Dave Miller’s Reevaluation and Reaffirmation Of Elders

Intro: From the beginning of time we have seen the drifting away from God’s standard.

1. When Cain and Abel made an offering to God, Cain’s was not acceptable to God.
   a. Gen. 4:5: “But unto Cain and to his offering he had not respect. And Cain was very wroth, and his countenance fell.”
   b. God says, “If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? and if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door” (Gen. 4:7).

   a. The day of Christ would not come till a falling away; 2 Thess. 2:3 “Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition”
      i. Most believe that the “man of sin...the son of perdition” refers to the papacy of the Roman Catholic Church.
      ii. Warning to the Ephesian elders; Acts 20:28-30 Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood. 29For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. 30Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them.”
   b. Thus the first great apostasy in the Lord’s church came out of the leadership and organization of the church.

I. GOD’S ORGANIZATIONAL PLAN

A. God (the Divine Three) owns everything
   1. He created all things thus having ownership rights over His creation.
   2. Prior to the creation, God planned a way to reconcile man back to Himself when man sinned.
   3. To accomplish this the Second Person of the Godhead came to this world; Phil. 2:6-8 “Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: 7But made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: 8And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.”
   4. In His death He purchased the church; Acts 20:28 “Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood.”
   5. In His resurrection, He was given all authority; Mat. 28:18 “And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power [authority—ASV] is given unto me in heaven and in earth.”

B. Christ is head over the church.
   1. Eph 1:20-23 “Which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, 2Far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come: 2And hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the church, 23Which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all.”
   2. Col. 1:18 “And he is the head of the body, the church: who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead; that in all things he might have the preeminence.”
   3. As head, He has complete “right to give orders, make decisions, and enforce obedience.”
   4. He has established His laws and revealed them to man in the Scriptures.
C. Within the local congregation.
1. There must be the expediting of the laws Christ made.
2. Paul sets forth the organization; Phi. 1:1 “Paul and Timotheus, the servants of Jesus Christ, to all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons:”
3. Bishops (also called elders, pastors, overseers, or shepherds) and deacons.
4. Bishops:
   a. Acts 20:28 “Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood.”
   b. 1 Pet. 5:2 “Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind;”
   c. The congregation; Heb. 13:17 “Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves: for they watch for your souls, as they that must give account, that they may do it with joy, and not with grief: for that is unprofitable for you.”

II. DEPARTURES FROM GOD’S PLAN
A. Latter part of the first century.
1. Some had a Diotrephes spirit; 3 John 9 “I wrote unto the church: but Diotrephes, who loveth to have the preeminence among them, receiveth us not.”
2. This attitude brought the great apostasy resulting in the Roman Catholic Church with its sinful organizational structure.

B. Modern-day departures
1. Society went through a time of rebellion to authority in the 1960s.
   a. The Crossroads movement:
   b. They by-passed the elders of a congregation to establish a higharchal system like the Roman Catholic Church
   c. It was first under Chuck Lucas then under Kip McKean.
   d. It is now called the International Church of Christ.
2. Reuel Lemmons attacked the authority of elders.
   a. He was editor of Firm Foundation
   a. “It is well to remember that there is not one occasion in the inspired record of a body of elders independently arriving at a decision about anything. There is, therefore, no New Testament authority or precedent for elders serving in the decision-making role for churches” (47).
   b. Under the section titled: “A Tenure For Elders?” he wrote, “There is a solution that has practical merit. It is that elders be appointed for a specific tenure—say for a period of two or three years.... At the end of the two or three year period the church could have the option of re-electing an elder, or of not doing so, as it felt his performance record justified. In the event the church did not see fit to re-elect an elder, his tenure would be terminated” (61).
4. Alvin Jennings.
   b. He advocated one central eldership for numerous congregations.
c. It was reviewed by brother Wayne Coats, *A Critique of “How Christianity Grows in the City”*

III. **DAVE MILLER’S ELDER REEVALUATION/ REAFFIRMATION**

A. **One determines what someone says by what they do.**

1. To find out what Dave Miller meant in his sermon, we must see the application of it at Brown Trail Church of Christ in Bedford, Texas (a suburb of Fort Worth, TX).

2. This principle is seen in the Bible.

   a. Jesus set forth the terms for receiving the remission of sins.

      (1) **Mat. 28:19-20** “Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: 20Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Amen.”

      (2) **Mark 16:15-16** “And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. 16He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned.”

      (3) **Luke 24:46-47** “And said unto them, Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day: 47And that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem.”

      (4) In these we learn one must believe, repent, and be baptized to have salvation.

   b. We know this is correct when we go to Jerusalem and see the apostles’ application of Jesus’ teaching in Acts 2.

3. Dave Miller preached a sermon regarding elder reevaluation/reaffirmation (hereafter elder r/r).

   a. He preached that sermon specifically for the Brown Trail congregation and their practicing it.

   b. To see what Dave Miller meant, we look at what Brown Trail practiced.

   c. Thus, we will consider both in this lesson.

B. **Background information**

1. **Brown Trail had 8 elders at the beginning of 1989.**

   a. 4 of them were liberal while 4 were conservative.

   b. Tommy Hicks in a letter to Maxie Boren wrote, “Can you imagine my disappointment when you told me that Brown Trail’s elders are ‘split right down the middle,’ that four of them are ‘moderates,’ that four of them are ‘too far to the right,’ and that your thinking was in agreement with the ‘moderates’? Maxie, you even told me the names and how you classified them. You said Barnum, Lauderdale, Peterman, and Tyson are the ‘moderates.’ And, you said Cain, Clark, Watts, and Whitten are the ‘right wingers.’ While you did not tell me who you thought the ‘leader’ of the ‘moderate’ group was, you did say that Eddie Whitten was the ‘leader’ of the ‘right wingers’” (5).

   c. Because of health reasons, toward the end of 1989, Graham Cain (one of the “right wingers” according to Maxie Boren) had to resign.

   d. This left the 4 liberal elders in control.

   e. Events within the eldership forced the resignations of Eddie Whitten and Ed Clark (two of the other “right wingers” according to Boren) in the first part of November 1989.

   f. This left 5 men within the eldership at Brown Trail.
2. These situations lead to a men’s congregational meeting held Nov. 21, 1989.
   a. Charges were once again made against the liberal elders whom Maxie Boren said were “moderates” (they had been previously made in elder’s meetings).
   b. Nothing was resolved in this meeting (Dave Miller sided with the liberal elders and placed the blame for the troubles within the eldership on Eddie Whitten).
   c. This resulted in numerous brethren leaving the Brown Trail congregation and eventually starting another congregation in the area.
3. After these brethren left, it was decided to both appoint new elders and also have an elder r/r of the 5 present elders.

C. The sermon preached.
   1. On April 8, 1990, Dave Miller (under the authority of the elders of the BT congregation) preached the sermon advocating the elder r/r practice.
   2. Dave Miller was at that time the director of the TV program, “The Truth In Love” which was under the oversight of the Brown Trail congregation (Johnny Ramsey was the pulpit evangelist).

IV. DAVE MILLER’S SERMON
   A. Lack of Biblical evidence.
      1. He correctly states at the beginning of his sermon: “we are people of the book, and we believe that whatever we do in religion and life must be authorized and guided by the Word of God.”
      2. However, he makes almost no attempt to provide Bible authorization for the practice.
      3. What little attempt is made fails miserable to provide such.
   B. He gives Biblical authorization for the office/work and that there is to be a plurality of men.
      1. He provides 1 Tim. 3, Tit. 1, Acts 20, and 1 Pet. 5 and mentions “other passages”
      2. We are in total agreement on these points.
   C. He questions: “But how are these men to be appointed?”
      1. He tells us the Bible is “largely silent on this matter.”
      2. Then contraditorily states, “the Bible has a great deal more to say about that matter than most perhaps members of the church realize.”
      3. He tells us the specifics or details are not spelled out but the principles are provided for us.
      4. He correctly denies the doctrine of evangelist oversight.
      5. He then gives what seems to him is “an inspired selection process given by the inspired apostles.”
         b. From Acts 6 he states there are two fundamental New Testament principles regarding the selection of men to serve in the capacity of elders or deacons within the church.
            (1) They are to look out from among themselves
            (2) based upon certain qualifications
         c. He then says “if that be the case brethren, the implications are enormous. If indeed this is intended to be the prototype—if this is intended to be the New Testament authority which we have for making selection of officials within the church when it
would be wrong for the preacher to make those selections and it also follows that it
would be inappropriate for officials to make those selections.”
(1) Notice he sets forth this “prototype upon supposition: “if that be the case.... If
indeed this is intended...if this is intended.”
(2) Biblical authority is not based on assumption, but Biblical evidence and proof.
(3) Dave Miller is woefully lacking in this area.

6. Miller then tries to offset what he sees coming when he says: “Someone says then that
you are saying then that elders and leaders are to be selected are to be selected by majority
vote. Well, that is not exactly what I am saying.”
a. He then mentions that one must meet the qualification.
b. He then returns to the idea of majority vote and says: “It seems to me that does not
make it majority vote so to speak. It is not a popularity contest.”
c. He leaves the door open for “majority vote...popularity contest” which becomes vital
to his elder r/r doctrine.

7. Having supposedly established the process by which they are selected, he turns to elder
r/r.

D. Elder Reevaluation/Reaffirmation

1. He admits that some would say it is a practice liberal congregations do.
a. He says he is not concerned whether or not liberals do it.
b. He says he is concerned about it being Biblical.

2. The complexion of a congregation might change.
a. He argues that “if the members select elders to begin with,” then if the “complexion
of the congregation in terms of its membership can change over a period of time,
over a period of years,” then the present membership might not select the same men.
b. He states that “once an elder, always an elder” is false (to which everyone agrees).
c. Problems with this:
   (1) When a person becomes a member of said congregation, they are placing
themselves under the oversight of those men who are elders.
   (2) They are selecting those men as their overseers (of that congregation and
themselves).
   (3) This is a fallacious proof to his case.

3. Not perceived as a shepherd.
a. Miller states: “conceivably a man could meet the qualifications, brethren, and yet not
be perceived by that flock as a shepherd. Not be a man to whom they will submit
themselves.”
b. When they became members they made the decision to submit to those shepherds
thus they “perceived” them to be their shepherds.
c. Elder r/r is the wrong approach (even if it was Biblical which it is not).
   (1) Members who no longer “perceive” elders to be men “to whom they will
submit themselves” should be taught to submit to the elders of the
congregation.
   (a) Acts 20:28 “Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which
the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath
purchased with his own blood.”
(b) 1 Thess. 5:12-13 “And we beseech you, brethren, to know them which labour among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you; 13And to esteem them very highly in love for their work’s sake. And be at peace among yourselves.”

(c) Heb. 13:7, 17 “Remember them which have the rule over you, who have spoken unto you the word of God: whose faith follow, considering the end of their conversation.... 17Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves: for they watch for your souls, as they that must give account, that they may do it with joy, and not with grief: for that is unprofitable for you.”

(2) They should not be trying to remove an admittedly qualified man.

d. Miller states: “Shepherds cannot lead where sheep will not follow. So a man could be technically qualified to be an elder, and yet if the membership where he attends does not perceive him a leader in whom they respect and trust, he cannot shepherd effectively.”

(1) Instead, the membership needs to be taught to follow.

(2) One is either qualified to be an elder or he is not.

(3) There is no such thing as one being “technically qualified” as if to say while they are qualified they are not really qualified.

e. Example.

(1) If 20 or 30 percent of the congregation thought he was “a dumpy preacher” that he would leave.

(2) Numerous people did leave the congregation (prior to the first implementation and again when they did it in 2002).

(3) This has no bearing on the Scripturalness of elder r/r.

f. Additional qualification (not found in God’s Word) of perception:

(1) He says: “What follows then that one of the qualifications of a shepherd is that the membership perceives him to be such, and is willing to submit and to follow to respect and to trust.”

(2) This is an addition to God’s Word making it another gospel bringing the anathema of God upon anyone teaching such.

4. The one passage used dealing with those who are presently elders; 1 Tim. 5:19-20 “Against an elder receive not an accusation, but before two or three witnesses. 20Them that sin rebuke before all, that others also may fear.”

a. Miller rightly states:

(1) “The principle here is that even though a man is in a position of being an elder in the church, he can disqualify himself, or make mistakes that he shouldn’t make. It therefore follows, that a man can be removed from the office of an elder.”

(2) Then, “we have the process of doing so, there has to be also two or three witnesses...if charges could be sustained against an elder being disqualified, he could be removed.”

(3) He correctly states that all that is needed for an elder to be removed is 2 or 3 witnesses of sin, not 26% of the congregation’s vote.

(4) He then claims:

(a) “That’s all we’re talking about,” however the evidence shows otherwise.

(b) Again, “the principle is that if the membership finds fault with an elder, the membership who put the elder in the first place, can remove them.”
However the process at Brown Trail does more than this.

i) They set forth a process to vote on the elders and those who got 75% approval rating remained elders.

ii) This is not the process set forth in 1 Tim. 5:19-20 “Against an elder receive not an accusation, but before two or three witnesses. Them that sin rebuke before all, that others also may fear.”

5. He returns to the idea of not perceived.

a. He says, “I would still maintain that a man could theoretically be qualified and yet have lost his standing with enough of the members that he ought to voluntary remove himself. Now how do you determine that unless you ask the members, how they perceive that man, as an elder of the church.”

b. Miller has it backwards as they should teach members to submit themselves to the elders, not remove the elders.

(1) Miller says “voluntary remove himself.”
(2) What they practiced was if an elder did not receive 75% approval rating, they were removed.
(3) There was noting voluntary about it.

c. Examples:

(1) Remember Miller said: “if I, or anyone else in a leadership sort of capacity, no longer sustains the respect from a sizeable portion of the flock, for whatever reason, the proper attitude would be to remove oneself from that position.”

(2) Moses:

(a) Should he because he might “have lost his standing with enough of the” Israelites asked them if they perceived him to be their leader.
(b) If he did not receive enough votes, should he have stepped down based upon their perception?
(c) If he had, he would not be following God’s will and desire.

(3) Jesus:

(a) The majority left Jesus in John 6.
(b) Should Jesus have stepped down from being our Shepherd?
(c) According to Miller’s statement, Jesus should have stepped down.

   i) No doubt He was “technically” qualified to be our Shepherd.
   ii) He “no longer sustain[ed] the respect from a sizeable portion” of his followers (they left Him, so many that He even asked His apostles if they were also going to leave).

E. The procedure Brown Trail would use.

1. “There will be two types of forms. One of these forms will give you an opportunity to simply state whether or not you think any of the five men who are now serving in the eldership should or should not continue to serve. You won’t be asked to sign that form.”

a. Latter they changed it to have people sign it.

b. Possibly they realized the possibility of stuffing the ballot box.

2. He tries to impress them with its seriousness.

a. He cannot escape the voting aspect of it.

b. He says, “May you not take this lightly. This isn’t like running down and voting for Clayton Williams. This is serious!”
V. BROWN TRAIL FORMS

A. They handed out 4 forms to the congregation.
1. Biblical Rational for Evaluation of Elders
2. Announcement from the elder selection screening committee
3. Procedure for Implementing elder evaluation/selection process
4. Elder Evaluation Form

B. Biblical Rational:
1. (1) The members select elders to begin with (Acts 6:3). Since the complexion of congregational membership changes over the years, an eldership may conceivably no longer consist of the same individuals whom the present membership would select. (2) Shepherds cannot lead where sheep win not follow. Even if a man is technically qualified to be an elder, if the membership where he attends does not perceive him as a leader whom they respect and trust, he cannot shepherd effectively. (3) The Bible makes provision for the evaluation of an elder’s spiritual standing (I Tim. 5:19). Should a current elder be found to be disqualified, he no longer meets the qualifications to be an elder. An evaluation process is simply one expedient means of ascertaining the elder’s conformity to God’s will. “Once an elder, always an elder” is as false as “once saved, always saved.” (4) Elders have the authority to ascertain the amount of confidence that members have in their leadership capabilities. Any shepherd who genuinely wishes to serve the flock will naturally desire the continued approval and respect of that flock. Should an elder no longer sustain that respect from a sizeable portion of the flock for whatever reason, the only proper attitude would be to remove oneself from a position that depends upon credibility. A Christian does not have to be an elder to go to heaven.
2. The first is based on an assumption of Miller from Acts 6.
   a. He never proved this to be the method of selection.
   b. The method of selection is not inseparably tied to the r/r process as if proving this is the method of selection proves this should be the method of r/r.
   c. When individuals become part of the congregation, they have already decided those men who are elders are men to whom they will submit.
3. Members are to be taught to follow the men the Holy Spirit made overseers, not devise a plan to remove them.
4. The Bible does demand elders meet certain qualifications.
   a. 1 Tim. 3, Tit. 1.
   b. They are to continue to meet these qualifications.
   c. When an elder sins:
      (1) At the mouth of 2 or 3 witnesses, charges are to be brought
      (2) The elder who sins is to be rebuked before all.
      (3) While one may call this an evaluation, the process at Brown Trail was not intended to determine sin at the mouth of 2 or 3 witnesses.
5. Here is the real crux of the issue at Brown Trail:
   a. It was to determine if the members wanted the 5 present elders to continue to be elders of the congregation.
   b. There is no Bible authority for such an evaluation process.

C. Elder evaluation form:
1. It said: “An elder must have the respect, trust, confidence, and support of the congregation. Shepherds cannot lead where sheep will not follow. The present Brown
Trail eldership is composed of Howard Barnum, Bob Lauderdale, Dale Peterman, John Tyson, and Bobby Watts. Will you please respond to the following evaluation information frankly and honestly. Please circle the answer that represents your view. Please fill out five forms on the present eldership—one form per man. Your assessment will be held in strictest confidence by the screening committee.

My evaluation of ____________

I have reservations about this man being an elder at Brown Trail.

YES NO

Please express your reason(s) for your decision:

Signature

2. There is nothing about the Scriptural qualifications of the men.
3. It is based solely upon “the respect, trust, confidence, and support of the congregation.”
4. It results in being a vote on whether or not the individual wanted this person to be an elder or not.
5. It was a popularity vote.

VI. RESULTS OF THE VOTE:

A. At the beginning of the process Brown Trail had 5 elders.

B. Johnny Ramsey's announced the “mandate” of the congregation.
   1. On May 6, 1990 after the invitation song, brother Ramsey announced that 2 of the 5 elders had been reconfirmed.
   2. The 2 reconfirmed were Howard Barnum and Bobby Watts.

C. After the announcement and a prayer:
   1. Bob Lauderdale (one of the 3 who did not receive 75% approval rating) resigned based upon “compliance with the ground rules.”
   2. The other 2 men who did not receive 75% approval (Dale Peterman and John Tyson) did not resign but were no longer elders.

D. Bulletin article:
   1. After the process was over Johnny Ramsey wrote in their monthly bulletin, Waymarks.
   2. “We bid Godspeed to brethren PETERMAN, LAUDERDALE, and TYSON for their tremendous work as overseers in days past and their present contribution to our efforts in this area and around the world. In a recent get-to-gether [sic], these three and their wives were honored for their labors and presented with beautiful plaques and exceptional Bibles as tribute to their years of service in God’s cause” (1).

VII. INITIAL REACTION

A. Sound brethren universally condemned it.

B. Goebel Music send several of Dave Miller's statements from his sermon to several preaching brethren
   1. Among them Dub McClark, Garland Elkins, Robert Taylor, Bill Jackson, Terry Varner, Mac Deaver (Some of the statements can be found in Dub McClish’s chapter for the 1997 Bellview Lectureship book).
   2. I do not know of even one person who approved the process at that time.
VIII. PROBLEMS OF ELDER R/R

A. God does not authorize it.
   1. Miller gave lip service to the authorization principle at the beginning of his sermon (“we are people of the book, and we believe that whatever we do in religion and life must be authorized and guided by the Word of God”).
   2. Miller tried in vain to come up with some Bible for it, but failed miserably.
   3. Those actions not authorized by God only have man’s authority and are thus sinful.

B. Miller and Brown Trail’s justification of it.
   1. Dub McClish in reviewing this sermon wrote, “The basic argument of the reevaluation advocates may thus be stated as follows: 1. The Scriptures authorize local congregations to select and appoint their own elders, but the details of doing so are in the realm of expediency. 2. Reevaluation and reaffirmation are merely alternate names for and means of the selection and appointment of elders. 3. Therefore, the Scriptures authorize reevaluation and reaffirmation of elders as expedients for selection and appointment of elders” (91).
   2. The second point is false.
      a. Elder r/r is not the same “means of selection and appointment.”
      b. Brown Trail used different forms for the selection as opposed to the r/r process.
      c. They required present elders to receive 75% approval, but that was not required for ones being installed.

C. It adds an additional qualification to the God-given ones.
   1. God gave His qualifications in 1 Tim. 3 and Tit. 1.
   2. Miller adds the qualification of being “perceived by that flock as a shepherd.”
   3. He also stated that “conceivably a man could meet the qualifications” and yet not be qualified because he is not “perceived” to be a shepherd.
   4. No one has the right to add to God’s qualifications.

D. It destroys the God-ordained organization of the church.
   1. It makes the elders subject to the whims of the members—at Brown Train it was 26% of the members.
   2. Elders are suppose to lead the congregation
      a. The congregation is to submit to their oversight.
      b. Elder r/r places the elder in the submissive role with the congregation in the decision making position (actually just a certain percentage of the congregation).

E. The 75% approval rating.
   1. This became a problem when Brown Trail used this process in 2002.
   2. How and who determine the percentage?
   3. How do you determine the 75%?
      a. Is it 75% of just the returned forms (which makes it much smaller than the congregation)?
      b. Should husband and wife be considered together or separately?
      c. Do children have the right to vote?
         (1) All children?
         (2) Just children who have been baptized?
         (3) Just children above a certain age?

F. It places a committee over the elders.
   1. The elders become quasi-elders at least for a time.
2. The elders are elders in name only as their authority has been give over to the screening committee (at Brown Trail the committee was made up of the preachers).

3. The committee:
   a. They receive the ballots.
   b. They discuss the votes with the elder(s) or the proposed elder.
   c. Thus the elders are subject to the committee during this evaluation process along with their subjection to the congregation.

4. It presents the opportunity for fraud, deceit, and favoritism by the committee member in tabulating the votes.

G. **Some tried to defend it as a way to remove unqualified men from the eldership.**
   1. It does not accomplish this.
   2. It only finds out which elders can achieve a set percentage of approval from the members (or those who turn in their votes).
   3. While they urge that the votes should be based upon Biblical qualifications, there is no guarantee that they are based on them.
   4. The forms handed out at Brown Trail was based upon whether or not one has “reservations about this man being an elder at Brown Trail.”
      a. The forms did not question whether or not the man met the God-given qualifications.
      b. If an elder who does not meet the qualifications gets 75%.
         (1) He remains an elder.
         (2) If Bible objections are raised by 2 or 3 witnesses
            (a) 1 Tim. 5:19-20 “Against an elder receive not an accusation, but before two or three witnesses. 20Them that sin rebuke before all, that others also may fear.”
            (b) What will the congregation do since he has received the needed approval rating.
      c. If a qualified man does not get 75% then he is removed based on Miller’s qualification of his not being perceived as an elder.
   5. This process is just as likely to remove a qualified man and leave a man who is not qualified in the eldership as it is to remove a man who is not qualified.

H. **It becomes nothing more than a political office.**
   1. It encourages elders to politick and make promises for approval by the congregation.
   2. All so he can receive the designated approval rating.

Conclusion: This had far reaching effects. Initially it (along with other events taking place at the time) caused a split in the Brown Trail congregation. When they did it again in 2002 (with Miller’s support and approval) it again brought a division within the congregation. The Gospel Journal reported it allowing brethren to know the sinfulness of the practice and Brown Trail’s use of it.

Miller was in the process of moving to work at Apologetics Press and after their blowup they called numerous brethren for support of it. 60 brethren allowed their name to be used as being in support of Apologetics Press. Miller was made executive director. Some of the 60 men had in the past been opposed to this practice. They now could not support Apologetics Press and oppose what Miller preached and practiced, so they ended up compromising what they formerly opposed (even though many if not most still claim to oppose it, yet they contradictorily continue their support). Instead of refusing to fellowship an unrepentant false teacher, many decided that it was more important to
maintain AP, so they extended full fellowship and support to Dave Miller. This brought about a great breach in fellowship among once fellow workers.

Brown Trail had a great opportunity to do right when charges were brought against some liberal elders. Instead, they got rid of the sound elders and implemented the ungodly scheme of elder r/r.

After the second time they practiced it, the then elders repented and said they would not do it again. However, Dave Miller (and others) has never repented and instead continued to defend the indefensible. We will never know the great harm this practiced caused among once faithful brethren.
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