have any officials, they would meet and simply somebody was picked more or less by random to preside. He had no authority. And they would not decide anything by majority vote, even in very recent days. No decisions by majority vote, xx simply decisions by what is the sense of the meeting. The meeting should come to a unanimity as to what they felt God's willwxwayx was. Amx And if somebody strongly disagreed, they won't make any decision. They wait and see if they can arrive at a sense of the meeting. There is much that is very attractive about the Quaker's method. One thing should be noted about it is that it does not have naything like the possibility as growth that the Methodist church does. The original Quakers were fiery preachers, and quite a sizeable group of over England came together into the Quaker group. But the group was hardly grown since. It is pretty much a hereditary group. And in this group, on the whole, very fine character has been developed, and w until the last fifty years, it was a very evangelical group.withxx In the last fifty, modernism has spread over 80% of it, I would guess, although there \$ 

The Quaker is the one extreme and the hier of the Methodist church is the other, though not in theory. The theory of the Roman Catholic Church is the mathema other extreme. Now, as far as at the Bible is concerned, we can find arguemtns in favor of the ker hier. in the anthrow authority which the apostles exerted. But the strange thing is that the leaders of the hier. thought they talk about apostolac succession, never claim to be apostles. I don't know of any church of any size where they make that claim. They claim to be bishops, but that the appstles authority, in some way, descended to the And you dont find any bishops in the N.T. with any and authority of bishops. that type whatever. Like modern bishops claim to have. The bishops in the N.T. are a group fo men, never an individual. And a group of men in an individual situation. So that the Xy Scriptural arguentn for a set hier. system is practically non-existent, as far as the Gospels and the epistles are concerned. You can find more by analogy, perhaps, in other books for of the Bible. But nothing directly.

51