

Introduction

Whether it be the world of pop music, films and TV, sport, business, publishing, or whatever, we are living in an age of the big and successful (especially in terms of money), an age where the big and successful (especially in terms of money) is best. Coupled with all that, these are the days of the cult of ‘the personality’, ‘the self’, ‘the name’, ‘the image’, ‘the superstar’. Millions hang on what ‘the celebrity’ is prepared to say about anything and everything; they treat the words of ‘the star’ or ‘the name’ as little short of oracular.

Such is the world we live in.¹

And nowhere is this more evident than in Christendom – not least, in evangelical Christendom.

Worst of all, this ‘celebrity craze’ is not unknown in the matter of ‘preaching’. That’s my contention, and this book is my mite cast into the scale of protest.

Oh yes, evangelicals are implicated! Big and successful is best in evangelical Christendom. Christendom has its ‘names’; especially in these internet days, evangelical religion has – and loves – its ‘galaxy’ of ‘preaching personalities’, its ‘successes’, its ‘stars’. What is more, in Christendom, big and successful spells ‘right’, ‘beyond question’.

Pagans know the principle and exploit it. I think it was the *Daily Mirror* which at one time carried the screamer: ‘Four Million Readers Can’t Be Wrong’.²

¹ See my *Veneer*.

² My memory may be playing me tricks over this illustration, but here is an up-to-date example: ‘Most new-product frameworks in marketing and economics... hold that the larger the stock of adoption of a new product [that is, the more that buy into the scheme – DG], the greater the likelihood of additional adoption’ (“‘Ten Million Readers Can’t Be Wrong!”, or Can They? On the Role of Information About

Introduction

And all this is being played out among evangelicals today: ‘A Quarter of a Million Likes In Two Days On Some Social Media Platform Must Make It Right, Mustn’t They?’

The Medieval Roman Church certainly cottoned on to the power of bigness, and knew how to exploit it. Take the Norman Conquest. Witness the cathedrals the victors erected, symbols of the money-spinning empires which the Conqueror or his descendants doled out as perks for their favoured acolytes, thus turning them into episcopal despots, fully kitted out in ermine, with well-lined pockets and well-filled stomachs. Their cathedrals were built to let the local population (in England, the Saxons) know, and know in no uncertain terms, who was boss from now on (the Normans). Those massive – and, it has to be admitted, impressive,³ overwhelming⁴ – stone structures –

Adoption Stock in New Product Trial’ on escholarship.org). In other words, the critical mass is the thing to worry about. Literally, in nuclear physics, the critical mass is the smallest amount of material required to start a chain reaction. In Christendom, it is the least number of religious-meeting-attenders needed, the smallest amount of money required in the kitty, and so on. 21st-century evangelical Christendom is no exception. If enough people (the critical mass) accept something as true, or good or right, or whatever, the rest will follow – like lemmings. A crowd always attracts a crowd. There is no shortage of examples of mass hysteria in this present century. Indeed, with social media the phenomenon spreads like wildfire. The death of a princess in a car driven at high speed by a drunk, provokes a maudlin display by a countless number, and a fatal stabbing is manipulated to raise millions sterling and spark off mindless riots throughout the country. And so on. On those riots, Marianna Spring: ‘What I found appears to be a commercial operation attempting to aggregate crime news while making money on social media... Accounts can make \$10-20 per million views or impressions... Some of these accounts sharing disinformation are racking up more than a million impressions almost every post, and sharing posts several times a day’ (Marianna Spring: ‘The real story of the news website accused of fuelling riots’, BBC News website, 8th Aug. 2024). I will return to the question of money.

³ That is the point: they were erected to impress.

⁴ That is the point: they were erected to overwhelm.

Introduction

‘sacred houses of God’ – were loaded with the mysticism of religious symbolism (aping the old covenant, linking it with paganism). They were in fact built to display the political, military and religious power of the ruling dynasty. While most of the peasants couldn’t read in the normal sense, they could only too easily read their serfdom written in stone. In Norwich, for instance, the Normans made sure the locals got the message – the conquerors erected both a castle and a cathedral, enforcing the concept of an all-embracing State-Church invested with might and numinous⁵ religion. Power in the raw. And all-dominant Rome, through the State, exercised it with a will! Countless millions of men and women were born, eked out a pitiful existence, died and plunged into a lost eternity in utter ignorance, utterly cowed into blind, superstitious submission by the dominant aura of mystical authority which the Roman ‘Mother Church’ exuded through the power of the State.

Witness Rome, Christmas Day, 800: Pope Leo III’s crowning of Charlemagne signalled the rise of the power of popery over kings. And the high Middle Ages proved that even sovereigns were not exempt from having to bow to Roman dominion. Witness Henry IV who, in the eleventh century, was (so it is said) kept standing in the snow until Pope Gregory VII deigned to grant him an audience.⁶ Power-play in the raw!

But then came the Reformation. All was changed! Or was it? Alas, no! Sadly, the idolatry of bigness, triumph and success didn’t die out with the Reformation. Far from it! Oh, the magisterial Reformers certainly got rid of the pantomime of the Roman emphasis on altar-spectacle for the masses performed

⁵ ‘Numinous’, mystical, not to say magical.

⁶ Facing the threat of abandonment by the English nobility, in 1077 Henry IV went to Rome to beg forgiveness from Pope Gregory VII. When the king arrived, the Pope refused to see him and made him wait in the freezing cold for days until the monarch, having stood barefoot in the snow, was ‘privileged’ to be allowed to kneel at the Pontiff’s feet and plead for forgiveness.

Introduction

by priests,⁷ yes, but only at the expense of replacing the Roman charade with the Reformed emphasis on the necessity of the masses listening to the pulpit orations of their preaching giants. It was a case of unending, repeated performance – both before and after the Reformation.⁸ The acts had changed, the players had (to some extent) changed, but not the fundamental concept; namely, performance presenting a display of power. And this, of course, led to and encouraged the idea of bigness, success and stardom. Sacramental power with wafer and cup, stage-managed by a priest duly shrouded in sacral vestments, had been replaced by pulpit (with a modified sacramental) power exercised by a presbyter (or his equivalent) decked in his Geneva gown. Magic was still in the air.

This past 150 years, culminating in the evangelical world of today – that is, the dominance of mass media, the rise of the all-conquering power of the instant-communication internet, social media, the endless round of big-name conferences with global corporations pushing the latest books of their protégés – have brought us firmly into the age of the evangelical superstar, the pastoral prince presiding as monarch over his megachurch and mega-congregation.⁹ Taking on from where the Victorians left

⁷ The pun is deliberate.

⁸ See my *Church Performance*.

⁹ In this, of course, the UK can hardly hold a candle to the USA or Asia. But it has done its struggling best! John Brencher (writing a quarter of a century ago): ‘In May, 1968, David Martyn Lloyd-Jones retired from one of London’s most celebrated nonconformist churches... It was the close of the age of the great metropolitan platform orators when men such as Leslie Weatherhead at the City Temple, W.E.Sangster at Westminster Central Hall and Lloyd-Jones drew large crowds. They were a social phenomenon and although it may be hard to imagine now, they were as much a part of the cultural and intellectual life of London as its concert halls and theatres. There are, of course, active churches in London today but there is nothing with which to compare the ethos and collegiality generated by these kinds of ministries. At the time these men were stars in the firmament of their churches... The 1930s was an auspicious time for London pulpits. There was what [has been] described as “the near-legendary three-point ministry of Methodist star preachers in London”. Donald

Introduction

off – the Nonconformists with their Gothic buildings designed to trump their religious competitors in the State Church¹⁰ – modern evangelicals have ‘improved’ on the Victorians: many devotees love their big auditoria, duly furnished to let the iconic preacher make his enchanting and crowning appearance on the stage, backed by all the paraphernalia needed by the exponents of the latest electronic, musical ‘worship’. What a glittering galaxy of success we have constructed, both metaphorically and – under specially (cleverly) sited and manipulated lighting – literally!

The drive to make a name for oneself, to carve out a legacy, is a danger for every believer who ventures into the public square – and this drive can have a devastating effect on the message the believer conveys.

Let me illustrate from the world of politics. Winston Churchill, in his record of the Second World War, devastatingly exposed the way in which the UK political leaders failed in their approach to Adolf Hitler in the 1930s. But in so doing, he

Soper... Leslie Weatherhead... W.E.Sangster... Dinsdale Young... A.D.Belden... If Lloyd-Jones had his followers, his coterie of admirers who hung on his every word, the same could be said of Campbell Morgan, Sangster and Weatherhead. It was not that these men contrived such a situation; indeed, they may have deplored it, but because of their impact and reputation as public figures it became inevitable...’ (John Bencher: *Martyn Lloyd-Jones (1899-1981) and Twentieth-Century Evangelicalism*, Paternoster Press, Carlisle, 2002, pp1,20,42-43). Note the use of ‘celebrated’, ‘great’, ‘large’, ‘phenomenon’, ‘star’. With passing of twenty-five years, the tide has gone out, leaving many sermon-auditoria stranded on the mud, not a few of them filled to bursting with car exhausts and tyres, carpets, or diy requisites (as John Betjeman would put it – ‘Are the requisites all in the toilet?’, a line from his poem ‘How To Get On In Society’).

¹⁰ Take Calne in Wiltshire, where I and my family lived for a time. The 19th-century Calne Free Church building – a stone’s throw from the Church of England edifice – had been erected by these who had defected from the State Church, erected as a blatant expression of power to show the world that whatever the Anglicans could do, the Nonconformists could do better. A more impressive religion!

Introduction

omitted to acknowledge how his own political decisions as War Minister, Air Minister and Chancellor of the Exchequer, taken in the 1920s,¹¹ had crucially paralysed UK defences. Not only that – and here’s the point – Churchill had made those critical and reckless decisions because, at the time, he was seeking to make a name for himself.¹²

All this, with the dominance of the internet, serves as a standing warning to us today!

The new covenant is the very opposite. Absolutely so! Religious power, the cult of the superstar-preacher, an emphasis on buildings and money, *and – above all – man*, is, I say, unknown in the new covenant. Indeed, our present love affair with stardom is not only foreign to Scripture, especially the new covenant, it is anathema to it. The principles of the new covenant, I repeat, demand the very opposite. Weakness is the word!

Contrary to Scripture? Yes, indeed. Take the old covenant for a start:

Human help is worthless (Ps. 60:11; 108:12).

It is better to take refuge in the Lord than to trust in man. It is better to take refuge in the LORD than to trust in princes (Ps. 118:8-9).

O Lord, what is man that you regard him, or the son of man that you think of him? Man is like a breath; his days are like a passing shadow (Ps. 144:3-4).

¹¹ Churchill became War Minister Jan. 1919.

¹² For a penetrating analysis of these events, see Basil Liddell Hart: ‘The Military Strategist’ in A.J.P.Taylor, Robert Rhodes James, J.H.Plumb, Basil Liddell Hart, Anthony Storr: *Churchill: Four Faces and the Man*, Book Club Associates, London, 1969, pp179-184. A little later, Robert Rhodes James observed: ‘The comment of Liddell Hart is severe, but just: “He [Churchill] was eager to make a fresh mark in current political affairs, and the best chance lay in the post-war [1914-1918] retrenchment of expenditure”’ (Robert Rhodes James: *Churchill: A Study in Failure, 1900-1939*, Weidenfield and Nicolson, London, 1970, pp124-125,164-168.

Introduction

Put not your trust in princes, in a son of man, in whom there is no salvation. When his breath departs, he returns to the earth; on that very day his plans perish (Ps. 146:3-4).

Surely the idolatrous commotion on the hills and mountains is a deception; surely in the LORD our God [and only in him – DG] is the salvation of Israel (Jer. 3:23).

Israel was told explicitly to put no trust in men, not even princes. Whyever not? Princes are men of splendour, wealth, weight and power are they not? They have influence. Exactly. Especially in the days when the above-words were first written. Worldly wise it might be to trust in such princes, but Israel had to repudiate such a course.

In the new covenant, likewise. Take Peter's visit to Cornelius. Note how he stoutly refused any adulation:

When Peter entered [the house], Cornelius met him and fell down at his feet and worshipped him. But Peter lifted him up, saying: 'Stand up; I too am a man' (Acts 10:25-26; see also Acts 14:15; Rev. 19:10; 22:8-9).

In short, in spiritual matters believers must place no trust in princes – not even in – specially not in – evangelical princes of the church. As I say, trust and confidence in men, elevation of men, is utterly contrary to the new covenant. But is far from unknown. Take the way evangelicals get round Christ's explicit proscription of the use of titles (Matt. 23:1-12).¹³

Worldly power and spiritual power are mutually exclusive. The first believers knew this, but they quickly forgot it and aped the pagans. Take the believers at Corinth. Look how Paul had to take them to task for elevating men, and he did it at great length – so important was the issue (1 Cor. 1:10 – 4:21). Pagan Rome, at the time, was making gods of their emperors. It would have been anathema for the believers to take any step towards treating their (to allow the term) pastors in such a way – if they remained loyal to the law of Christ, that is.

¹³ See 'The Use of Titles' in my *The Pastor* pp145-154.

Introduction

In the very early days, the first believers did keep Christ's law, and, as an integral part of this, it meant that they had no hankering for greatness. Take their assemblies. In the early days of the new covenant, once they were scattered from Jerusalem,¹⁴ believers were few in number and, unlike Jews, Greeks and Romans, and, having no desire for 'sacred space', they had no thought of having buildings of their own. They met in domestic houses. And when persecution broke out, they simply went further underground.¹⁵ Christendom quickly reversed all that, and with a vengeance: the bigwigs erected buildings, ever-increasing in size and height, creating massive and impressive 'sacred space'. They broke down the barrier, the separation, the demarcation, that ought to exist between believers and the world, thus promoting the idea of inclusive bigness. Today, it goes without saying, Christendom's version of the *ekklēsia* (if it can still be called such – where is the 'called-out-ness' today?) is the absolute norm for the vast majority of believers. If anyone questions it, he is dismissed, out of hand, as a crank (or, if he is the USA or Canada, a kook).

I can hear it: Weakness? What's that! Inadequacy? Frailty? Vulnerability? Helplessness? That's the last thing we want! Success is the watchword! Achievement, Triumph, Stardom, Glitter. We want winners! We want an image that will sell! We are competing in the marketplace. Success is key! We want the critical mass! We must have it! People are attracted to a going concern.

The modern evangelical church and its ministry and its ministers have far more to do with a business model than the new covenant. Hence the scramble for success! So much so, we need to give Paul a face lift, a make-over, for the 21st century. We need to add an Appendix to 1 Timothy 3, for instance. Elders and deacons are all very well, of course – indeed, they are essential – but churches now need serious guidance on how to select its up-front lead-pastor, all the other barrage of pastors

¹⁴ Acts 8:1.

¹⁵ See my *Public Worship; Public Worship Notes*.

Introduction

of this and that, its worship-directors, its book-keepers, personnel-managers, hospitality and entertainment entrepreneurs, IT whizz-kinds, electronic and audio nerds, civil-engineers and clerks-of-works capable of managing a vast campus of buildings, legal high-fliers and clever accountants who can handle tricky relations with the State in order to maintain, expand and fully exploit financially-advantageous tax-exemption schemes, and so on. Above all – above all – we need a PR guru.

Let's not be mealy-mouthed about it. Money is never far below the surface; if that (1 Thess. 2:5). Rome has, over the centuries, developed its well-oiled machinery for prising the pennies and pounds (or dollars) out of the pockets of 'the faithful'. Modern evangelicals are no slouches. 'Tithe' is a key word in many a Christendom church;¹⁶ 'Donate' is a key word on many an evangelical website.¹⁷ Christendom, including evangelical Christendom, knows how to use such red-button words, and use them to advantage.¹⁸

¹⁶ In my experience these days, more common in the USA than in the UK.

¹⁷ Compare Paul's attitude. Writing to the Philippians, he said: 'I rejoiced in the Lord greatly that now at length you have revived your concern for me. You were indeed concerned for me, but you had no opportunity. Not that I am speaking of being in need... Yet it was kind of you to share my trouble. And you Philippians yourselves know that in the beginning of the gospel, when I left Macedonia, no church entered into partnership with me in giving and receiving, except you only. Even in Thessalonica you sent me help for my needs once and again. *Not that I seek the gift*, but I seek the fruit that increases to your credit. I have received full payment, and more. I am well supplied, having received from Epaphroditus the gifts you sent, a fragrant offering, a sacrifice acceptable and pleasing to God. And my God will supply every need of yours according to his riches in glory in Christ Jesus. To our God and Father be glory forever and ever. Amen' (Phil. 4:10-20).

¹⁸ Here is a suggestion for a winning scheme for a would-be money-spinner: 'Spot the preacher who has a sizeable – *and growing* – following on social media. Get him to write a book. Push the book. Arrange a series of conferences. Encourage two features – Sales and

Introduction

Seventy years ago, I recall a spiritual which was doing the rounds:

The gospel train's a'leaving. Get on board! Get on board!

Today, the words need adjustment:

The gravy (or popularity) train's a'leaving. Get on board! Get on board!¹⁹

All this has all the marks – the stench – of the South Sea Bubble of 1720,²⁰ or the dot-com boom (and bust) at the start of

Donate. Learn the lessons from the world's business models. Apply them. Remember, attendance at meetings is king. Numbers at all costs. Big is beautiful; big is best'. It's Tetzels' clink in a modern dress. I wonder when the gospel offer will be overtaken by the latest book (or whatever) offer – signed photograph of the star preacher? Let me illustrate from the pagan world. Two art dealers bought the entire output of a deceased, unknown artist, wrote a book saying how important this artist's work was – frankly, puffing it – and raked in the profits from selling the paintings they had advertised. I know of a case where a dealer was selling one or two paintings *per* week for a certain artist – at about £300 a go. He told me that he was toying with the idea of taking a whole page in a prestigious magazine to advertise one for £10,000, but lacked the courage. A little later, he told me he had taken the plunge. Before his shop opened the next day, he said, he had had a transatlantic phone-call buying the work.

¹⁹ C.H.Spurgeon – with irony, if not sarcasm – deplored the pastoral spirit of the age in which he lived: 'Men have a saving faith', he said, 'and save their own persons from trouble; they have great discernment, and know on which side their bread is buttered; they are large-hearted, and are all things to all men, if by any means they may save a sum' (C.H.Spurgeon: 'The Need for Decisions for the Truth', *Lectures to My Students*, Third Series). What he would say today is quite a question.

²⁰ 'The world's first financial crash, the world's first Ponzi-type scheme, speculation mania, and a disastrous example of what can happen when people fall prey to "group think". That it was a catastrophic financial crash is in no doubt and that some of the greatest thinkers at the time succumbed to it, including Isaac Newton himself, is also irrefutable. Estimates vary but Newton reportedly lost as much as £40 million of today's money in the scheme' ('The South Sea Bubble: The 18th-century version of the Dot Com Boom – And

Introduction

the 21st century, or any other of the countless scams that have been foisted – and are still being foisted – on the gullible.²¹ I fear the modern evangelical world is proving itself to be woefully unprepared to withstand the ‘attractions’ of digital-Christendom, and hold itself clear of them.²²

* * *

Let’s page back.

It didn’t take Satan long. The sun had hardly set on the day of Pentecost when the arch enemy began his work of spoiling the *ekklēsia*, ruining the gospel and, above all, robbing Christ of his glory. He became especially active when Gentiles were being converted.²³ Take the *ekklēsia* in Galatia. Paul was deeply shocked that the believers in Galatia had listened to the false teachers who had sneaked in among them (Gal. 2:4; see also Jude 4), and, as a result, were deserting Christ and the gospel (Gal. 1:6-9). Take the *ekklēsia* in Corinth, to which I have already referred. Seemingly unimpressed by what we now

Bust’, Historic UK website, slightly edited). (Actually, the 17th-century Dutch Tulip-Bulb Bubble pre-dated the South-Sea Bubble by a century). It has continued. The Italian swindler, Charles Ponzi (1882-1949), ‘perfected’ a scam in North America in the 1920s: ‘A Ponzi scheme can maintain the illusion of a sustainable business as long as investors continue to contribute new funds, and as long as most of the investors do not demand full repayment or lose faith in the non-existent assets they are purported to own’ (Wikipedia). Pyramid Selling (Multi-Level Marketing) and Chain-Letter schemes come into this bracket.

²¹ See Anthony Trollope’s *The Way We Live Now*, published in 1870, for his exposure of the principles and consequences of the Railway Boom of the day. ‘Trollope had just returned to England from abroad, and was appalled by the greed and dishonesty those scandals exposed. This novel was his rebuke. It dramatised how such greed and dishonesty pervaded the commercial, political, moral and intellectual life of that era’ (Wikipedia).

²² I have already confessed that I feel the power of this digital world.

²³ In what follows, I give a very brief *précis*, but for more on this see my *False; Relationship; Attracting; Triumph*.

Introduction

know as his first letter,²⁴ the Corinthians moved on. Things got so bad there, that Paul had to write his second letter to the believers, almost all of which was taken up with warning them about the so-called (self-styled?) ‘super-apostles’ – the ‘names’ or celebs of the day – who were lording it over them.²⁵ Peter, in his second letter, and John, in his first, also entered the fray.

And when, in particular, in the second to fourth centuries the Fathers got to work and joined hands and hearts with the Roman emperors Constantine and Theodosius in setting up Christendom, the gospel was dragged down into very murky, pagan, depths. The biblical separation between believers and pagans – one of the essential marks of the *ekklēsia* (the called-out ones) had been eliminated by the all-inclusive Christendom Church. And as the Christendom Church – especially, its clergy – became increasingly bloated, the priesthood of all believers, was allowed – encouraged? – to wither into virtual oblivion.²⁶ And the principle of weakness went to the wall.

The *ekklēsia* has never recovered. No! As I have indicated, not even the magisterial men (the household names) of the Reformation were able to get back to the original pattern. And in the closing quarter of the twentieth-century and the start of the next – with its devotion to seeker-friendly, inclusive-at-all-costs churches catering for ‘the unchurched’, ‘the-not-yet-converted’, the evangelical-aping of business models, the evangelical consultation of pagans and use of pagan methods, along with Relationship Evangelism governing wholesale re-engineering of the *ekklēsia* – things have plunged even further. And with the advent – and mushrooming – of the internet and social media...²⁷ Alas, all this means that weakness never gets a look-in. It has gone to the wall.

Well... that’s what this book is about.

²⁴ I have no intention in digressing into the theories about how many letters Paul wrote to Corinth.

²⁵ See my *False*.

²⁶ See my *The Priesthood of All Believers*.

²⁷ See the previous note.

Introduction

* * *

Briefly, this is how I intend to set about what I feel moved to say.

Although it will give the entirely misleading impression that I think that the new covenant knows nothing of power, I intend to concentrate on weakness. The new covenant is full of power, the power of the Spirit, no less, and that needs proper emphasis.²⁸ Evangelicals – particularly the Reformed – have reacted so badly against the Charismatic movement that they have lost much of the sense of the Spirit, with many preferring to stumble on in their dry, powerless, boring traditional routine. In other works, I have raised this phenomenon, but in this book I confine myself to the topic of weakness. This must not, however, be taken to mean that I think we evangelicals can remain satisfied with our present low and carnal condition. The need for power – spiritual power – is as pressing as ever it was.

But it's weakness that is my concern at this time.

Weakness, then.

When Paul dealt with the false brothers – the *pseudadelphoi* – and their teaching,²⁹ he set out the principles which should have stopped the rot, once and for all. Indeed, if believers had kept to the principles of the new covenant laid out in the post-Pentecost Scriptures, Christendom would never have been thought of. And when I talk of Paul's rebuttal of the *pseudadelphoi*, I am not confining this to the doctrine of the believer and the law – though that's never far below the surface. It is the apostle's argument that weakness is a vital part of the new covenant which concerns me in this present work. Law-men and their teaching can do nothing but encourage boasting (Rom. 4:2). And it surely goes without saying that those who adopt pagan principles must encourage pagan boasting and a pagan love of

²⁸ Since, to establish 'weakness' I will be referring heavily to Paul's letters to Corinth, it is significant that, on my count, those two letters contain 26 references to 'power'.

²⁹ As already noted, for more on this see my *False*.

Introduction

profit – despite Paul being adamant that boasting has no place in the new covenant (Rom. 3:27; 1 Cor. 1:29-31; Eph. 2:9).

Alas, even in his own day, Paul himself was increasingly sidelined, and this inevitably meant (chicken and egg) that his teaching was also pushed aside, even turned on its head.³⁰ The cult of man was not long in coming. John had to write about it, and he did not fear putting a name in the frame:

Diotrephes, who likes to put himself first, does not acknowledge our authority. So if I come, I will bring up what he is doing, talking wicked nonsense against us. And not content with that, he refuses to welcome the brothers, and also stops those who want to and puts them out of the church (3 John 9-10).

Diotrophes, alas, has sired many sons.

The consequences of all this have been horrendous; they still are. And one of the saddest things of the whole affair is that Christendom has come to play such a dominant role in society in general – and in the *ekklēsia* in particular – that, as I have already noted, if any believer dares question the monstrosity's thought and practice, he is immediately dismissed as a crank; or worse. Christendom rules! OK?

The question is: where is it taking us? One thing is certain – Christendom will never encourage weakness.

But what does Scripture teach?

³⁰ But, of course, Christendom has long been used to doing that with Christ's teaching. In my *The Pastor* pp145-154, I showed how evangelicals persist in arguing black is white over Christ's forbiddance of titles. The love of prestige, the gaining of a name – even while disavowing the same – proves too enticing.