

# **HOW NEW TESTAMENT CHURCHES DEAL WITH CHANGE**

**James W. Garrett**

## **PART ONE: The Inevitability of Change**

**Section I: The Passages of Life**

**Section II: Generational Succession in Churches**

**Section III: Cultural Changes in the Local Church**

## **PART TWO: The Unshakable Kingdom**

**Section I: Constancy**

**Section II: Unchangeable Elements in the Kingdom**

## **PART THREE: A New Testament Example of Handling Change**

## **CONCLUSION**

All Scripture quotations, unless otherwise noted, are from the New American Standard Bible ®  
© Copyright the Lockman Foundation 1960, 1962, 1963, 1968, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1975, 1977.  
Used by permission

© Copyright 2000 Doulos Press, Tulsa, Oklahoma. This article is copyrighted in order to protect against improper use of the material contained therein. Permission is hereby granted to anyone wishing to make copies for free distribution.

# HOW NEW TESTAMENT CHURCHES DEAL WITH CHANGE

James W. Garrett

Change will come. It is inevitable. For some, change brings fear. For others, change is the exciting dimension that defines life. In the 1970's when everything in America was experiencing change, one member of the church said to me, "Everything around me is changing. The only thing that seems to be constant, something that I can count on to be the same, is my church. I need that." Those who feel this way will become very upset by any change in their church. For them, the church is a destination, a place to settle. It is an anchor in the midst of a turbulent terrain.

In contrast to this, I recall a former member of TCF whose constant question was, "Where is TCF going?" For him, the church always had to be moving from one emphasis to another, one experience to another, one revelation to another. For him, the church always should be on an exodus. He craved change as much as the other man craved constancy and stability. Let it be said at the outset, that neither of these perspectives should drive the Church. Change is not a virtue. Neither is ossification.

## PART ONE: THE INEVITABILITY OF CHANGE

Before discussing how to deal with change, we begin this study by identifying some of the changes that are inevitable for the local church. First is the reality that we humans age and that we change with age. Physical change is obvious. Look about the circle and see how different some of us are in appearance from one year ago. What effects the church is the mental, emotional, and spiritual changes that occur with aging.

All of us have had the experience of being momentarily startled by some reasoning presented by one who is younger than we are (younger in the faith or younger in chronological age). We are startled only "momentarily," because we quickly see ourselves in our younger companion. That's the way that we thought when we were at the very point of life's journey, presently occupied by our younger brother.

### SECTION I: PASSAGES OF LIFE

In 1976, Gail Sheehy wrote the best seller, *Passages*.<sup>1</sup> The reason that the book enjoyed such popularity was because readers found in the book an accurate explanation of what they were experiencing in life. Sheehy is not a believer and some of her suggestions we must reject. However, her portrayal of what humans experience as they age is quite accurate. About every ten years, adults go through a "passage." One's perspective on life changes, priorities adjust, there is an emotional reformulation. Upon getting through the passage to the next chapter of life, things settle down, but going through the passage is when many people make major changes in their lives, some of them destructive. Most people go through the various passages without serious consequences, but usually one or two of them do have an impact. For me, the most

difficult passage was the one surrounding my 50<sup>th</sup> birthday. I was not thinking about the fact that I was "50." I didn't feel "old." There was no sense that I was losing it and so I needed to go out and buy a red sports car and find a new wife. There just was a very great sense of purposelessness. I experienced an ill-defined despair, beyond description. I recall one evening, standing under the big birch tree in our front yard. A dear friend, one who had seen me at my best and worse and still was my friend, said, "Jim, it's your age." I didn't say it, but I thought, "You idiot!" However, months later, when the passage was over, I knew that Jim Creitz had been right. It was my age.

Many men face a serious passage surrounding their 30<sup>th</sup> birthday. Sometime between 28 and 32, these men feel like a runner who has been running around the same enclosed course for a number of years. The feeling is, "There's that same curve. Surely, there is something else." Notice how many marriages fall apart at about this age. Notice how many men change jobs at this age. Women undergo dramatic hormonal changes. Normally, men don't, but the sense of running around the same course again and again has a similar impact.

It is not unusual for a man to be struggling with a passage and feeling that something has to change. He can't change wives. He can't trade off his children. He is afraid to change his job. The one thing that he can change without serious risk is his church. However, his conscience won't let him just leave. He has to have a reason. He has to find something wrong with the church so that he can justify leaving. He becomes a critic and begins to accuse leadership. Unfortunately, other church members often are caught up in his pathology. Elders may try to meet with him and talk things through, perhaps even trying to change something to satisfy him. My own experience has been that these efforts to placate result in failure. The departure may be delayed, but usually it is inevitable. One of the strange aspects of this behaviour is that after the departure, the departing brother often wants to keep up a friendship with individual elders.

This syndrome has great effect on the local church when a large block of the membership is of the same generation. An army marching in step along a road will break stride when coming to a footbridge. If the marchers kept marching in step, the rhythmic footsteps would cause a vibration in the bridge that could cause it to collapse. Armies learned this lesson because they did have bridges collapse as a result of marching across them in step.

When a major block of the church is in the same decade of life, they are marching in step, emotionally and developmentally. The resulting vibration often is very destructive to the local church. In such a situation, the elders suddenly are faced with a flock that is behaving in a bewildering manner. "What's going on, what's going to happen next," they moan among themselves. Some declare that it is a Satanic attack on the church. It may be, but the weapon that the enemy is using in such a situation is the very universal experience of the "passage."

Leaders go through these passages, personally, and that affects the church. Whether or not it should be true, it usually is true that the congregation is a reflection of its leadership.

## SECTION II: GENERATIONAL SUCCESSION IN CHURCHES

One of the difficult changes that several churches within our acquaintance have faced in the last five years has been the generational change in leadership. Many churches were planted in the late 60's and 70's. Their leadership, at the time of the founding of the church was in its 30's and 40's. Today, that leadership is in its late 60's and early 70's. Most of these founders were men of vision and they functioned apostolically. Most were men who inspired personal loyalty. In all honesty, it must be said that some of these men had ego needs that were met by being a successful church planter.

The transition from one generation of leaders to the next has been a mixed experience. In some churches it has gone well. In other churches, it has been a disaster. The key to determining whether the experience will be a season of blessing or a time of trauma lies in the manner in which the older generation of leaders conducts itself.

Every leader should be sensitive to the Holy Spirit's work among those who are under his charge. He should be asking God to show him his replacement, or replacements. He should be discipling and training so that there will be a pool of prepared men from whom the Holy Spirit can pluck future leaders. When the time for the transition comes, he joyously can begin to turn loose of responsibility and authority as the younger men assume it. His greatest joy becomes that of a father or older brother who advises and mentors those gifted brothers whom God has chosen to lead the church. When they do a good job, he has done a good job. He does his best to become as inconspicuous and hidden as he can. He praises the younger leaders in the presence of those in the congregation who want to keep giving him a special place. He keeps emphasizing that the church belongs to Jesus Christ and not to any man or group of men. One of the things that he has to deal with emotionally is the guilty feeling that he is not doing enough, because all of his life he has borne responsibility and has kept a boundless schedule. He knows that for the health of the church he must do less and less so that the younger men can do more and more, but he still has to deal with his feelings. If he approaches this time properly, it can be the happiest time of his life.

Such is the ideal manner in which the transition should happen. Sadly, all too often it does not. Some church founders cannot stop seeing the church as an extension of themselves. If they are not at the helm and controlling every aspect of the church, their lovely creation is being ruined and they, in some manner, are not the success that they should be. Some have their identity in their role, rather than who they are in Christ. Some have trouble giving up the sense of being "special." These are not thoughts that they would put into words. They are "unchristian" thoughts. However, their subtle, subliminal communication to the congregation effects the atmosphere and makes it difficult for the new leaders. If he stays in the church, the founder often has a comment on every problem, thereby undermining his successors.

In a traditional church, which has a professional view of ministry, there is this axiom: "When the founder retires, another leader must follow him as a sacrificial interlude. When that successor fails and is dismissed, the next leadership can be installed and the church will go forward to a new chapter." Even though I have seen this axiom proven many times, I believe that in New Testament Churches it does not have to be so.

### SECTION III: CULTURAL CHANGES IN THE CHURCH

Another change that effects the church is the change in culture. Present day America differs from the America in which I spent my childhood as much as present day American differs from Spain. In the seven decades of my life, I have lived in several American cultures. With the exception of seven years in Ohio while in seminary, I have experienced all of these evolving cultures in Oklahoma. Some of these cultures have been in stark contrast to one another. Although tempted to do so, I will not undertake to list the changes, here, they are too numerous. Like it or not, our churches have been impacted by these cultural changes. Leith Anderson's 1990 book, *Dying for Change*,<sup>2</sup> focused on how cultural changes are effecting church growth. The proposition of the book is that the local church must make rapid changes and adapt, if it is to be effective in reaching the changing generations; churches, must adapt to the Baby Boomers, the Baby Busters, and the X generation.

One of the most obvious changes in culture that has impacted the church is the change in music. The July 12, 1999 issue of *Christianity Today*, published an article entitled, "The Triumph of Praise Songs: How guitars beat out the organ in the worship wars." It is interesting that the subtitle spoke of the "worship wars." In many churches they have been just that. In the 1960's every church east of the Arkansas River in Tulsa had a piano and most also had an organ. Guitars were unheard of in the city churches. However, in blue-collar West Tulsa and Redfork, west of the Arkansas River, guitars were commonplace. West Tulsa and Redfork were different cultures from the rest of the city. Most of Tulsa proper considered guitars as being too undignified for a church service. Today it would be difficult to find a congregation anywhere in Tulsa that does not have guitars as a part of the musical team. The more traditional church folk faced significant turmoil as the transition took place.

Not only the instrumentation, but the musical style also has changed. A few years ago, Bill Gothard wrote and distributed a document, *What the Bible says about "Contemporary Christian" Music. Ten Scriptural Reasons Why the "Rock Beat" is Evil in Any Form*. Some have objected to any music that is syncopated. One person often has commented to me about the musical changes in our own local church, saying that we have "let the world and the Devil into the worship service." One family walked out of the service, one Sunday, because they objected to the syncopated music. For the same reason, another family that was with us for a couple of years began arriving in the service after the congregational singing had ended. They didn't want their children to be effected by the "worldly" music. On the other side of the coin, some view the hymnal and the songs in it as being staid and lifeless. For most of my life I have considered the music department of the church to be the war department. The musicians always seemed to be a main area of turmoil because musicians have large souls. It is a part of their gifting. In our present era, it has become the war department because of the strong emotions that people attach to the music issue.

## PART TWO: THE UNSHAKABLE KINGDOM

Hebrews 12 is very pertinent to our discussion.

*For you have not come to a mountain that may be touched and to a blazing fire, and to darkness and gloom and whirlwind, and to the blast of a trumpet and the sound of words which sound was such that those who heard begged that no further word should be spoken to them. ... And His voice shook the earth then, but now He has promised, saying, "yet once more i will shake not only the earth, but also the heaven." And this expression, "Yet once more," denotes the removing of those things which can be shaken, as of created things, in order that those things which cannot be shaken may remain. Therefore, since we receive a kingdom which cannot be shaken, let us show gratitude, by which we may offer to God an acceptable service with reverence and awe; for our God is a consuming fire. (Hebrews 12:18-19, 26-29)*

### SECTION I: CONSTANCY

This passage often is quoted as a section about change. However, quite the contrary, this is a section about constancy in the midst of opposition and turmoil. This chapter urges constancy on the part of the believer as a reflection of the constancy of God. Whatever the surrounding circumstances might be, the believer is urged, to keep *fixing [his] eyes on Jesus, the author and perfecter of faith* (v 2). Our Lord modeled constancy, regardless of the circumstances.

Another reason for our remaining constant is because we *receive a kingdom which cannot be shaken* (v 28). Verses 22-24 describe elements in that Kingdom.

*But you have come to Mount Zion and to the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to myriads of angels, to the general assembly and church of the first-born who are enrolled in heaven, and to God, the Judge of all, and to the spirits of righteous men made perfect, and to Jesus, the mediator of a new covenant, and to the sprinkled blood, which speaks better than the blood of Abel.*

These are the marvelous components of the unshakable kingdom. Here is permanence and constancy. Superfluous to these components are things that can be shaken, i.e., things that can be removed or changed. Rather than enter into an extensive exegesis of this passage, we only note the fact that some things are permanent and unchangeable and some things are not. What are those things that the New Testament Church must consider unchangeable and what things may be changed?

### SECTION II: UNCHANGEABLE ELEMENTS IN THE KINGDOM

- The Gospel message is unchangeable.

*I am amazed that you are so quickly deserting Him who called you by the grace of Christ, for a different gospel; which is really not another; only there are some who are disturbing you, and want to distort the gospel of Christ. But even though we, or an angel from heaven,*

*should preach to you a gospel contrary to that which we have preached to you, let him be accursed. As we have said before, so I say again now, if any man is preaching to you a gospel contrary to that which you received, let him be accursed. (Galatians 1:6-9)*

The historical events upon which that Gospel is based are listed in I Corinthians 15:1-4

*Now I make known to you, brethren, the gospel which I preached to you, which also you received, in which also you stand, by which also you are saved, if you hold fast the word which I preached to you, unless you believed in vain. For I delivered to you as of first importance what I also received, that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures, and that He was buried, and that He was raised on the third day according to the Scriptures...*

The historical events which must be accepted as such, are the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ. The good news is that by these events we are saved, if we believe them, trust in them, and hold fast to the promise resulting from them.

Churches that depart from the literal belief in these events are leaving behind the unshakable and becoming a part of that which can and will be shaken.

- The Great Commission, the summary of the final command of Our Lord to His Church, is another absolute for the Church.

*Matthew 28:18-20 And Jesus came up and spoke to them, saying, "All authority has been given to Me in heaven and on earth. "Go therefore and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all that I commanded you; and lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the age. "*

The First Century Church, under the leadership of apostles who were fully enlightened by the Holy Spirit, demonstrated how the Great Commission was to be obeyed. They went forth and preached the historical facts of the Gospel, then declared the promise of forgiveness and deliverance from sin to all who would accept the implication of this truth. Those who believed, immediately were immersed into Christ and then were taught and disciplined in their walk with Christ. This is Christ's command, and this is how the Apostolic Church modeled its fulfillment.

A growing number of churches are departing from a literal understanding of the Great Commission. They no longer will take a stand on the absolute truth that Jesus declared, *I am the way, and the truth, and the life; no one comes to the Father, but through Me.* (John 14:6)

Peter declared, *And there is salvation in no one else; for there is no other name under heaven that has been given among men, by which we must be saved.* (Acts 4:12)

The influential writer, Hans Kung, expresses a view that is growing in many segments of the Church. In 1995, he wrote *Christianity: Essence, History, and Future*,<sup>3</sup> in which he stated that Christianity is the "one true religion," he also stated that there are "many religions" in the

sense that the salvific truth can be found in all the world religions, though it is supremely embodied in Jesus Christ - at least for Christians. He advocates that our goal should be a "pluralistic holistic synthesis."<sup>4</sup> Kung is an author that only theologians and seminarians would be inclined to read, but the view that he expresses is found more and more in popular writing and in the attitude of many in the church.

Religious studies professor, Wade Clark Roof has produced a number of studies of the Baby Boomer generation. As a result of recent studies and interviews, Roof concluded that 1/3 of America's 77 million Baby Boomers identify themselves as "born again Christians." What do they mean by that? According to professor Roof, it means that they have had a "highly personal spiritual experience that has changed their lives." You are born again "because of certain feelings ... and experiences, not because you believe any particular set of doctrines." Shockingly, 1/3 of those who call themselves, "born again," believe in astrology and reincarnation.<sup>5</sup>

Such a departure from the exclusive way of salvation in Jesus Christ cannot be tolerated. These are changes that a local church must reject.

- Jesus and the apostles clearly defined the moral life of the Church. The Sermon on the Mount (Matthew 5-7 and in a briefer form in Luke 6); is a description of how citizens of the unshakable Kingdom are to live. Paul, in more than one letter, declared that immoral people had no place in the Kingdom of God. For example, in I Corinthians 6:9-11, he wrote,

*Or do you not know that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived; neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor homosexuals, nor thieves, nor the covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor swindlers, shall inherit the kingdom of God. And such were some of you; but you were washed, but you were sanctified, but you were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and in the Spirit of our God.*

He even ordered the Corinthian Church to expel a brother who persisted in open sin.

*It is actually reported that there is immorality among you, and immorality of such a kind as does not exist even among the Gentiles, that someone has his father's wife. For I, on my part, though absent in body but present in spirit, have already judged him who has so committed this, as though I were present. In the name of our Lord Jesus, when you are assembled, and I with you in spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus, I have decided to deliver such a one to Satan for the destruction of his flesh, that his spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus. ... But actually, I wrote to you not to associate with any so-called brother if he should be an immoral person, or covetous, or an idolater, or a reviler, or a drunkard, or a swindler - not even to eat with such a one... remove the wicked man from among yourselves.*  
(1 Corinthians 5:1-5, 11, 13)

There is a moral standard that was set by the Holy Spirit, through the apostles. This standard is unchangeable. It must be the standard for the Church for all time, even though contemporary culture is abandoning these standards.

Some things are unchangeable and these are clear. They are written plainly and as matter of fact. They are not matters that require interpretation. They are matters that the simplest person can understand, although the subtleties and full depth of all that is implied may not be understood. All that is required is belief and obedience. On these matters, the man of God must take a stand and say, "No change is allowed."

### **PART THREE: A NEW TESTAMENT EXAMPLE OF HANDLING CHANGE**

The biggest change that the Church ever has faced was the transition from being a Jewish Church to an inclusive Church. First, was the struggle that the early leaders faced over the issue of even preaching the Gospel to Gentiles. When that was accepted as God's will, because God certified it through miracles (Acts 10 - 11), the next issue faced was whether or not Gentile converts had to become Jewish proselytes. Many of the early Jewish Christians just could not consider the possibility that God might accept uncircumcised Gentiles. After all, the promise was made to Abraham; in the Mosaic Law instruction was given as to how Gentiles might become participants in that promise, i.e., through being circumcised and becoming proselyte Jews. The Messiah was sent to Jews in keeping with the promise to Abraham. So, they reasoned, there just wasn't any way that God could accept Gentiles into the Church unless they were circumcised and kept the Law.

This issue was on the verge of splitting the Church. That it didn't do so can be attributed to the Spirit-led behaviour of the leading Gentile Church, the Church in Antioch.

*And some men came down from Judea and began teaching the brethren, "Unless you are circumcised according to the custom of Moses, you cannot be saved." And when Paul and Barnabas had great dissension and debate with them, the brethren determined that Paul and Barnabas and certain others of them should go up to Jerusalem to the apostles and elders concerning this issue. Therefore, being sent on their way by the church, they were passing through both Phoenicia and Samaria, describing in detail the conversion of the Gentiles, and were bringing great joy to all the brethren. And when they arrived at Jerusalem, they were received by the church and the apostles and the elders, and they reported all that God had done with them. But certain ones of the sect of the Pharisees who had believed, stood up, saying, "It is necessary to circumcise them, and to direct them to observe the Law of Moses." And the apostles and the elders came together to look into this matter. (Acts 15:1 - 6)*

The Antioch Church reflected the principle that Jesus taught in the Sermon on the Mount.

*If therefore you are presenting your offering at the altar, and there remember that your brother has something against you, leave your offering there before the altar, and go your way; first be reconciled to your brother, and then come and present your offering. (Matthew 5:23 - 24)*

Although the situation described in Acts 15 was not exactly like the one described in Matthew 5, the principle was the same, "Don't let your pride keep you from seeking to make peace." However, we must not make a mistake about what was taking place in the Jerusalem Council. It is clear that in this situation, much more was at stake than peace and unity in the Church. At

stake was the truth about the Gospel. The real reason for the Acts 15 Jerusalem Council was not to maintain peace, but to establish the truth.

The Antioch Church, representing the Gentiles, clearly was theologically correct. Paul had received the Gospel from Jesus Christ and he knew that he was preaching the truth. Antioch could have said, "Bologna on those Jerusalem Jews. We are right and we are going to go ahead and follow the truth. If they have a problem with us, it's their problem." However, they did not do this. From their position of certainty, the Antioch Church did the godly thing. They sent a delegation to Jerusalem. This was appropriate for more than one reason. First, the Jerusalem Church was the nexus from which all other churches had come. Furthermore, the Twelve, by whom the Gospel had first been preached and who most of the Church recognized as the final authority, were in Jerusalem. The relationship between Antioch and Jerusalem was similar to the principle presented in I Timothy 5:1-2, *Do not sharply rebuke an older man, but rather appeal to him as a father... to the older women as mothers.* Jerusalem was the older church; in one sense, Jerusalem is the Mother Church of all of Christianity.

As could be predicted, when the Antioch delegation began to speak there was debate until Peter stood up and reminded everyone of how God had chosen him to be the one to bring the Gospel to the Gentiles for the first time (Acts 10). Peter concluded his remarks by saying, *But we believe that we are saved through the grace of the Lord Jesus, in the same way as they also are.* (Acts 15:11)

This quieted the crowd who listened intently to Barnabas and Paul as they *were relating what signs and wonders God had done through them among the Gentiles.* When Barnabas and Paul were finished, James, sensing the consensus, stood up, quoted Scripture, then said, *Therefore it is my judgment that we do not trouble those who are turning to God from among the Gentiles...*

A letter then was written to be read to the Antioch Church in a congregational meeting. That settled the matter, officially. However, some Jewish Christians just couldn't accept the decision and continued to itinerate and cause problems. Even so, this tremendous change in the constituency of the Church was handled in a godly and reconciling manner.

## CONCLUSION

Some principles emerge from the Acts 15 example:

1. Truth never must be sacrificed for peace.
2. When possible, the principles of Matthew 5:23-24 and Matthew 18:15-18 should prevail in church matters, as well as between individuals
3. When questions of truth arise, the question should be talked out
4. Mature brothers must seek the will of God and stand for it.
5. Some will not agree with the decision

Unfortunately, most controversies arising as a result of change are not as black and white as was the question of circumcising of Gentile converts. The changes do not relate to the elements of the "unshakable Kingdom." In the matter of circumcising Gentiles, God already had made His

will known. The Jewish Christians just needed to accept it. Most of the things that we deal with are not so clear: "I don't like overheads, why can't we use the hymnal that has sustained generations;" "Brother Elmer planted the church and served selflessly for so many years and I think that we should always get his opinion on how we do things;" "I can't stand the sound of that organ and the pianist sounds like a drum, he pounds so hard, I want us to use guitars;" "Full Breeze Tabernacle is having a great revival and people are slain in the Spirit every Sunday morning and I think that we should cut back on the preaching and spend most of the morning praying for people, like they do;" "I don't like the fact that we have more than one preacher and I think that brother Jones should be the only preacher;" "I don't like the way that we have been extending the worship time to the point that the sermon gets pushed late into the service;" "I don't like the way that we have been cutting short the worship time and leaving 45 minutes for a sermon;" "I think that we are displeasing God by not having a full-blown Sunday night service, even though attendance is down to about 20 folks - God is going to judge us;" *ad finitum*.

So, how do we handle these gray areas where emotions often loom large? From my own experience, I have come to realize that negotiating and trying to be kind can prolong the unavoidable. When there is controversy, either for or against a change, a meeting of some sort needs to take place. Whether the meeting should be between individuals, a group, or the entire congregation will depend on the circumstances and the issues involved. Again, from experience, I have found that congregational meetings called to settle some dispute often degenerate into an occasion for emotional, usually immature, irrational people to create confusion. Such a meeting should be undertaken only after much prayer and committing all things into the hands of God.

Leadership must be very loving in any meetings. It is important that the leaders treat everyone with greatest respect. Every person must feel that he or she is a person of worth. Leadership must be careful to use the most God-honoring language. Leadership must accept any attack or accusation without feeling intimidated or wounded. This is possible, only if each leader has a pure heart before God, as far as the issues are involved. If manipulation or some sort of deceit has been perpetrated by leadership, then leadership is vulnerable to accusation, and needs to be intimidated and wounded; they need to repent. Full and honest explanation of why changes have been or are being made should be given.

Once the appropriate meetings and conferences have taken place, the leadership then must make a decision and act on it. Leadership will be called, "controlling," by some, but others will thank the leadership for taking a stand and acting. This latter group feels secure with a proactive leadership. This fits the Matthew 18:15-18 pattern in which reasonable efforts are made to work things out, but immediately after that, a stand must be taken by the leadership. I have seen painful situations drag on for months, even years, with the situation becoming a festering sore, because leadership did not have the confidence to act.

It is important to realize that there are no bad people involved in most of these controversies. Usually, they are differences between very good people, but their perspective makes them uncomfortable with or irreconcilable to the changes under discussion, whereas others have the very same reaction to remaining with the *status quo*. Let me repeat, when leadership, acting after prayer and in the wisdom so received, makes a decision, there will be some who will criticize, attack, and usually leave the local church. Regretfully, one has to say, "So be it." The

important thing that leaders must do is to make certain that God approves of their hearts and that He is recognized as the King of the Church, not the elders.

---

<sup>1</sup> Gail Sheehy, *Passages*, (New York, EP Dutton, 1976)

<sup>2</sup> Leith Anderson, *Dying for a Change* (Minneapolis, Bethany House Publishers, 1990)

<sup>3</sup> Hans Kung, *Christianity: Essence, History, and Future* (Continuum)

<sup>4</sup> Review in *Christianity Today*, October 2, 1995, page 40

<sup>5</sup> Wade Clark Roof, *The Spiritual Marketplace Remaking of American Religion* (Princeton University, 1999) pages 115-120, 176-179

© Copyright 2000 Doulos Press, Tulsa, Oklahoma

Permission is hereby granted to anyone wishing to make copies for free distribution