

I think there is much to be said for it but I really feel there is greater danger in it than good. I think it's better to the same man(men?) by having the control of the church in the hands of a group of men who would be re-elected frequently. That is; say they were a rotating body elected every three years so that the people judge of their loyalty to the Lord of their sincerity and and/of their effectiveness when they re-elect them and then they should have a responsibility to, if they become convinced that the pastor has passed his usefulness there, to start doing something about it. I feel that any system with imperfect human beings has great dangers but the system of an election every year, I'm afraid can lead to the unsettled situation that would make it difficult for a man to carry on the sort of service that would be most effective. But I think it's much better than the system where a man can take a church and in six months run it down to six people. (Student question) I can't say that I think of any case in the New Testament, definite evidence of people selecting but there has to be somebody. You have to either have somebody appointing or you have to have the people selecting - you have to have one or the other. Or else you get into fights and chaos and difficulty inevitably. You do in every group and you have constant splits and schisms. Or else you have one group walking the other out of the property. That sort of thing comes to every group in the course of 30 or 40 years - every group. And there must be some place where authority, human, is situated. And I don't know of any Scriptural statement that makes it clear but my personal opinion is, from the teaching of the Scripture as a whole, that the authority is in the hands of the Christian believers as individuals. But that this authority has to be exercised in order to otherwise you have utter chaos. I knew of a man who was here visiting with us from the Pacific coast about ten years ago. While he was here one of the men in his small church began propagandizing heavily to get rid of him. And he told me he got out there and with all the talk and the criticism of him and everything why it just seemed as if two-thirds of that church was just down on him. So he listened around and he heard what the criticisms were and then he wrote a paper in which he took up these criticisms one by one and he said that he knew that he'd made mistakes, knew he had his weaknesses, but that he had tried to do what he thought was the Lord's will and he gave his position regarding the different points that were being discussed around and he sent it to every member of the congregation and then he called a meeting. At the meeting he threw it open for anything they would want to bring up. And a man got up and