

The following letter was received from a Brother who read my article in The Grace Proclamator & Promulgator which was a response of mine to Elder D. P. Newell, III, which appeared in The Berea Baptist Banner September 5, 2006, p. 407-9.

Dear Brother Settlemoir:

I take exception to your third paragraph in your article in Brother Camp's paper (Death Blow Averted). I read your entire book. (Brother Newell was wrong not to read it and BBB was wrong to print a review about a book that the reviewer did not read in its entirety.) Not everyone who has the malady of EMDA (as you call it) has a weak stomach . . .etc. I am not sick from EMDA. I am nauseated with the constant fighting among brethren about this issue. It is time to move on.

...

MY RESPOSE

Dear Bro ...:

Thank you for your letter concerning the article I wrote for Bro Camp's paper and the comments about *Landmarkism Under Fire (LUF)*. I appreciate every communication concerning *LUF* from brethren whether they agree with me or not. I am glad you read my book and even though you differ with me, I do not count you, or any other brother who differs, an enemy.

I would like to point out one thing about your statement however.

I did not at all mean to imply that all EMDA brethren are biased as you seemed to suggest. I emphatically said: "Essential Mother Daughter Authority (EMDA) brethren **generally...**" I know many brethren who differ with me on this subject that I do not consider to be as those described there. Some do consider the whole picture. Some do have good arguments. Some differ with me and we discuss these issues. One brother who wrote an article against my book came by to see me on the way to a conference and loaned me a book--a book which totally opposes his viewpoint! We discuss these things together. Yet, when we finish we are still good friends. In no way do I count any brother an enemy because he differs with me. But this stubborn fact remains. Generally those brethren to whom I referred, absolutely refuse to consider facts, arguments or Scriptures which do not line up with their position. They do not

answer our arguments and objections. Bro Camp and I have constantly attempted to consider and answer every objection, every argument and to carefully consider the Scriptures which they have presented for their position.

This is the very reason that in *LUF* I examined the Scriptures which are usually quoted to support EMDA in considerable detail. This is why I examined Mt. 18:20 closely giving a careful exposition of it. This is why I quoted so many Baptists who specifically apply Mt 18:20 to church constitution.

As to the acronym EMDA it is perfectly benign. In no sense was it meant to be a stigma. You have to call a thing or an idea by some name to prevent constant repetition of the whole idea. I tried to express exactly what my brethren mean in this term. If I have misunderstood their idea or failed to express it correctly I am open to suggestions for a better term. Keep in mind I had before called their position the *Authority Theory* but because they objected to that term in an attempt to remove all offence, I changed it to EMDA. Now I am learning that this term is offensive too! What will please them? Why don't these brethren select a term which expresses their idea? I can assure you we will use it if they will give it out.

I apologize for not having an index for *LUF*. I really wanted to include an index but with all the trouble I had getting it through the press and having to change it through three or four different word processors I had to give up on that. The glitches which it has were mostly my own fault but the garbling of the Greek and some other painful things such as the indentation of every first line on many pages were done by others after it left my hands and I never saw it until printed.

The quotes you asked for are found:

Keach *LUF*. p. 86.

Jones *LUF*. p. 88.

Dever's book is on line. I do not have the address on the top of my head but if you need it I am sure you can find it with any search engine. If not let me know and I will look it up for you. Also *LUF* is on line at <http://users.aol.com/libcfl/>. It can be searched electronically.

Brother, I wish to respectfully differ with you concerning "the constant fighting among brethren on this issue," especially when you say "It is time to move on."

When any man, group or church can teach the mother church (call it whatever you will) is an essential doctrine of the Bible and that no church can be constituted without

its use, and that any church constituted without it is a false church, when the Bible says no such thing, and the leading men of this doctrine admit this fact but still continue to publish it to the whole world, it is no time to furl the flag, but a time to earnestly contend for the truth.

When EMDA is so pervasive that a church can dismiss its pastor because he does not believe EMDA and yet it is a known fact that church was constituted without EMDA, it is imperative that we cry out. How can a man who knows these things be honest to his calling without an active ongoing opposition to such an error until it cannot find a single place to rest the sole of its foot!

I know of a man who has been baptized five times! This is the fruit of EMDA! The old Landmarkers never practiced any such thing! Every time someone comes along and finds what he thinks is an EMDA glitch in a church history, the doctrine demands you start all over again. Reorganization, Rebaptism, Re-ordination, on and on. If not, then you have no church! You can have no church fellowship among those that follow this error unless you are willing to let them give you this all important authority! This man referred to is literally held in the chains of tradition as strong as any Rome ever forged! I oppose all such with all my power. I love the brethren but oppose this error no matter what it is called.

J.R. Graves had a standing editorial which he published in every issue of The Baptist for years:

KEEP IT BEFORE THE PEOPLE

4. Each visible Church of Christ is a company of scripturally immersed believers only (not of believers and their unconverted children and seekers on probation), associated by voluntary covenant, to obey and execute all the commandments of Christ, having the same organization, doctrines, officers, and ordinances of the Church at Jerusalem, and independent of all others, acknowledging no lawgiver in Zion but Christ, and submitting to no law He has not enacted (read Rom. 1:7; 1 Cor. 1:2; Eph. 1:1; Col. 1:1-5; Acts 2:41-42; Mt 18:20-23-28; 2 Cor. 7:6-19; Rev. 2:23; Phil. 1:26-27; 1 Cor. 5:12-13). [Hailey. P. 47].

He said: "Keep it before the people"! I think this is the right thing to do. And this quote above indicates he was opposing EMDA unbeknown as it was not then developed! He also said:

I appeal to my brethren, and all men familiar with my public life, if I have not, from the pulpit, and through the press, apposed what I have believed to be erroneous in Baptists, as severely and faithfully as I have the errors of other denominations; and have been quite as intensely hated and as rudely treated and slandered by some few of them—the especial advocates of those errors—as I have by the advocates of other errors. I have opposed the advance of false teaching, and

inconsistent practice among Baptists when I knew that I should lose personal friendships, and receive positive injury. [Hailey. P. 50].

Graves did not think it was “Time to move on” while the errors he met were still up and running.

In another case a man and his wife are seeking to unite with a church. They were told they would have to appear before the deacons (is this baptistic?) and there denounce my book in order to become members! I am not informed as to what they did. Whatever happened to soul liberty among Baptists?

But beyond all these things my greatest concern is not that we have peace, although no one loves it more than I do, but that we uphold right and truth. Our Lord forewarned us that He did not come to send peace:

Think not that I am come to send peace on earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword. 35 For I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter in law against her mother in law. 36 And a man's foes shall be they of his own household. 37 He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me: and he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me. 38 And he that taketh not his cross, and followeth after me, is not worthy of me. Matt 10:34-38

We have the responsibility to oppose error and to support truth until the truth prevails--and it will! That is what I am trying to do.

May the Lord bless you and your labors for Him.

By grace only,

J.C. Settlemaier

----- Original Message -----

From: [dhillard](#)

To: jcsettle1@bluemarble.net

Sent: Friday, January 12, 2007 11:59 AM

Subject: Death Blow Averted

Dear Brother Settlemoir:

I take exception to your third paragraph in your article in Brother Camp's paper (Death Blow Averted). I read your entire book. (Brother Newell was wrong not to read it and BBB was wrong to print a review about a book that the reviewer did not read in its entirety.) Not everyone who has the malady of EMDA (as you call it) has a weak stomach . . .etc. I am not sick from EMDA. I am nauseated with the constant fighting among brethren about this issue. It is time to move on.