

Dr. Murray on the other hand talks about the verities and the distinctives. And a lot of people think the distinctives are just as important as the verities which I feel is very unfortunate. But just where are we going to draw the line?

I mean for instance that because a man belongs to a certain church he is therefore outside the pale. I would say that the man should try to make the best testimony he can and he should consider whether he can make his best testimony in that church. But if he has a chance to reach a ~~couple~~ couple of hundred people in a church which is tied to a denomination that is bad, why isn't that better than going out and getting 10 people somewhere and leading those 10 people. But of course before long, if the denomination has gone pretty far, it is not just a matter of the pronouncements it makes, if pretty soon ~~he~~ he finds there is big pressure to have his people from ~~the~~ his church go to meetings where they will be given unChristian teaching, or if there are advertized meetings in the neighborhood which he as a loyal member is supposed to support, why then he gets into a situation where he's got to make a decision. It seems to

It seems to me that to quite an extent it is a decision of expediency rather than a decision in which one is right or wrong. But I think it's a person's duty to think through a matter. Of course the attitude of McIntire takes is that the Presby. Church U.S.A. has become apostate therefore nobody should stay in it and it is wicked to be in that church, perhaps even to go and speak to them.

That I think is an extreme unBiblical attitude, but I like it far better than the attitude of a fellow who says, Let's go along with the denomination and try to get a little out but recognize that as against what ~~little~~ little gospel I can get there are all kinds of forces coming in against the gospel. I think it's far better of the two, but I don't think == see why we need to go to either extreme!

That affects a great many other matters too. Like the charismatic business. If the -- If God did enable early Christians to speak in tongues as a sign, there is no reason he could not do it today if he chose. But are the people who do it today, are they simply giving vent to an emotional expression? Are they laying themselves open to demonic influences? Are they getting into something harmful? But when people say, That was for the first century; it's absolutely wrong now. It's done with. The Bible does not say that anywhere. It says, Forbid not to speak in tongues.

So to take an extreme, hard and fast position on that-- I mean I would feel much closer to a person who spoke with tongues and believed in Christ and the Scripture and stood solidly on the main things of the gospel, than with somebody who might be much more educated but who had adopted a good bit of modernist teachings.