



# Storming Fortresses

For the weapons of our warfare are not of the flesh,  
but divinely powerful for the destruction of fortresses.

2 CORINTHIANS 10:4

Vol. 22; No.02

©Copyright, 2003

February, 2003

## Thought Provoker:

The Bible is authoritative. By this I mean that we are to believe what it teaches and to practice what it commands. It is the Christian's only rule of life and faith, and all the opinions of men and women are to be tested against it. What contradicts it we need not believe....To accept the notion of the authority of the Bible and at the same time declare in favor of errancy is to rest on shifting sand. Infallibility and authority stand or fall together.

Harold Lindsell  
The Battle for the Bible

## Keeping The Faith Part 2: Pluralism and Syncretism = The New Christianity

By

Murray McLeod-Boyle

### Introduction

There is an old adage that states: "Necessity is the mother of invention." Generally this saying is applied to physical items. I would like to apply it to the metaphysical.

We are looking at Keeping the Faith—Biblical, historic, Christianity. We are undertaking this journey precisely because Biblical, historic, Christianity is under attack. As we noted in part one, the attacks come in many forms. Despite the differing forms, the underlying concepts are the same. Each attack comes from a denial

of God. In short, all assailants will in some way base their idea upon a presupposition which denies God the right to be first—to be all that He has revealed Himself to be, promised to be, and is by His very Nature and Being.

At this point we need to understand very well that not all attacks are aimed at toppling God. By this, I mean that not every attack is hatched in a back room with the express purpose of destroying God. Some well meaning Christians, in an attempt to do a good work, can make subtle alterations which in the long term will have drastic consequences;

simply because God was removed from his rightful place.

Others, of course, are not guilty of a simple intellectual error. *They have plotted in the back room.* These guys are the ones to whom the "mother of invention" adage is to be applied. These people want to deal with Christianity; and that for a reason best known to themselves. *The problem is that they are not content with historic Christianity.* This stems directly from their dissatisfaction with the presuppositions upon which Biblical, historic Christianity is built. There-

STORMING FORTRESSES is published monthly by REFORMATION MINISTRIES, a non-denominational organisation committed to maintaining and implementing Biblical truth as reasserted by the Reformers.

STORMING FORTRESSES is sent free of charge to all who request it.

We would ask that those who receive STORMING FORTRESSES prayerfully consider how they may support this work. Donations are gratefully received and can be made by Cheque, Credit Card (Visa, Master and Bank) or Money Order.

Amounts payable in Australian currency. Cheques and Money orders made payable to:

REFORMATION MINISTRIES,  
PO Box 1656,  
THURINGOWA CENTRAL,  
QLD 4817

©Copyright, 2003. All material published in STORMING FORTRESSES remain the property of its author.

Permission to reprint material from STORMING FORTRESSES in any format, apart from short quotations for review purposes, must be obtained from the copyright owner.

fore, they must of necessity invent ideas and concepts that will justify their jettisoning of Biblical presuppositions. After all, you cannot exactly claim to be a Christian or a theologian without Christ or God. That would be obvious to all, especially when you had to describe yourself as an “-Ian” or a “-Logian.” Consequently, ways are invented whereby historic terms and concepts can be used, but used without their original or Biblical meaning.

In this scheme, there is not an open denial of Christ. There is redefinition and devaluation. Jesus, therefore, is no longer Messiah, Son of the Most High God. He is not the anointed One who existed in eternity, who created the world and who has authority to speak because He is part of the Triune Godhead. To these moderns, Jesus becomes a man with a god-conscience. He is a good man who tried to live a moral life and who was put to death by some old grumps who did not catch his vision. Jesus is not to us, therefore, Messiah, Son of

God, dyeing on a cursed tree to appease the wrath of God and make atonement for sin. Rather, he is an inspiration to live a moral life.

Brethren, beware the “Ians” and the inventors of false doctrines! (When you remove “Christ” from “Christian” you are left with “ians.”)

## Our Context

In part one, we looked at the issue of hermeneutics and paid particular attention to the issue of contextualisation. I would like to pursue this theme as we continue our study.

Our aim is to take the general issues spoken about already and see how they are being worked out all around us. We hope to show that these ideas are far more prevalent and pervasive than many probably think.

### 1 United Theological College

Earlier we saw statements from this institution on the subjects of exegesis and eisegesis. To get the ball rolling we will quickly look at a summary of their teaching which illustrates how reinvention destroys historic Christianity.

As a conclusion to the discussion on exegesis, we are given four points to consider:

1. It is important to interpret the bible.
2. Interpreting the bible needs to be ethical.
3. Interpreting the bible needs to take context seriously.
4. God is still revealing about Himself through us (the human agency) and will continue to do so.<sup>1</sup>

Starting at point three, we would

heartily agree that “context” is important for interpretation. However, the essential nature of this is that we appreciate fully the context *into which the word was originally spoken*. In doing this we have a far greater opportunity of rightly understanding and applying the text. Unfortunately, this is not what is meant. As we have seen, the concepts flowing through this documentation all head in one direction—I. It is **my** context that becomes all important.

This self-orientation continues into point four. Now I am not sure about you, but I find it hard to look at this statement in any orthodox manner. It seems to be saying that we are, in some way, on a path to deification. Scripture is clear about several things. First, God spoke finally and fully in His Son, Jesus Christ (Hebrews 1:1-2). Second, the Scriptures make and keep a clear distinction between man and God. Even glorified man, in all the attendant majesty, will never be a god. He will always be man (Psalm 115:1 and 16).

These points betray the fact that the interpretation of Scripture for the UTC is completely bound up in the individual, his perspective, his culture and his time. The individual, therefore, governs everything. This is the reason that a feminist spin doctor can write such a diatribe under the guise of giving notes on exegesis. It is why the Uniting Church can accept homosexuals. We are gods. Revelation is not final. There is an ongoing validation process which requires the time bound individual to approve *any and all* revelation.

In this teaching, Man stands as the judge of God. God speaks. If Man does not like it, he discards it. God is not so much openly discarded as He is forced to sit on the sidelines. The

1. <http://www.utc.uca.org.au/utc.bak/private/bud110/8.htm> accessed 13/03/2003.

nett result is, off course, the same. The Garden is revisited. Man declares, once more, that he is god!

## 2. Highview Christian

### Community College

The dishonesty of those peddling these modern doctrines seems to know no bounds. Highview begin by stating that, “Our governing body has representatives from four participating main-stream local churches in its membership, but no general doctrinal statement adhered to by all members.”

The obvious intent here is to say that there are no “doctrinal” statements as such and that such statements are not necessary. Does this mean that this particular group do not believe anything? Is it to say that anything goes? Of course, not. It is more smoke and mirrors.

Under the heading, “Non-Fundamentalism,” we read the following:

As regards our approach to the Bible, Highview’s policy is to promote a non-fundamentalist reading of the Scripture in line with the most recent, generally accepted scholarship. Our main emphasis would be on the “stories” of the Bible, encouraging students to relate to these in line with their own faith and family traditions. Where different religious traditions promote significantly differing approaches to faith, moral and social issues, our policy is to make students aware of, and encourage them to respect these different approaches.

For a body that does not have an agreed “doctrinal statement” they have certainly made a fairly good effort. Keep in mind, statements can be negative or positive. A positive statement says, I believe...! A negative statement simply rules out certain things. Thus, Highview does have an agreed doctrinal statement. They have said that they do not believe in

Biblical, historic Christianity—a fundamental, literal type of approach to Scripture is *a priori* ruled out as valid. They do not believe the Fathers—modern scholarship has surpassed them. The Bible is not authoritative revelation—it is no more than stories to which we must relate and from which we may hope to learn. There are no prescriptions or prohibitions in this Bible. Conflicts are to be resolved by education to tolerance. After all, each view is valid and is equally true.

Once more we meet that monster named ‘contextualism’. The Bible is devalued and Man’s place in time and space is elevated. All are urged to relate to mere stories “with their own faith and family traditions.” In this scheme, the ‘faith and family tradition,’ become normative and God’s Word is viewed as transient. This is a reversal of the Scriptures’ teaching. Scripture declares with no uncertain sound that man is like a fading flower which the wind shall drive away. In contrast, it is the word of the Lord which endures forever (1 Peter 1:24-25).

As I critique this educational facility’s statement, I cannot help but wonder if they use the same principles in regard to educational philosophy. Are the teachers allowed to mark a student wrong? After all, if each student’s expression is valid, what does it matter that two plus two equals six, fifty, two, zero or four! I wonder if the history class is encouraged to relate to Caesar, Napoleon and Captain Cook as mere “stories” that may teach nothing more than a moral concept?

Consistency would dictate that they must adopt such a philosophy. However, we suspect that there is a touch of philosophical gymnastics at this point. If their approach to theology was applied to education, educa-

tion would become an impossible and futile pursuit.

This, of course, begs the question: Why are such obvious distortions applied to the Bible? The answer is found in our contention that all errors deal with the removal of God from His rightful place. This is no different. Acceptance of historic Christianity means an acceptance of the fact that we are men under authority. This is a concept with which autonomous Man cannot cope. Therefore, he must of necessity invent a way in which he is given control.

## 3. Churches of Christ

### Theological College

The prospective student is enticed to the Churches of Christ Theological College with the offer of a “multi-faceted program” which incorporates:

- a. The disciplined study of the Bible which authoritatively declares the story of God’s revelation.
- b. The perceptive exploration of how people in other times and places have sought or are seeking to be Christian.
- c. The nurture of spiritual development recognizing that we can only minister effectively from the resources of our own experience

On top of this, the enquirer is given an “invitation” to study and thereby join a “journey of discovery.” The lures provided are, amongst other things:

- i. Read the Bible afresh as new perspectives offer wider vistas of understanding.
- ii. Encounter God anew as theological insights are shared with others.
- iii. Reflect on faith journeys people have been making throughout the ages.

iv. Discover ways of connecting faith and contemporary life issues.

What is the prospective student to make of this? The better question may be: What is the uninitiated to make of this?

When people look at study, they are usually excited at the prospect of learning something new. Therefore, language which excites the mind can be a very effective advertising tool. Over the past decades it has become a fad in Christian circles to dress learning and many other things in this same guise. The above is a perfect example. The student is going to “explore,” conduct “journeys,” enjoy beautiful “vistas,” “encounter” God in some new and mysterious way and so on. In many respects you would think you are at the local travel agent booking a holiday to a remote, sun drenched Pacific island.

This positive language has only one aim. It is there to overwhelm the senses and to evoke an emotive response. It is an attempt to get the feelings to drive the will. No greater example exists than that of real estate advertising. Now we have all learnt to read between the lines when it comes to looking for a house. For example, “close to shops” means that the property is in the middle of a concrete jungle where no tree or blade of green grass exists. “Handy to public transport” means that the front fence is no more than two-and-one-half feet from a freeway. When the advertisement highlights the potential of the back shed, you know the house cannot be fit for rats. “Three compact bedrooms” means that you have to sleep people standing up in the closet. A “cosy entertainment area” means that you can only invite one other person over to watch a movie and it would help if they were under

forty kilograms! This is so you can stand in the closet to watch the movie. The advantage is that if it is a boring movie and you fall asleep, nothing is lost. You can just call it a sleep over!

The point of this little illustration is to make people aware of how language can be used to cover up the true intent of a point being made. To the uninitiated, the above statements may seem very enticing. However, they are essentially theological jargon of the real estate variety.

It should always be a concern when we read of God’s Word as a “story” or when “our experience” becomes the defining factor. It should also trigger alarm bells when salvation-history is viewed from a standpoint of looking at how others struggled with their faith journeys. This reductionist approach conceives of the Bible as nothing more than an historic record of how different people in different times have struggled with the concept of God. Scripture is neither normative or authoritative. Once more Man’s own position in time, his attitude to God and the workings of his own heart become the rule of law by which he lives and is judged.

All these subtleties are disguised by the new language—a language which hides a shift from objective to subjective; absolute to transitional; normative to nonconformity; obedience to dissension.

It is this framework that allows modern Christian institutions to trumpet that they can offer “wider vistas” as people read the Bible “afresh” from a “new perspective.” This type of enterprise is simply not available unless the historic understanding of Scripture is abandoned.

#### 4. The Bible College of Victoria

Before moving on to the next section, I would like to post one last example that illustrates how subtle the shifts in understanding can be.

The BCV list certain “Core Values” which express the “deepest aspirations” of the institution. The first of these is:

We acknowledge our primary allegiance to love God: Father, Son, and Holy Spirit with all our heart, soul, mind and strength. We accept the Bible as the inspired authoritative Word of the living God, without error in all that it affirms, the final reference for our belief and behaviour.

This statement would be, to most, reasonably acceptable. It has a few flowery words which may be there to appease a few people, but generally it would find acceptance. So, what is the problem? Well, the concern stems from the suppositions on which this statement is based. The introductory paragraph reads:

From **our** *experience and understanding* of the call of God **we** have identified Core Values that define the evangelical perspective, central ethos and fundamental principles of **our** community life and training programs.<sup>2</sup>

Despite the seeming orthodox nature of the opening “Core Value” the premise upon which it is built is decidedly unorthodox. Note that everything that is said is limited and subjective. It is “our” understanding and “our” experience which “we” have utilised to identify evangelical perspectives for “our” community.

The point that must be understood is that any change in the “we” / “our” automatically legitimises a change in

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.bcv.vic.edu.au/default.asp?id=31&mnu=31> accessed 01/03/2003. Emphasis added.

the community’s values. Consequently, this value system has no solid basis. It could change in any direction at any time depending on the make-up of the “we”. It should also be noted that these values exist only for this particular community.

This is the simple infiltration process. In an effort to be modern, accommodating, politically correct, tolerant and accepting, we begin to think the world’s thoughts after it. Again this is a reversal. We are analogues of God. We think His thoughts after Him. We are not of the World and their thought process has no place in our minds and certainly not in our theological institutions. Yet, as you can see, modern thought has infiltrated and it has done so because we have been afraid to stand up for the Gospel of Jesus Christ as revealed in the Scriptures.

**Pluralism**

This compromise will lead, first of all, to a pluralistic approach to Christianity. It is then a short step to syncretism. Finally, we will have a new Christianity. A concoction of belief which will draw upon the life and teachings of Jesus in a very non-specific way and which will be acceptable to all-comers. Its acceptability will be found in the fact that nothing will be objective. Everything will be reduced to the lowest common denominator. There will be no demands and no specific requirements—except that of upholding the unifying theme.<sup>3</sup>

Two hallmarks will stand as a har-

binger. First, agreement and acceptance will be based on the lowest acceptable standard. Hence, tolerance *will be* a high priority. The unifying factor will be an ideal rather than a set of specific doctrinal standards. In short, people and organisations will be pledging allegiance to a concept rather than a specific set of tenets.

Second, no one who holds to a fundamental, literal approach to Scripture, will be tolerated or found within the ranks.<sup>4</sup>

This is the new Christianity—which is really, old time paganism! It is around us. It is very prevalent. It is waiting in the wings for an opportunity. Allow me to show you what I mean.

**Sydney College of Divinity**

Under the heading “Ethos”, the Sydney College of Divinity says:

The SCD has developed a distinctive ethos whose features include:

- commitment to the Gospel of Jesus Christ as it is preached and lived out within our Christian denominations;
- respect for different theological standpoints of our member institutions;
- a properly critical approach to theological reflection on our faith traditions and on the relationship between faith and culture;
- willingness to work together and to celebrate our shared enterprise in prayer and liturgy.

Similarly, their “educational philosophy” is to be “characterised by a desire to:

- articulate the Gospel in a contemporary context;
- bring our different theological traditions into dialogue with the wider world of Christian scholarship.”

Before moving on to consider the wider implications, I would simply like to highlight the recurring themes. Note once more that the Gospel of Jesus is not objective and authoritative. It is that which is “preached and lived out” within denominations. This subjective element is found in each of the points listed.

**????????**  
 Whatever  
 happened  
 to  
 Truth  
**????????**

Continuing to highlight these things may be repetitious so I will simply ask one question, Where is truth in this scheme? This question is serious and so is the answer. These subjective approaches kill truth. Therefore, truth is nowhere to be found. Each denomination and its way of doing things is as valid as the next. This is why it is no coincidence that the first point affirms subjectivism and the second demands alle-

---

<sup>3.</sup> The end result will be a revisitation of Rousseau’s paradox—everything is tolerable except for intolerance.

<sup>4.</sup> It may be worth noting that the term “literal” is used in a specific sense. Liberals will accuse people of being “literal” in their interpretations. By this they mean that every word is to be taken literally. Such is nonsense. A literal interpretation is one which takes the text seriously based on sound exegetical principle. As an example, we do not view poetry or apocalyptic as we would a narrative. We know that there are other elements in the former which we need to take into account if we are to understand the text properly. We use “literal” in this sense. A sense that allows Scripture to speak.

giance to that very concept. In short, every practice is the gospel, therefore every practice is to be respected.

The point of plurality and syncretic belief is unveiled when you look at those institutions who are members, associates or affiliates of the Sydney College of Divinity. Members<sup>5</sup> include the Australian College of Ministry, the Catholic Institute of Sydney, the Centre for Christian Spirituality<sup>6</sup>, the Salvation Army College of Further Education, Southern Cross College<sup>7</sup>, St. Andrews Greek Orthodox Theological College<sup>8</sup>, United Theological College and the Wesley Institute<sup>9</sup>. Associates include Emmaus College<sup>10</sup> and Canberra College of Theology<sup>11</sup>. To most these are simply names, so let us try and unravel this puzzle.

There are several ways to divide these institutions and by exploring each we should see exactly why the charge of plurality is warranted.

1. Progressive Scale: At one end of this scale you have the Greek Orthodox. The McLeod-Boyle rule of understanding states, that when you read the word “orthodox” in conjunction with a direction (Eastern) or a country’s name (Greek) it should be read as, “Stuck in the first century.” Typically these churches are highly liturgical and have progressed little from the churches of the first few centuries.

At the opposite end would be the UTC. This college is progressive to the utmost. Historic Christianity has

been all but abandoned in favour of modern scholarship and a contextual understanding of the Bible. In short, they are liberal.

2. Authority: On this scale the church of Rome and Greek Orthodox institutions are to be found. These place a total emphasis upon the authority of the Church. As an example, the church of Rome will always accept its own history and statements before it will accept the Bible. If there is a conflict between the two, the church wins.

At the other end we would probably strike the UTC and institutions like the Wesley Institute. Although these are denominations with a governance structure, much more emphasis is placed upon the individual. As we have already seen, liberal theology emphasises the input of the peculiar person.

3. Theological: This category is by far the most important. Toward the centre of this scale you would have institutions like Southern Cross (AOG), Emmaus College, The Wesley Institute and Canberra College of Theology. To the extremities would be those institutions associated with Rome and the UTC.

At this point the real contention comes to the fore. The aforementioned group are all (broadly) evangelical. We may not agree with the charismatic aspects, their premillennial eschatology or even the inconsistency between belief and practice, however, we cannot deny that their

various “Statements of Faith” centre around the person and work of Jesus Christ. Each of these institutions gives a credible statement concerning the authority of Scripture and the fact that redemption is in Christ alone.

To one side of these we have the Greek Orthodox and Roman churches, to the other is the UTC. The commonality shared here is that the authority of Scripture and the sole reliance upon Jesus Christ for atonement and a right standing with God are devalued.

This brings us to the crux. Here are several evangelical institutions who subscribe to the authority of Scripture and the primacy of Christ and who, for resource pooling or accreditation purposes, have thrown in their lot with institutions that do not hold to these central tenets. This may be excusable if it were not for the ideology mentioned above to which member organisations have to subscribe. In upholding those statutes, these evangelicals are stating that the institutions that deny Scriptural authority and the primacy of Christ each have a valid Christian expression which is equal to their own.

Here we return to the question concerning truth. Can all these groups be right? Can the Roman church be a final authority and Scripture be a final authority? Is salvation in the Church or solely a matter for each individual? Is the Reformation principle *sola Christi* valid or not? Maybe it is time to abandon moner-

5. Members and Affiliates can be viewed at: <http://www.scd.edu.au/members.htm> accessed 05/03/2003

6. <http://www.thecentre.com.au> accessed 05/03/2003

7. [http://www.scc.edu.au/scc\\_believe.htm](http://www.scc.edu.au/scc_believe.htm) accessed 13/09/2003

8. <http://www.sagotc.orthodox.nsw.edu.au/body.html> accessed 05/03/2003

9. [http://www.wima.edu.au/wi/what\\_we\\_believe.asp](http://www.wima.edu.au/wi/what_we_believe.asp) accessed 13/09/2003

10. <http://www.emmausbiblecollege.org/What%20we%20believe.htm> accessed 05/03/2003

11. [http://pastornet.net.au/ccot/statement\\_of\\_faith.htm](http://pastornet.net.au/ccot/statement_of_faith.htm) accessed 05/03/2003

gism and embrace synergism!

Brethren! This is the thin end of the wedge. This unholy mixture can only bring grief. Not everyone can be right. Either Christ is the basis of salvation or He is not. Either Scripture is our authority or it is not. We can never say, on the one hand, that Christ is the way of salvation and then, on the other, sign a document which validates the religious expression of other organisations when some of them do not hold to that most important fact. To do so is to bring into question the very statements that have been made.

## Conclusion

The issues that we have canvassed here are of the utmost importance. The unfortunate reality for the modern church is that the quality of a denomination's training institution at any given point in time will reflect the quality of that denomination for many years to come. If training institutions are willing to compromise on these issues, then it is more than likely that they will breed an attitude of compromise amongst their students.

This will ill serve the Church Catholic as many more branches submit to humanism and secularism. The standard will be lowered. The witness of Christ will be lessened. God's instrument of war will be thinned in its ranks. In terms of the title of Brian Abshire's monograph, God's armoury will be looted. Culture will disintegrate.

"Pessimism!" you cry. No, an expectation of the outworkings of God's covenant stipulations: Righteousness exalts a nation, But sin is a disgrace to *any* people. The king's favor is toward a servant who acts wisely, But his anger is toward him

who acts shamefully (Proverbs 14:34).

Think about the parallels that this text draws. The righteous act wisely. They avoid causing God's wrath to flare because they obey His commands and do that which is pleasing in His sight. The sinners are not so. They are a disgrace because they bring death to a nation. Their lewd, irreverent, and disobedient acts are such that the justice of God is aroused to the point where He must act against them.

In such an environment the whole nation may/will suffer.

Another text that is relevant here are the words of the Psalmist: If the foundations are destroyed, What can the righteous do? (Psalm 11:3) The eminent David Dickson comments on this verse, saying:

First, Faith in God, and flying to him in all straits for relief, is the *foundation* of all religious and righteous persons, whereupon they build their hope and happiness solidly; for David had laid it for a foundation, that God was *a rock*, or mountain of refuge for men to flee unto in straits. Second, A temptation to mistrust God, and not flee to him in all hazards, is most dangerous, and destructive of all true religion, for it is the destroying of the very foundations of righteousness and happiness, and the resisting of this temptation is so necessary, as in what measure it is yielded unto in that measure the righteous man is put to a stand, and to a comfortless perplexity, and should despair certainly if he went from it: for, *if the foundations be destroyed, what shall the righteous man do?*<sup>12</sup>

In order to apply these words we need to extrapolate the necessary points as they relate to the wider community of faith. Mr. Dickson's

words are aimed, primarily, at the individual man and rightly so, for this is the context of the Psalm. However, I would like to argue that there is a wider application. Mr. Dickson rightly speaks of the individual mistrusting God and not relying upon Him in all hazards. This is a common experience. We have all been tempted to trust the arm of man. Those who have given in to this temptation can testify to how the arm of man readily fails.

As true as this is, we need to also recognise that the arm of man can fail in a corporate way just as easily. The plight that Mr. Dickson so aptly describes can equally become a "comfortless perplexity" to congregations and denominations. As we have seen, and as we shall see in the final part, there are institutions and denominations that have committed this sin of failing to trust God. They now rely on Man's best guess or research to reveal the ethical standards by which they should live.

Many years ago, when faced with the challenge of the humanist, large segments of the Church refused to flee to God. As the enemies surrounded the people of God and closed ranks to begin their slaughter, the flock began praising false gods rather than flee to the refuge of the everlasting God. At this point the foundation of true religion was opened to "danger and destruction."

Now we look at our church and our society in our present day. No better phrase than "comfortless perplexity" could be coined to describe each one. Society searches in vain for meaning. The rise of paganism is evidenced by abortion, euthanasia, pornography, murder, rape, theft; it is evidenced by murderers walking free after a few years and thieves being locked away for life—showing

<sup>12</sup>. David Dickson, *The Psalms*, (A Geneva Series Commentary, Banner of Truth Trust: London, 1959) 50.

where our priorities truly lie. Molestation of children and infidelity in marriage show how the rot has entered the most trusted and sacred of institutions, namely, the home and marriage.

Make no mistake, the Church is not immune from this either. The Church is equally searching in vain. Having abandoned the truth of God's word, she now meanders like a flooded river, driven by external forces, out of control, destructive. She is almost the opposite of what she should be. Instead of being an instrument for stability and happiness, we find many within her are equally comfortless. Here we are not talking about troubled minds pricked by the Holy

Spirit, but of families who receive no counsel and guidance from elders; young men who have no fathers in the faith to teach and train them; parents who mourn straying children; wives who marry the men of their dreams, even though they have no profession in Christ.

Then there is perplexity for those who seek to uphold a righteous standard and who suffer for it. Perplexity for parents who, in fulfilling their covenant duties, are scorned by leaders within the Church. Perplexity for children who listen to other adults deride their parents for striving to do that which God commands. Perplexity for the father who asks for help in raising his children. Perplexity for

the newly married couple as they struggle to understand the full wonder of the marriage covenant.

Yes, my dear brother, you have summed the nature of our day well! "**Comfortless perplexity**," indeed!

This is our lot because we have abandoned a *pure faith* for a mixture. Truth has been forgotten and tolerance is the new standard. Compromise, in short.

If pluralism and syncretism are allowed to abound and grow, then our churches and our societies will continue to founder. Comfortless perplexity will become the norm!