

**EFFORTS CONTINUE TO INFLUENCE CBS
NOT TO AIR HOWARD STERN**

By O.B. Porterfield

Florida Family Association (FFA) wrote letters to CBS's top officials to respectfully request that they NOT air Howard Stern because of the pornographic content of his show. This letter contained approximately 100 letters from large corporations who have pulled off of Howard Stern's radio shows in Florida. Additionally, FFA encouraged readers of the May 1998 newsletter to send postcards and letters to urge CBS NOT to air Howard Stern.

Since CBS did not respond to Florida Family Association and supporters' letters and postcards, FFA wrote to 605 large corporations which advertise on television. The letter contained Cal Thomas' commentary titled CBS: *Touched by a pervert* (referring to Stern). Ninety Percent (90%) of the companies to whom Florida Family Association wrote made the decision to STOP advertising on Howard Stern's radio show in Florida. The letter respectfully requested that each company inform CBS and CBS affiliates, as early as possible, of their intentions NOT to advertise on CBS's Howard Stern Show.

GOOD NEWS! Florida Family Association received a call from Roy Busnum with MASTERCARD INTERNATIONAL. Mr. Busnum stated that "*MasterCard would NOT advertise on Howard Stern's new show and would notify CBS of their decision.*"

Florida Family Association wrote similar letters to these corporations in 1996 to ask them to take the same position regarding *Public Morals*, NBC's self proclaimed show that revolved around profanity. Public Morals failed miserably. Hopefully and prayerfully, CBS's plans for Howard Stern will also fail. Please pray that many corporations inform CBS early about their intentions NOT to advertise on Howard Stern's Show.

541 Seibles Rd. Montgomery, AL 36116

(Ed. Note: Write or phone your local CBS affiliate station and object to any attempt to carry the lewd antics of Howard Stern in your area.)

NON-PROFIT
ORGANIZATION
U S POSTAGE PAID
DUNLAP TN 37327

DUNLAP CHURCH OF CHRIST
BULLETIN BRIEFS
Jim E. Waldron, Editor
P.O. Box 123
Dunlap, TN 37327

ELDERS AND/OR PREACHER

BULLETIN BRIEFS

Vol. 1

August 1998

No. 7

NO SALVATION TODAY?

Wayne Jackson

The doctrine of "dispensationalism" contends that Christ came to the earth twenty centuries ago to re-establish the Davidic regime of Old Testament fame. Advocates of this view argue, however, that since Jesus was rejected by the Jewish people, he *postponed* his kingdom plan, and so he will not sit upon "David's throne" until he commences his millennial reign at the end of this "church age."

There is a real flaw in this theory. The Old Testament contains a vivid prophecy which indicates that Christ was to function as our "priest" at the *same time* that he "rule(s) upon his throne" (Zech. 6:12-13). If the reign of Jesus upon his throne has been postponed, then clearly the Lord's work as priest has been delayed as well. This would mean that we have no priest functioning on our behalf. If no priest, no forgiveness.

Thus, the doctrine of dispensational premillennialism implies that, lo, these past 2000 years, there has not been available any redemptive system for man's benefit. This is the logical consequence of dispensationalism, and the very absurdity of it is a forceful negation of its validity.

P.O. Box 55265 - Stockton, CA 95205

MARK 16:16

Tracy Dugger

Jesus stated to His apostles, “Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned” (Mk 16:15-16). Surely this passage is among the clearest in all the Bible. One of the important truths it teaches is that baptism is necessary for salvation. However, many attempt to dismiss the force of Jesus’ words in verse 16: “He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.” For the denominational world teaches, “He that believeth and is **not** baptized shall be save.” But as this statement is compared with verse 16, one can easily see that Jesus did not so teach.

One objection leveled against us when we teach from Mark 16:16 is that Jesus did not say, “He that believeth not **and is not baptized** shall be damned.” When Curtis Porter met Glenn Tingley on this matter in public debate, Tingley responded to Porter’s argument on Mark 16:16 by saying that it did not say “He that believeth not and is not baptized shall be damned.” Porter countered in the following manner:

*No. I know it did not. If it had, it would have been silly. Suppose that some of you teachers who have a class in school, would give your class this statement tomorrow: “He that eats food and digests it shall have health.” You require the class to bring the negative of that on the following day. The next day Johnnie comes back with this: “He that eats food and digests it shall have health; but he that eats not and does **not digest it** shall starve.” I wonder what kind of grade little Johnnie would get on that? Why that’s silly — the very idea of digesting food that you haven’t eaten.*

Let me tell you my friends, the man who has not believed can no more be scripturally baptized than a man can digest food that he has not eaten. It takes both eating the food and digesting the food to bring health; but eating no food alone will bring starvation; and you do not have to say, “And does not digest it.” It takes both belief and baptism to bring the salvation, but unbelief alone will bring the damnation; and you do not have to say, “And is not baptized.” It takes both belief and baptism to bring salvation, but belief alone will bring condemnation. (Porter-Tingley Debate; Dehoff Pub.; 1947, p.269)

Porter devastated the error of Mr. Tingley by using a simple parallel. (1519 Miller St. - Malvern, AR 72104 - 501-332-8513)

DO WE NEED TO ADD TO THE BIBLE?

Roelf L. Ruffner

On June 10, 1998, the *Wichita Falls Times Record News* reported that the Southern Baptist Convention, meeting in Salt Lake City, “took historic stand Tuesday against life styles ‘contrary to scripture’ by adding a section on the family to their official confession of faith.” It was a four paragraph, 261 word statement. The first such change in the “Baptist Faith and Message” since 1963; it sought to show how the Bible defines the family.

Part of me sympathizes with the Baptists. The American family is taking a **beating** from the feminist-homosexual forces in our society. They are enemies of the Bible and the traditional family. Their goal is to redefine the family to include what God considers an abomination. If successful the family will be destroyed and our nation cursed. “Righteousness exalteth a nation: but sin is a reproach to any people” (Proverbs 14:34).

Yet, being a new Testament Christian and not a member of any man-made religious organization or denomination I feel constrained to protest. One does not need an “official confession of faith.” Such are not delivered by God but are clearly **human** in origin. As Christians we already have a divine document which contains “all things that pertain unto life and godliness” (2 Pet. 1:3). Again it is written, “All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be complete, thoroughly equipped for every good work” (2 Tim. 3:16-17). We do not need to add to these or create a separate “official confession of faith” (cf. Rev. 22:18-19).

It is ironic that Southern Baptists would attempt this in, of all places, Salt Lake City. This is the hometown of the **notorious** “Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints (LDS).” For years these folks have tried to hawk the Book of Mormon as “another testament of Jesus Christ.” However well meaning, the Baptists are guilty of the same thing. In other words, the Bible plus the Book of Mormon equals Denominationalism. The Bible plus man-made Confessions equals Denominationalism.

Denominations are constantly trying to “define” things. For centuries church councils and committees have churned out guidelines, confessions, and various attempts to “clarify” the word of God. Various denominations, such as the United Methodists, the Episcopalians and the Presbyterians have (in truth) tried to dilute the power of the Bible by writing their ecclesiastical creeds. They pale in comparison to the **Book of Books**. Box 278 Chillecothe, TX 79225

GOOD ADVICE

Bryan Hodge

I remember quite well some advice an older preacher (Charles Elledge Hill, now deceased) once gave me. He told me that preachers (elders or others) should avoid being alone with a woman in counseling, Bible study, or personal visit, or in any other situation that can be avoided.

His reason was really quite simple. First, it avoids the potential for jealousy and mistrust on the part of their spouse or their own. Second, it prevents rumors and gossip from spreading. Third, it eliminates the opportunity for impropriety. In counseling sessions especially, if domestically things are not going well at home for the one being counseled, it is easy for the one receiving the attention from the counselor to develop a certain attraction for the counselor. Fourth, it avoids the “Clarence Thomas Syndrome” as I would call it. That is, it keeps one out of the situation where she is saying one thing and you are saying another, and there is no witnesses to establish what in fact did happen.

This was his reasoning. As I reflect back upon what he said, I believe this to be good healthy advice for all Christians, especially for those who are married. The Bible says plainly that we ought to avoid situations that appear to be less than honorable (1 Cor. 16:1-4; 2 Cor. 8:16-21). Certainly to do so is wise (Gen. 39:11-ff).

Rt 4, Box 152X , Savannah, TN 38372

(Editorial Note: Godly elders and faithful gospel preachers are most competent to give people spiritual guidance for their lives. This God expects them to do. They should, however, explain to those in need of counsel that they are speaking as elders or gospel preachers, not as “professional counselors.” We must realize that sometimes individuals do need “professional help” even medical help. Bryan Hodge’s advise above is most wise. Also, the local church might want to contact their regular insurance provider to inquire concerning what in the industry is called “Pastorial Counseling Liability.”