12-21-78 page 6

AAM: Well, I was visiting a mission where the increasing modernism of the denomination had resulted in the leader of this mission to the Indians deciding to break and become independent, and he was leaning in that direction. I was talking with him and the illustration occurred to me, I said, you can take a hoe and you can hit someone over the head and kill him with it, while, I said, you if you are going to cultivate your field, you don't want to say that a hoe can be an instrument of death so let's use our fingers to till the soil. Organization is a powerful weapon for good or for ill, and it depends on who handles the organization. The fact that the modernists work at handling it may mean we have to discard it to some extent, but if it puts us back into working with our fingers, the people who use the instrument are going to go way way ahead of us!

I believe that particularly today— I believe that one big universal church is bad. It's mid too dangerous and gets into the wrong hands. But I believe that several denominations that in friendly rivalry can see which can accomplish the most for the Lord will accomplish far more than a host of independent churches. For a number of reasons. One reason is: An iddependent church in most cases depends a great deal on almost accident what happens when the leader goes. Particularly if he's a strong and able leader. Most able leaders can't work with somebodmy else that's an able leader. The man who can really step out and build things, usually has to do things the way he wants. The man who is capable of succeeding him usually can't work with him. So there are cases with where two men work together beautifully and one of them dies or retires, and the other takes over, but its' it's very very rare. In an independent church, it can change radically, tremendously.