Tom, the other liberals will argue, as you have below with weddings and funerals, that potlucks and other social affairs are teaching opportunities. They argue if a preacher can eat in his office the church can in the building. Tom, your arguments below are the same arguments used for fellowship halls, yet you say I misrepresent you? Nay, you chose to be inconsistent. Sometimes we cannot see our errors because we are more set on defending ourselves than examining ourselves (Matthew 22:15-46; cf. Haggai 1:5; 7). If you'd like to provide the Scripture(s) showing that weddings and funerals are a work of the local church, I'd be delighted to repent (though I am full well aware such cannot be done). Therefore, since there are no Scriptures, you do sin when doing such (Romans 14:23 and I John 3:4).

Must we divide over every issue seems to be your running call along with "is it a test of fellowship?". Tom, if you teach or practice something unauthorized by the Lord we are divided like it or not (I Corinthians 1:10, Philippians 2:2; 3:16). If I choose to ignore a difference and go along with it, we are only united in sin together (Amos 3:3). I am attaching an article for you to consider and I hope you will. It is a future bulletin article for my local work here in El Paso on the subject matter of "Test's of Fellowship" (notice how just the Scriptures can be used to teach rather than human reasoning and argumentation). Further, you guys loved to say people will not discuss Florida College and other institutions. Nay, some of us not only will, but have many times. I have three articles on my website about FC, "Bible Camps", and other innovations of Non-Institutional (yea, right) folks. Do you guys even realize you are now in Institutionalism? Did you guys simply ignore that moderator (Steve something from what I could tell) when he outright said so?

Yes, I do have an attitude of hate (Romans 12:9). Don't you? You are wrong in a several areas if you choose to see that I'd be delighted to help you. Let me first suggest that you have to get past yourself before you can see the Lord and His truth (James 4:6-10). Speaking the truth in love is exactly what I am trying to do (Revelation 3:19; cf. Proverbs 27:5). When men have corrupted the truth, as you and other G.O.T party members, one cannot bit show his disdain for what is done. Maybe a careful reading of Matthew 23 will help you to understand my point.

I am sorry that you feel I owe you to correct an accurate statement. Because you cannot see where you doctrine leads is not my fault. Maybe you'd look at Ron's benevolence institution and see where you are all headed. Soon, you'll still oppose "church kitchens" (language of Ashdod), but you'll be more left than the left on Institutionalism. Let me assure you Tom, as a former liberal who fought fights while a liberal, you are a liberal! You have taken liberty with the word of God and such qualifies the term.

You should not commend me for leaving liberalism. It is not a badge of honor, but rather dishonor. This shows that in times past I did not respect the authority of the Lord my God (Ephesians 5:10). I was headed for Hell (Revelation 22:18-19). The fact that I had to repent and

turn to the truth is sad, for had I never followed the marching call of liberalism I would have never needed to repent. Tom, I must warn you again that the path you are on leads to destruction.

I did something when I was in the process of leaving the liberal mindset and I shall suggest the same to you. I knew that I was ignorant and did not understand what the will of the Lord was (Ephesians 5:17). Thus, I drew a chart with four columns on my whiteboard. It stated action in column one, command in two, example in three, and necessary conclusion in column four. I listed all that I did as an individual and all the local church was doing as well in column one. When I could not fill in at least one of the three remaining columns with a Scripture, after diligent study and searching, I stopped the practice and preached against it. Sadly, there were almost as many with Scriptures as there was without. I had just done what I had seen for way too long.

Tom, I assure you there are many things you have overlooked in your traditions. Consider the opening prayer at the open forum. The man leading the prayer prayed several times for God's direct influence in helping the sick, with an understanding of the Scriptures, etc.? Surely, you have taught against this many times. You have taught how God does not directly give us knowledge and understanding. Surely, you understand these were prayed for in the 1st century, but they were answered through spiritual gifts (I Corinthians 12:3-11). Just consider, you've heard this many times over and may even say "help us with a better understanding of thy word, etc.", but did you ever think about what you were saying (I Corinthians 14:15). I hope you will stop and think for a while. Get off of the G.O.T. bus, Tom!

There is more to say. If you desire a study, which would be recorded and made available online, I am very much up to it. Are you? Do you have authority from the Guardian of Truth Institution to speak on their behalf? Let me know!

Sincerely,

Brian A. Yeager
3917 Tierra Roman Dr.
El Paso, TX 79938
915-525-5794
brianyeager@wordsoftruth.net
www.wordsoftruth.net

From: TOM ROBERTS [mailto:tmr1935@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Wednesday, August 27, 2008 11:23 AM
To: Brian A. Yeager
Subject: Re: Remarks about GOT, etc

Dear brother Yeager:

Sadly, you are a classic example of why "we must divide on every issue." Your view of scripture does not include the biblical category of authorized liberties. You allow no one the liberty to differ from you on any issue. You seem to have no grasp of the Lord's teaching in Romans 14, nor do you have a grasp of the Lord's teaching on "love the brotherhood," or "love one another." You are, admittedly, a disciple of hate.

Yes, I understand that we are to hate all that is evil, but you certainly go beyond that. In your zeal to rend and tear your brethren, your hatred extends to those who exercise a liberty different from yours.

I see no reason to continue our correspondence. I had hoped that a study would be profitable for both of us, but your closed mind and refusal to consider scriptural arguments precludes such an arrangement.

I predict that you will one day be like Carl Ketcherside and Leroy Garrett. They had such a radical attitude in the beginning of their work that they marked everyone but themselves as liberal. Then, when they made their flip (as radicals often do), they embraced every liberal cause and beyond. I fear that will be your future.

If you ever cast off your mantle of hate and diatribe, please contact me. I always remain open to mutual respect and Bible study.

Brotherly

Tom Roberts

From: Brian A. Yeager [mailto:brian@wordsoftruth.net]
Sent: Wednesday, August 27, 2008 4:51 PM
To: 'TOM ROBERTS'
Subject: RE: Remarks about GOT, etc

Dear Tom:

As soon as time permits, I must write the article titled: "G.O.T. Now Says Institutionalism Is A Matter of Romans 14"! I almost cannot wait. I wish I had the time today to do it. Yet, at the same time, your application of Romans 14 also exposes your dishonesty. If you really believe the Institution you are a part of is a matter of Romans 14, then you must cease your practices as others are offended (Romans 14:13; 19-21). Furthermore, since you now believe Romans 14 allows for Institutionalism, give me a call and I will give you some phone numbers for many of the "new" brethren you are now in fellowship with. you might be able to attend a few new lectures too (i.e. ACU, Freed Haredman, Harding, etc.). These are now all in your fellowship based upon your logic and reasoning.

I also find it fascinating that you are part of a human institution that has caused division, yet you accuse others of division. You guys sound like Ahab (I Kings 18:17). Thus, I shall respond by saying, I have not troubled brethren; but thou, and thy fellow institutional preachers (again, by your own admission), in that ye have forsaken the commandments of the LORD, and thou hast followed denominationalism (cf. I Kings 18:18). When you show me that forming human institutions such as the Guardian of Truth Institution is a scriptural liberty from God's word, I will then concede. However, we both know that human institutions such as the G.O.T. were not hinted to, ever, in God's word. Therefore, it should not even be a thought of ours (I Corinthians 4:6). Again, I must ask, when did God ask for what you have done (II Samuel 7:1-7)? As for others differing on issues of conscience with me, how do you know anything about me since we have never conversed nor discussed the matter you accuse me of? If you would like, I can prove I know others who I disagree with over matters of personal conscience (i.e. home schooling), yet I do not assert my conscience on theirs! However, when someone begins to teach or practice something without the authority of our Lord (Colossians 3:17), I will stand against them (Ephesians 5:11). Your charge is false, but I understand why a person with no scriptures to defend their view would have to create a straw man.

Your implication of "love the brotherhood" is a classic argument of institutionalism. Are you trying to stretch the idea of a universal church and a working brotherhood here? I am asking, because it SEEMS to be the implication you are making since I am familiar with the argument made by most institutional minded folks. When have I attempted to "rend and tear" my brethren? Are you assuming I think of you as a brother or that I tried to rend and tear you at that? I am careful to call someone a brother, having an understanding of who deserves such a relationship (Matthew 12:46-50 and II Corinthians 6:14-18; cf. I John 4:1). If rebuking sin and marking false teachers is what you consider rending and tearing "brethren", I am guilty I suppose (Romans 16:17-18 and Revelation 3:19; cf. I Timothy 5:20).

I figured you would not want to continue any discussion. I know that those who do not have the truth cannot have a Biblical discussion. I said that in my article. I see that in the Scriptures: *"And no man was able to answer him a word, neither durst any man from that day forth ask him any more questions"* (Matthew 22:46). If I were trying to defend institutionalism, I'd run from a biblical discussion as well (cf. Matthew 21:23-27). In fact, I use to do that very thing so I recognize it firsthand. The only surprise anyone could have is that you and your party use to accuse Ed Harrell and his buddies as being cowards in not discussing Romans 14. Now, you make the same arguments as they do / did! Consider: *"For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged: and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again... For by thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned"* (Matthew 7:2; 12:37). I often tell people that Truth Magazine is the NEW CHRISTIANITY MAGAZINE (that may be an understatement, I saw a copy last year in which the front cover of 'Truth' looked like a Watchtower publication). I'm surprised Ed Harrell is not on the board of directors. Let me ask, is he a silent advisor on how to dodge Biblical questions and avoid Biblical discussions for your foundation?

Tom, I hope I am never like Carl Ketcherside and Leroy Garrett. I will not make an arrogant claim wherein I'd say "never" (I Corinthians 10:12). I suppose if I ever slip to their errors, we then would be in fellowship with each other seeing as how you use Romans 14 just as they did!

By the way, what will you be telling all the institutional folks among the liberals when they hear your fellowship saying "We are a human institution"? Will you apologize to them for marking them in the past since you now see this as a Romans 14 issue? Will you apologize since they've maintained their institutions and practices have always been a matter of Romans 14? Who's done some flipping, Tom? Can't you even see who you sound like?

Finally, I still will leave the open invitation for a public discussion here in El Paso (formal or otherwise) and I stand prepared to come at the drop of a hat to the congregation where you are (I'll drop the hat too if I have to) for a recorded discussion.

Sincerely,

Brian A. Yeager
3917 Tierra Roman Dr.
El Paso, TX 79938
915-525-5794
brianyeager@wordsoftruth.net
www.wordsoftruth.net

From: Brian A. Yeager [mailto:brianyeager@wordsoftruth.net]
Sent: Thursday, August 28, 2008 5:51 PM
To: 'TOM ROBERTS'
Subject: A Request

Dear Tom:

I realize you are likely to not respond to the many Scriptures I presented for your consideration based upon your last email. I labored in thought about your errors and the institutional movement you are part of among the erring today. As one who left that error, I can see that "NI" churches will soon fail to exist if your cause continues along with FC and the other institutions among "NI" folks (what a misnomer). I tried to warn you that your words would judge you. Here is what's to come for Tom Roberts if you do not repent, turn to God, and do works meet for repentance (Matthew 3:8, Acts 26:20, Ezekiel 14:6, etc.). I am soon going to publish what you have written. 903 people have been interested thus far in the first article I wrote at the beginning of this week (not including emails sent). When I publish what we have written to each other I will also publish a section called Tom Roberts VS. Tom Roberts. You see Tom, you have treated me just like Christianity Magazine treated your institution and yourself in years past. You cried foul then, but now you are arguing the same Romans 14 garbage and using the same duck and run tactics. Your words Tom, will judge you. I submit the following for your consideration and will only hold the publishing of them based upon your repentance and a real discussion.

I have to leave for our Thursday evening class in a few minutes. I will be putting together the article and publishing it Saturday if I do not hear from you by then. You have my email address and telephone number.

In times you, Tom Roberts, denied Romans 14 “covered” Institutionalism. In fact, you then coupled the application of Romans 14 to institutionalism with some great applications...

**“If Fellowship Permits Matters of Considerable Moral and Doctrinal Import,” and
“Contradictory Teachings and Practices on Important Moral and Doctrinal Questions” ...**

Where Can Fellowship Be Limited On:

Institutionalism

Homosexuality

Profanity

Pornography

Social Drinking

Abortion

Evolution

Premillennialism

Instrumental music

Baptism, etc.

(<http://www.watchmanmag.com/0202/020214c.htm>)

“Shall the fellowship of Christ be extended to embrace error that divides churches and causes souls to be lost” (*Toward a Better Understanding - The Burnet Meeting*; The Preceptor Company; 2000; Page 96)?

“We demand the same right to confront the error as those who claim the right to introduce it. It is not "unrighteous," as has been charged, to quote those who teach error, citing the references, so long as utmost care is exercised to avoid misrepresentation. It is certainly not out of order to reproduce the exact statements which define that person's position. If there are contradictions between one's written statements and oral preaching, one cannot be right in both instances. If there are contradictions between one's past public teaching and his current private teaching about fellowship, these differences should be addressed and corrected rather than label objections as ‘misrepresentations’” (*Toward a Better Understanding - The Burnet Meeting*; The Preceptor Company; 2000; Page 96).

“While it is easy to attribute base motives to those who oppose unity in diversity and fellowship with "considerable moral and doctrinal matters," is it not possible, just possible, to recognize that something other than a "party spirit," or "jingoism," or "extremism," a "cur dog" mentality, motivates those of us who hold to a different view of Romans 14? I ask you to grant to those of us who differ the same noble heart that you envision in yourselves” (*Toward a Better Understanding - The Burnet Meeting*; The Preceptor Company; 2000; Page 98).

“It is bizarre, to my thinking, that seasoned brethren are discussing how much sin we may fellowship or how much false doctrine is permissible among brethren. The idea is astounding” (*Toward a Better Understanding - The Burnet Meeting*; The Preceptor Company; 2000; Page 102).

“Those willing to have fellowship with or encourage those who teach error ‘share in his evil deeds” (*Toward a Better Understanding - The Burnet Meeting*; The Preceptor Company; 2000; Page 102).

“If consistently applied, the application of fellowship through a misuse of Romans 14 will allow reception of sinful teachings and practices that are "honestly held," or about which the scriptures have not spoken with sufficient ‘clarity” (*Toward a Better Understanding - The Burnet Meeting*; The Preceptor Company; 2000; Page 108).

“Please notice carefully the parameters of Romans 14 which will not permit it to include sinful teaching and practices in its "reception." 1) Neither the weak nor strong brothers were practicing matters that were inherently sinful. 2) On the contrary, the subjects of discussion were said to be "clean" (v. 14), "good" (v. 16) and "pure" (v. 20). 3) Both brethren could continue their practice or non-practice of the disputed matter and be in God's fellowship. 4) Each was to be "fully convinced in his own mind" (v. 5) - which is not a liberty in sinful matters. 5) Judging one another was forbidden (vv. 3-4) - which is not a liberty in sinful matters. 6) Each was to keep his personal faith to himself (v. 22) - which is not a liberty in sinful matters. 7) "Serving Christ in these things" (v. 18) is not possible in sinful matters. 8) Toleration of sin does not edify one another (v. 19). They were not to "dispute" about such matters (v. 1) - which is not possible about sinful matters (Jude 3)” (*Toward a Better Understanding - The Burnet Meeting*; The Preceptor Company; 2000; Pages 108-109).

“When matters are injected into Romans 14 that are either commanded or forbidden and treated as though they are authorized liberties, **a license to sin has been created**” (*Toward a Better Understanding - The Burnet Meeting*; The Preceptor Company; 2000; Page 112).

“Those who cannot accept what the Bible teaches about fellowship will draw the line of fellowship against us and division will follow. In that case, they will be the ones responsible for the breach in fellowship because they could not tolerate the preaching of the truth on that subject” (*Toward a Better Understanding - The Burnet Meeting*; The Preceptor Company; 2000; Page 115).

Brian A. Yeager
3917 Tierra Roman Dr.
El Paso, TX 79938
915-525-5794
brianyeager@wordsoftruth.net
www.wordsoftruth.net

Conclusion

The human institutions among “Non-Institutional brethren” are soon going to bring the church into full swing apostasy. Those brethren who are truly concerned must recognize the same language the foundation uses now is the same used when Institutionalism was introduced in the last century. Brethren erred in the past by allowing the discussion to shift from the authority of institutions doing the Lord’s work to discussing church supported institutions. The premise was made to be misleading. The fact is, if God wanted institutions to be formed by man to carry out His work (whether the church financially supports them or not), HE WOULD HAVE SAID SO (II Peter 1:3 and Proverbs 30:5-6).

Brethren, the stand against these errors is long overdue! In the words of Tom Roberts we will conclude: “The Woodmont church (Sunrise Acres - B.A.Y.) will endorse such a debate (discussion - B.A.Y.). Will Easton Road (whatever congregation Tom is a part of - B.A.Y.)? If so, a debate (discussion - B.A.Y.) can be quickly arranged. Readers are urged to consider this controversy carefully. I know of no issue of greater magnitude nor of farther reaching consequences than this one. It has the capacity to "turn the grace of God into lasciviousness" (Jude 4) but it shall not do so quietly and without opposition” (Guardian of Truth, February 16, 1995 ~ Volume 39, Number 4).