

MARKING  
THE  
FALSE DOCTRINE

*Taught and Practiced*

*by*

ELDERS KING, PUCKETT and YORK

*at the*

*Taylor Boulevard Church  
Of Christ*

## Table of Contents

Unity of the Spirit .....	2
Two Groups .....	2
Factiousness .....	2
Three Distinct False Doctrines .....	3
Majority Rule in the Eldership .....	3
Why Did Brother Hazelip Persist in Staying at Taylor Blvd. ....	5
Brother Hazelip Was Not Officially Rehired .....	6
The First Division in the Eldership .....	8
The Great Sin of Majority Rule in the Eldership .....	8
The Cause of Trouble According to Brother Hazelip .....	10
Majority of Elders Depose Another Officer .....	10
Majority of Elders Enforce Restriction of Scriptural Teaching .....	12
Withdrawal Announcement .....	16
Beechmont Woman's Club .....	17
All of the Difficulties .....	18
Brother Hazelip's Views .....	18
Has Bro. Hazelip Pressed His Views .....	19
Elders Cannot Carry Out Brother Hazelip's Views .....	23
Statement From the Four Elders Who Support This Article .....	24

## PREFACE

It was during the period from 1950 to 1953 that the institutional issues arose at Taylor Boulevard Church of Christ. The Church had made donations to the newly formed "Herald of Truth" program which was first started in 1952. Contributions had also been sent to some of the Benevolent Institutions that care for orphan children.

These issues were discussed in various meetings of the church at which times it was proven that such contributions and donations were not in keeping with the New Testament principles which had been taught at Taylor Blvd. since the church began meeting at 3248 Taylor Blvd. Therefore the elders decided to stop making donations to these outside organizations. This decision pleased the congregation, so there was no trouble over the benevolent institutions and evangelistic societies until 1958.

When brother Hazelip came to work at Taylor Blvd. about January 195~~2~~, he too, believed as did the elders that it was wrong to support the Benevolent Orphan Homes and the Herald of Truth from the church treasury.

After brother Hazelip changed his position in 1958, some of the elders changed their attitude toward these institutional problems. Although they did not make contributions to these outside institutions, they did allow tracts and literature to be used at Taylor Blvd. which promoted both the Institutional Orphan Homes and the Herald of Truth. It was this change of attitude which led to the change of doctrine at Taylor Blvd. Church.

## THE UNITY OF THE SPIRIT

A Scripture which every faithful child of God treasures highly is Eph. 4:3-6.

“Endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. There is ONE body and ONE Spirit, even as ye are called in ONE hope of your calling; One Lord, ONE faith, ONE baptism, ONE God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all.”

As long as a Christian accepts these basic truths and walks in them, he is in harmony with God. Automatically he is then in harmony with every other Christian who also is in fellowship with God. But when a Christian or any group of Christians depart from the truth revealed by the Holy Spirit, there can no longer be harmony with God or “unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.”

### TWO GROUPS

There used to be peace and unity at Taylor Boulevard Church of Christ. As the result of sin, there are now two groups of brethren meeting at separate times for worship in the building located at 3248 Taylor Boulevard, Louisville, Kentucky. Each group has as its own elders and its own preacher, and its own separate treasury.

The only purpose of this article is to state and prove the doctrinal error that has been taught and practiced at Taylor Boulevard Church.

### FACTIOUSNESS

In Titus 3:10 A.S.V. the expression “factious man” means a false teacher, and is translated “an heretic” in the King James Version of the New Testament.

Since elders, E. G. King, Horace Puckett and Jimmie D. York, Sr., and the preacher, brother Harold Hazelip have taught and practiced False Doctrine, *they have therefore become factious* in the New Testament meaning of the word. Brother Hazelip is here mentioned as a factious man because he was chosen to be the spokesman for these elders, and he upheld—

### THREE DISTINCT FALSE DOCTRINES

The False Doctrines Stated:

1. **The Membership is Obligated to Follow Decisions Made By a Majority of the Eldership.**

*Study to Understand:* This false doctrine is condemned in the Bible with the following and other scriptures. Heb. 13:17, Acts 20:17, 28, 1 Peter 5:1-3, Phil. 1:1.

2. **A Majority of the Eldership can Make the Decision and of Themselves Depose an Officer Who was Previously Chosen By the Congregation.**

*Study to Understand.* This false doctrine is condemned in the Bible with the following and other scriptures: Acts 6:1-6, 1 Tim. 3:1-13, Mat. 18:15-18, 1 Tim. 5:19-20.

3. **By An Appeal To The Congregation, A Majority Of The Elders Can Restrict And Restrain A Controversial Discussion of Scriptures Upon Which Members Hold Conflicting Views. To Enforce This Appeal, They Can Treat Violators With Immediate Discipline."**

*Study to Understand:* This false doctrine is condemned in the Bible with the following and other scriptures. 2 Tim. 2:15. 2 Tim. 3:16, 17: 2 Tim. 4:2. Mark 16:15, 16. Mt. 28:20.

### THE PROOF

that these Three False Doctrines have been Taught and Practiced at Taylor Boulevard is contained in Written documents. Due to a lack of space only the parts dealing with the subject at hand will be quoted, however anyone is welcome to personally examine all of the documents on file.

Each false Doctrine will be stated in the same order just mentioned. Proof that each one was taught and practiced will be presented. Neither of these three elders or the preacher have repented of any of these, so the only conclusion is that they still believe them to be true, and that they would teach and practice them again if they decided to do so!

### AN EXAMINATION

of the three False Doctrines follows:

#### First — False Doctrine Stated

**The membership is obligated to follow decisions made by a majority of the eldership.**

*The Bible* condemns this doctrine. Heb. 13:17 in referring to elders declares "Obey them that have the rule over you." The expression "Obey them" necessarily implies that in matters of judgment all of the elders are to be obeyed; none are to be disobeyed.

Other scriptures condemn this doctrine: Acts 14:23, Phil. 1:1, Acts 20:17, 28, 1 Peter 5:1-3. Neither a majority nor a minority of the elders can rule. God demands a united eldership.

If UNITY within the eldership cannot be reached, it shows that one or more do not possess the scriptural qualifications to remain an elder. (I Tim. 3:1-7) Proper scriptural charges should be made and proven against those guilty, then if they do not resign, they should be removed by the congregation which chose them. This was not done at Taylor Boulevard because all of the other elders in documents dated at late as August 22, and October 13, 1961 acknowledged Brother Dukes as an elder. They did accuse him of not agreeing with them on these matters, but never at any time did they bring a scriptural charge against him. Because he disagreed with them, they began to practice majority rule in the eldership.

PROOF—of teaching and practicing this false doctrine. Refer to letter signed by 3 of the 4 elders dated August 22, 1961—

"we have earnestly tried to keep unity within the eldership, but . . . brother L. L. Dukes who serves as an elder, is not in agreement with the other elders on these matters. . . . We are left with no choice except, as *the majority of the eldership*, to humbly and sincerely announce that the above decisions will be carried out. . ."

EXAMPLES—of majority rule, practiced in the eldership at Taylor Boulevard.

1. *Re-hiring of brother Hazelip* beginning September 1, 1961. On June 29, 1961 in the *Religious Reminder* it was stated "The *elders* have extended the invitation to brother Hazelip to continue working with the Taylor Boulevard Church for another year, and he has accepted. This agreement is based on a year which begins each September 1."

This was a false statement which gave the impression that it was the entire eldership which had rehired brother Hazelip. Brother Dukes did not agree to this decision, therefore, *the elders* did not invite brother Hazelip to remain at Taylor Boulevard as stated, only part of the elders invited him. When this majority of the eldership contended that they had the scriptural right to re-hire brother Hazelip over the protest of the minority of the eldership, they began the factious move which developed into full division of Taylor Boulevard Church. Before the time came to decide on re-hiring brother Hazelip, all of the elders received expressions from many in the congregation protesting his being retained for another year. But for some reason, a majority of the elders considered his being retained so important that they not only violated the eldership function by practicing majority rule, but also they failed to consider these expressions of opposition to brother Hazelip. In this they also violated. 1 Peter 5:3 by lording it over many in the congregation.

### **WHY DID BROTHER HAZELIP PERSIST IN STAYING AT TAYLOR BOULEVARD?**

As early as Sept. 19, 1960 brother Hazelip knew that members were questioning his views on the current issues, he also recognized that there was criticism for re-employing him for another year in 1960. He so stated this in his Sept. 19th speech, page 1—

“This . . . meeting brought criticism of the elders for re-employing me for another year . . . and my beliefs and preaching. Tonight’s meeting has been scheduled to give me the opportunity to speak for myself, and others opportunity to question me.”

The three elders who were so definite about brother Hazelip staying, knew that *his being rehired was causing most of the criticism at Taylor Boulevard*. This they stated in their Aug. 22nd letter, 10 days before brother Hazelip began his next year’s work:

“Most of the current criticism is being directed toward the elders for re-employing brother Hazelip for another year.”

Therefore, they knew all of this criticism was in the congregation at least 10 full days before his coming year's work began, and yet they failed to do anything about it.

*Special Note*—It is true that elders have the right to employ a preacher, but it must be a decision of all the elders, and their decision must not be detrimental to the welfare of the congregation, and especially, knowingly so. In this instance brother Dukes did not give his consent. Therefore—

**BROTHER HAZELIP WAS NOT OFFICIALLY REHIRED,** and the announcement in the June 29, 1961 Religious Reminder that some had “extended the invitation to brother Hazelip to continue working with Taylor Boulevard church for another year” was not an official invitation from the eldership.

Brother Hazelip himself was fully aware that his being rehired was causing internal trouble, because these 3 elders had conferred with him before the letter of Aug. 22, 1961 was even written. And although brother Hazelip was conscious of the trouble his being rehired was causing, these 3 elders report in their letter of Aug. 22nd—

“He has indicated that he has no intention of asking to be released until it is settled.”

**BUT, BROTHER HAZELIP STAYED,** knowing all the while that it was in rebellion to one elder and over the protest of many others in the congregation including three of the deacons.

2. *Removal of a Bible Class Teacher.* On September 1, 1961, three of the four elders wrote brother Harold Byers, stating “we are at this time removing you as a teacher in our classes. . .” Remember this was not the elders acting, only a majority of them. All of the elders had previously assigned brother Byers his classes. Now one elder said for brother Byers to continue teaching, and three elders said do not teach anymore.

Since neither a minority nor a majority of the elders can rule, what was to be done? God says obey them all. Heb. 13:17. When these 3 elders tried to carry out their majority rule decision, it created "havoc" in the classrooms.

3. Cancellation of all Future Meetings including brother Robert Jacksons. August 22, 1961 letter to the congregation states, "We are cancelling all future meetings which are scheduled."

August 22, 1961 letter to brother Jackson states "we have had a gospel meeting scheduled with you for the Fall of 1961—we find it necessary to cancel this arrangement with you."

Again this is not the eldership ruling, only a majority of them. These three elders assumed that they had the scriptural right to make decisions over the protest of another elder who served the congregation along with them.

There were many members in the congregation that did not want to take sides. They did not want to disobey brother Dukes as an elder, neither did they want to disobey the other elders. By forcing these 3 decisions on the congregation, the majority of the elders compelled every member to take sides. Which side should they follow, the majority or minority of the eldership?

Therefore in attempting to carry out this majority rule decision, these three elders, King, Puckett, and York threw the whole congregation into a state of confusion.

It was because of—

### THE INSTITUTIONAL ISSUES

that brother Dukes did not agree to any of these three decisions. But the majority of the eldership were so determined to carry out their majority rule decisions, that they did so even to the dividing of the body of Christ. They had made it impossible for the members to obey all of "them that have the rule" because they forced decisions upon which there was not unity or agreement in the eldership. Thus these men brought about—

## **THE FIRST DIVISION IN THE LEADERSHIP**

when they decided to take control by majority rule in the eldership, regardless of consequences.

Since these 3 vital decisions were made by only a factious majority of the elders, a great number of the brethren recognizing this action to be contrary to scripture, began trying to get these three elders back on Bible ground. Opposition to this factious move (false teaching and practice of majority rule in the eldership and other things discussed later in this article) was expressed in classes, in small groups before and after almost every service, by telephone, letters, tracts and other means.

## **THE GREAT SIN OF MAJORITY RULE IN THE ELDERSHIP**

The one who forced this majority rule decision in the eldership compelled every member of the Church to rebel against either the minority or the majority of the elders. Those who took sides with the majority rebelled against the minority in the eldership. Brother Hazelip rebelled against part of the eldership when he remained at Taylor Boulevard after brother Dukes had asked him to leave. So did others who sided with brother Hazelip.

Those who took sides with the minority rebelled against the majority in the eldership. This included all those who protested against majority rule decisions.

Every member has to disobey some of the elders when decisions are forced, upon which there is not agreement among the elders themselves. Elders King, Puckett, and York put the entire membership in a position to where they had to take sides or get out of the congregation; And many did leave!

The open clash of forces came when these 3 elders announced that they definitely were going to carry out their majority rule decisions. Those who pointed out this error have been accused of manifesting "the spirit of rebellion and contention." When the Apostle Paul opposed error, they accused him of being "a pestilent fellow and a mover of

sedition", Acts 24:5, but that did not make him such. Faithful Christians should always oppose error and speak the truth in love. Gal. 2:4, 5, Eph. 4:15. This is the attitude expressed by the Spirit of Christ. Rom. 8:9.

All three of these examples just itemized and re-stated here are definitely matters of judgment upon which the elders should decide:

- (1) Rehiring of the preacher. (Brother Hazelip)
- (2) Removing a Bible class teacher. (Brother Byers)
- (3) Cancelling future meetings. Brother Jackson's and others)

But as in all other decisions which God enjoins upon elders, He requires that an agreement in the eldership be reached before they can officially be carried out. Therefore,

ALL THREE OF THESE DECISIONS WERE  
UNOFFICIAL,

and the congregation in God's sight was not obligated to them. So,

Brother Hazelip stayed,  
Brother Byers taught classes, and  
Brother Jackson held the meeting.

#### QUESTION—WHERE WAS THE REBELLION, AND WHO REBELLED?

The definite answer to this question is when the majority of the eldership forced decisions which were contrary to the minority of the eldership. These acts were in rebellion to God's revealed law. Heb. 13:17, 1 Peter 3:1-5, Phil. 1:1, Acts 20:17, 28.

No one rebelled against God's eldership, just because he would not go along with decisions rendered by a majority of the elders. God does not require such!

THE ELDERSHIP THEREFORE WAS NOT FUNCTIONING ON THESE OCCASIONS,

because of the sin of majority rule. So the members in the congregation were left to decide for themselves, consequently *some went one way, and some went another!*

## THE CAUSE OF TROUBLE AT TAYLOR BOULEVARD ACCORDING TO BROTHER HAZELIP

is a quest for power. He has accused those who oppose his views as wanting to run the church. From the false doctrines which he has upheld could anyone truly say that to oppose such was a quest for power? **Those whom he accuses deny the charge!**

### Second—False Doctrine stated—

**A majority of the eldership can make the decision and of themselves depose an officer who was previously chosen by the congregation.**

*The Bible* does not teach this false doctrine. God's truth is that church officers are chosen by the congregation, Acts 6:1-6 in accordance with qualifications specified in 1 Tim. 3:1-13 and other scriptures.

These scriptures give the congregation authority to choose an officer when it is proven that a man possess the Bible qualifications. These same scriptures give the congregation authority to remove an officer when it is proven that he no longer possesses the Bible qualifications. But the **POWER of choosing or removing an officer is NOT GIVEN TO THE ENTIRE ELDERSHIP**, much less to only a part of the eldership.

**PROOF**—that this false doctrine is believed and taught. Read letter written to brother Harold Byers, a deacon dated September 1, 1961, signed by 3 of the 4 elders.

“we cannot recognize you as a deacon of this congregation any longer . . . your duties as a deacon . . . will be filled before this coming Lord's Day September 3, 1961. We believe the above action to be our duty and . . . we exhort you to work faithfully with us as a member of this congregation.”

Notice these 3 elders speaking of themselves state “We believe (removing this deacon from office) to be **OUR DUTY.**”

This action on the part of 3 elders is an—

**EXAMPLE**—of transgressing and not abiding in the doctrine of Christ. 2 Jno. 9-11.

As the result of this letter attempting to depose a deacon, numerous members of the congregation demanded from these 3 elders scriptural authority for such action. This they could not give, however, because of so much opposition these 3 men signed a letter dated September 3, 1961 in order to keep brother Byers and others from bringing up their unscriptural action before the whole congregation.

“Dear brother Byers:

We are rescinding the accusation brought against you in our recent letter, deposing you as deacon and teacher. This is being done until we have our business meeting next Thursday night, September 7.”

According to this letter brother Byers was then back in office as deacon, and he also taught his regular class on Wednesday night, September 6th.

On Thursday night, although brother Byers held up his hand to speak at the business meeting and even went to the front seat and personally asked brother King, the chairman, to let him speak, he was DENIED this privilege. After the meeting these 3 elders held to their original letter of September 1 and in their eyes brother Byers was out of office as deacon again, and removed again from teaching his regular Bible classes.

On the night of September 18, 1961, all of the 4 elders arranged a special meeting at Taylor Boulevard at which brother Byers *was* permitted to speak. (There were many who felt that the 3 elders had done great injustice to brother Byers in not permitting him to speak at the September 7 business meeting.) At this meeting brother Byers pointed out that these 3 elders had tried to remove him as deacon and teacher because he had openly opposed their enforcement letter of August 22, 1961. He also asked for scripture that authorized a majority of the eldership to depose another officer. Brother Hazelip, in speaking for the 3 elders, gave NO SCRIPTURE for their action, yet he upheld what was done. The 3 elders did not attempt to speak for themselves, and offered no scriptural defence whatsoever for what they had done.

### Third—False Doctrine Stated—

By an appeal to the congregation, a majority of the elders can restrict and restrain controversial discussion of scriptures upon which members hold conflicting views. To enforce this appeal, they can treat violators with immediate discipline.

*The Bible* teaches contrary to this false and liberal Doctrine. Whether majority, minority, or the entire eldership, no group of elders has the God-given right to restrict teaching on one single scripture at any time, regardless of circumstances. According to 2 Tim. 2:15 and 3:16, 17, God tells us that the man of God needs to study all of the scriptures in order to be "thoroughly furnished unto all good works." God also declares that *His Word should be proclaimed in season and out of season.* 2 Tim. 4:2 in all the world to every creature. Mark 16:15, 16. And further, that Christians should be taught to observe all things commanded of God. Mat. 28:20. Besides these passages, this **liberal idea** is condemned by numerous other scriptures. See Gal. 3:15 and Rev. 22:18-19.

*Please note*—in their letter of August 22, 1961, three of the four elders say "we have never sought to forbid the discussion of any Scripture, but all of us know that the issues are being injected where there is nothing in the Scriptures being studied which deals with them." Contrary to this statement, examine the—

*Proof*—that shows the facts to be different:

- a. "the *issues* deal with benevolent work, sponsoring churches, the Herald of Truth, etc." . . . May 11, 1960 statement of the elders.
- b. There are many scriptures which deal with these issues. Brother Hazelip, while speaking in favor of these controversial matters, cited several passages of scripture which shows that even he recognized they are Bible subjects. Following are the scriptures he used: Gal. 6:10, Gal. 1:2, Gal. 6:1, James 1:27, 1 Tim. 5, James 2:2, Eph. 5:19, Acts 3, Acts 11:28-30, 2 Cor. 8:9, Rom. 15:26-28, Acts 8:14-25, Acts 11:22, Acts 15:25-26, 2 Cor. 8:15.

These scriptures are found in his printed speech of September 19, 1960, by reading from the part he entitled *Concerning Benevolence* and going through the section he called *An Explanation* "concerning the Herald of Truth." (Pages 6-7-8-9-10).

Brother Hazelip has taught his convictions on these scriptures both publically and privately in the past, yet he was willing to restrict and restrain his teaching on these scriptures after the elders made their appeal. Can a gospel preacher really do a thing like this and still remain true to his God? Read 2 Tim. 4:1-2 where Paul Says "Preach the Word be instant in season, out of season. . ."

c. The views which brother Hazelip presented on these scriptures conflicted with views held by other members and teachers at Taylor Boulevard, and for this reason the elders on May 11, 1960 had stated:

1. "it is our judgment that at this time as far as possible these controversial matters should not be raised."

2. "brethren let us appeal to you . . . controversy in our classes, conflicting views from our pulpit, will drive visitors away. . ."

d. *Brother Hazelip interpreted the elders statement as restricting and restraining Bible discussions.* (Page 11 of his September 19 speech)

"are we going to abide by the elders statement or not? If we are, then Bible class teachers, visiting preachers, and all others should submit to the same *restriction*. If an individual cannot teach and abide by the *restraint*, if the *restriction* is to be *enforced*, let him *cease teaching* before the unity and growth of the Church suffers." In this September 19 speech, it was brother Hazelip who first publicly interpreted the elders' statement as a *restriction* and a *restraint*.

It was he who first spoke of *enforcing it*. After this speech, it took 11 months before 3 of the elders could be influenced to enforce their May 11 appeal.

e. August 22, 1961 letter signed by three of the four elders, states the **restriction** very plainly.

1. "although he (L. L. Dukes, an elder) joined with us in the May 1960 appeal to cease the strife, he refuses to join with us in *enforcing that appeal.*"

*Information:* brother Dukes said he was trying to maintain unity in the eldership and therefore joined with the other elders in making the appeal. He looked upon the statement merely as a temporary suggestion asking members not to discuss anymore than possible these controversial matters in the classes, pulpit, and vestibule, but he repented and retracted his part of the statement. He did this after seeing that the May 11 statement led to the "enforcement" letter of August 22, 1961.

2. "We believe that the people who have mailed letters and tracts to members of the congregation dealing with our problems know that such conduct is in *violation of the appeal* made by the elders."

*Information*—One member had mailed a tract entitled "What is the Herald of Truth" and other Christians had written letters stating opposition to these controversial things.

3. "We believe also that those who are agitating these matters in our classes, in small group discussions, before or after almost every service and by telephone, know that they are violating the appeal we made for unity."

*Note:* It is called "agitating these matters" when a member discusses what he believes on scriptures dealing with the issues, whether he teaches in classes, small groups, or by telephone.

f. Enforcing the appeal of May 11, 1960.

1. Read the following from August 22, 1960 letter (signed by three of the four elders) "any further

attempts to stir contention within the congregation either by letter, or in the classes, or by any other means will be treated by immediate discipline." Read 1 Thes. 2:2, notice the preaching of Paul was "with much contention." Certainly, no one would say Paul needed to be treated with immediate discipline.

Children are to "contend earnestly for the faith" Jude 3. Brethren who are contentious over their opinions or error are condemned in 1 Cor. 1:11-12. Some members at Corinth were contending they were "of Paul", others were contending they were "of Apollos", and still others were contending they "of Cephas". All three of these groups were contentious and they were wrong in the sight of God. *But the final group were contending they were "of Christ"*. These were right in their contention, and were well pleasing to God in their contention.

God does not want contentions among brethren, but rather He wants all to contend for the same thing and "to speak the same thing", and to be "perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment." 1 Cor. 1:10.

Wherever there are contentions among brethren, as have been at Taylor Boulevard, someone is wrong! The liberal brethren say institutionalism is a matter of opinion, and they do not want anyone teaching contrary to their opinion on the subject. The other brethren believe institutionalism is contrary to scripture and therefore a matter of faith. They are convinced that at times these issues should be discussed, while at the same time give the liberal brethren an opportunity to express why they think its a matter of opinion.

But three of the four elders did not want this kind of controversy among the membership, therefore, the threat of enforcing the restricting appeal if members did not cease discussing the scriptures which dealt with the issues!

Following are—

EXAMPLES—showing that these three elders did enforce their restraint appeal:

Example 1—September 1, 1961 statements from letters to Harold Byers signed by three of the four elders: “The following Friday, August 25, you dated a letter to the whole congregation which was in open rebellion to our earnest requests. It seems that you meant to leave us no choice but discipline. We are at this time removing you as teacher in our classes and stating that we cannot recognize you as a deacon of this congregation any longer.”

Please note that the eldership was not here functioning, only a majority of the eldership. Brother Dukes, the other elder, was opposed to enforcing the appeal.

Example 2—October 15, 1961—three of the four elders, without telling him why, removed brother Rollin Morris as song leader. Only two weeks before, he had mailed a tract on benevolence to members at Taylor Boulevard along with a letter stating his belief on the issues. The tract discussed many scriptures upon which there is controversy. Again, majority rule in the eldership was practiced.

Example 3—The Document of October 15, 1961, read at Taylor Boulevard by Jimmie York, Sr., was

### **THEIR WITHDRAWAL ANNOUNCEMENT**

It states—

“We, Horace Puckett, E. G. King, and Jimmie D. York, Sr., three elders of this congregation . . . hereby withdraw fellowship from L. L. Dukes, Harold Byers, Paul Woodward, Forest Hurst. . . . We are exercising this discipline upon behalf of the congregation . . . it would serve no useful purpose to itemize to the Church either the offenses and public actions of these men in recent weeks and in recent months or the pleas which have been made to them to refrain from divisive action. . . .”

*Please notice* that these 3 elders state “We are exercising this discipline on behalf of the congregation” when it was not even known to the congregation before this time.

Previous to the withdrawal announcement on Oct. 15, these

three elders had not told any of the four brethren which they withdrew from their intended actions, even though one brother they withdrew from was an elder himself.

On Friday night, Oct. 13 (during bro. Jackson's meeting at Taylor Blyvd.) just two days before the withdrawal announcement,

### **BROTHER HAZELIP RENTED THE BEECHMONT WOMAN'S CLUB,**

in the name of Taylor Blvd. Church, and invited only a few male members of the church to attend (approximately 45 were present, including elders King, Puckett and York). All of the men in the congregation were not invited. At this closed secret meeting some of the men present expressed themselves to these 3 elders that a withdrawal should take place, some were opposed to such a withdrawal. Both brother Hazelip and brother Horace Puckett thought such action should not take place at that time. Could it be that they knew a scriptural procedure of withdrawal had not been followed?

Never-the-less, only 2 days later, Oct. 15, the withdrawal announcement took place.

NOTE—Not once up until the time of this withdrawal attempt, did any of these three elders ever ask brethren Dukes, Byers, Woodward or Hurst to repent of anything. Even in the withdrawal statement they did not mention any specific sin against any of these four brethren. Since no sin was singled out, no repentance was asked. They did say these brethren were guilty of divisive action, yet failed to mention even one sin which was divisive, much less itemize others. Read Titus 3:10, Mat. 18:15-17 and 2 Thes. 3:14, 15 to see that God requires a first and second admonition before a withdrawal should take place. God further teaches in 2 Thes. 3:14, 15—

“And if any man obey not our word by this epistle, note that man, and have no company with him, that he may be ashamed, Yet count him not as an enemy, but admonish him as a brother.”

From this scripture it is clear that **God demands further admonishing even after a brother has been refused.** Since their withdrawal, not one of these 3 elders have made any attempt to point out error to these four brethren, even though they have pleaded with them to do so (up until the time this article was printed),

### ALL OF THE DIFFICULTIES

at Taylor Boulevard have been centered around brother Hazelip's views or opinions. His views follow

1. **It is a matter of opinion when a church donates to a Benevolent Institution.**

(An example of these institutions are Potter Orphan Home and School Corporation, Bowling Green, Ky., and Children Inc., Cullman, Ala.)

He contends that it is a scriptural principle to support such benevolent institutions from the church treasury if the elders decide to do so, but it's a matter of opinion whether they do or not. A church, he believes, can contribute to them and still be scriptural. Read from Page 8 of brother Hazelip's September 19 speech: "In my Sunday evening sermon on benevolence at Taylor Blvd. in June 1958, I spent one hour explaining in detail the various points made by all sides involved in the controversy, and concluded: I would not, *I must confess, in my present frame of mind, condemn as sinful a contribution from a church to an orphan home of either type provided the congregation uses what I am pleased to call* (I don't know if anybody else does or not) *selective giving.*"

2. *It's a matter of opinion when several churches donate to another church to enable it to do world-wide evangelism.* (An example of this is Highland Church in Abilene, Texas asking and receiving funds from more than 1,000 churches to put on the nation-wide Herald of Truth program as a brotherhood project.) He contends that it is a scriptural principle for churches to contribute to another church to *enable this one church* to carry on a world-wide evangelis-

tic program but that it is a matter of opinion whether they do or not. He believes churches can do so, and still be scriptural. (On page 10 of his Sept. 19, 1960 speech brother Hazelip states):

“The Highland Church in Abilene agreed to try to raise the funds and a program was begun called ‘Herald of Truth’. . . These brethren are also producing a television program which is currently being carried over WAVE in Louisville. . . . It has been averred that such time would not be available to a preaching program, but only to a semi-dramatic series, this is not true. I have seen the program without the semi-dramatic format being presented elsewhere, and can give example. But, suppose the semi-dramatic presentation, or any other feature of a given program should be wrong, this would not still affect the *scriptural principle of church cooperation in evangelism*”.

From these words of brother Hazelip, it can be seen that he upholds the principle upon which the Herald of Truth program is based.

#### **HAS BROTHER HAZELIP PRESSED HIS VIEWS**

Brother Hazelip said “I have never at any time pressed my views upon the congregation” (page 11, Sept. 19, 1960 speech).

#### **Just What Would He Call Pressing His Opinions?**

Following are some of the things brother Hazelip has done to **promote his liberal views**:

1. *Proclaimed his views in two full sermons at Taylor Blvd. in June 1958.*
2. *Persuaded the elders to secure brother Ruel Lemmons for a spring meeting in 1960.*

Brother Lemmons agrees with brother Hazelip on institutionalism, and is editor of the *Firm Foundation* (a weekly religious magazine) which is published in Austin, Texas. Through this magazine brother Lemmons promotes the Institutional Orphan Homes and The Herald of Truth. Just previous to his meeting at Taylor Blvd., brother Lemmons devoted two full pages in *Firm Foundation* (Dec. 5, 1959—pages 787 and 788) displaying a picture

and an article on "The Herald of Truth" in which this program received great praise.

3. *Encouraged the liberal group at Okolona.*

Some of the members who favored institutionalism pulled away from Haldeman Ave. Church after brother H. A. Fincher, Jr., the preacher failed in his attempt to convert the whole church to his liberal views. Brother Hazelip bid them God-speed in several ways:

- a. Preached the first sermon for them, July 3, 1960.
- b. Printed the following announcement in the Religious Reminder, June 30, 1960.  
"There has been considerable interest in the Okolona area for several years. . . . Interested brethren have rented the auditorium of Southern High School, . . . and will begin meeting on Sunday afternoon at 3 p.m. beginning this Sunday, July 3rd. Brother Hazelip has been invited to preach in the first service Sunday at 3 p.m."
- c. Attended their special service and encouraged others to do so when brother Athens Clay Pullias spoke regarding Christian Education and David Lipscomb College. Brother Pullias is president of Dapid Lipscomb, and believes that it is scriptural for churches to contribute funds to colleges, and so accepts church donations for his college. He is a leader and promoter of Institutionalism!
- d. Printed other articles in Religious Reminder commending the the Okolona group.

*Special Note*—Brother Hazelip used Taylor Boulevard's equipment and postage to send out these notices in the *Religious Reminder*. This equipment and postage was paid for with some of the money which had been contributed by those opposed to brother Hazelip doing this. He did so anyway, mailing the *Religious Reminder* to more than 1,500 people in the Louisville and surrounding areas.

4. *Suggested to the elders that Brother C. E. McGaughey hold a meeting for Taylor Blvd.*

Brother McGaughey signed a letter dated April 18, 1961 along with 9 other well-known Institutional preachers which was mailed out to various churches of Christ, including the Louisville area. The letter stated:

“Dear Brethren, As you know it is now possible to reach an almost unbelievable number of people through the Herald of Truth. . . . Please won't you heed the urgent appeal now being sent your way by the elders of the Highland church. . . .”

Brother McGaughey conducted the meeting at Taylor Blvd. beginning April 23, 1961, just five days after this letter was mailed promoting the Herald of Truth.

Brother Hazelip endorsed brother McGaughey without reservation, and did so even after the promotional letter was received among the Louisville churches. Not one word of public rebuke did he give. And by his silence showed his complete approval.

5. *Has taught his views privately to members at Taylor Boulevard*

False teaching has the same bad effect, regardless of whether it is taught publicly or privately.

6. *On Sept. 19, 1960 brother Hazelip preached one full hour to the male members at Taylor Boulevard in which he set forth his views very definitely and clearly as in favor of Institutionalism.*
7. *He printed the text of his Sept. 19, 1960 speech and distributed it at church expense. And this printed speech still teaches and proclaims brother Hazelip's views on Institutionalism.*
8. *He created disturbance in a church in northern Indiana by teaching privately his views to some of the deacons of that congregation.*

**QUESTION—Just how many times does a false doctrine have to be taught before it is considered being pressed?**

When a preacher or teacher presents *false doctrine just one time*, this is sufficient to demand opposition from every faithful child of God who hears it taught. 1 Jno. 4:1 declares:

“Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God.”

Brother Hazelip and some others—**believe and state that—**

TEACHING ON THESE CONTROVERSIAL MATTERS OUGHT TO BE RESTRICTED AND RESTRAINED because they are only opinions.

**This is a very deceptive statement.** It has also been used very effectively to actually promote brother Hazelip’s views on the issues. This very statement in itself presents his views, because HE BELIEVES THE ISSUES ARE MATTERS OF OPINION. And while he claims not to be teaching his views, he has taught them all the while by saying, these things are MATTERS OF OPINION to be decided by the elders of a congregation.

Those who oppose brother Hazelip’s views BELIEVE THEM TO BE MATTERS OF FAITH. *God condemns them by the silence of the scripture* in just the same way He does instrumental music in worship.

If instrumental music in worship were a matter of opinion (as the Christian Church teaches) then elders could decide either to have Instrumental Music or not to have it. Also, if donating church funds to Benevolent organizations, Colleges, Missionary Societies and the Herald of Truth program were matters of opinion then elders could decide to contribute to them or not to contribute.

But neither of these are decisions which God has left for elders to decide. He decided these things long ago and revealed them in His Word. To be scripturally right, elders can only carry out God’s decision on these matters, and in

doing so *they cannot allow any opinions* to the contrary to be taught, **not even once**, without rebuking the person who teaches them.

### **ELDERS CANNOT CARRY OUT BROTHER HAZELIP'S VIEWS**

because they not only violate the conscience of some, but **they actually contradict Bible teaching.**

If there were never any abuses in the principles which brother Hazelip advocates, *the principles would still be wrong in and of themselves.* They are contrary to Sound Doctrine. 2 Timothy 4:3. At Taylor Boulevard, whenever Bible teachers or visiting preachers presented the Truth on these Bible subjects *it brought replies from brother Hazelip.* And evidently by Sept. 19, 1960 brother Hazelip had decided to give wider circulation to these views of his, because he says (page 6 of this speech)—

“I have repeatedly stated that anyone can learn further what I believe by simply asking. If conditions continue as they presently are, I shall probably give wider circulation to these views, either in tracts or in articles.”

**Just how much wider circulation he has probably given to these opinions can be judged only by the fruits of division which they have brought about at Taylor Boulevard.**

By teaching and practicing the False Doctrines (previously discussed) brethren, King, Puckett, and York departed from other faithful brethren. It was therefore necessary for the church to continue on without them.

## **A STATEMENT OF ATTITUDE FROM THE FOUR ELDERS WHO SUPPORT THIS ARTICLE:**

Dear Reader:

The material which has been presented in this article, to the best of our knowledge states accurately events which led to the division at Taylor Boulevard Church of Christ.

To knowingly uphold the false doctrines which elders of the other group have advocated, would be to rebel against God and His Word. This we CANNOT do!

However, if anyone can point out scripture which we may have violated we will be glad to make corrections, and will encourage others under our oversight to do likewise.

On several occasions, over the telephone, by letters, in elders and deacons' meetings, in general business meetings, and in private conversations we have pointed out scriptures which they have violated to elders, brethren King, Puckett, and York, and to brother Hazelip the preacher. And we plead with them even now to repent of having taught and practiced the three false doctrines outlined in this article. So far, they have made no effort to correct any of the wrongs which they have committed.

No fellowship has existed with these brethren since their public statement of withdrawal. Since they have no charges and their procedure was also unspiritual, God does not recognize their action (3 John 9-10), and neither do we; by teaching and practicing these false doctrines they are not in fellowship with God (1 John 1:6), nor with us (Eph. 5:11). We shall continue to admonish them as brethren, (2 Thes. 3:15) and we shall encourage others to do likewise.

Those Christians who are working and worshipping under our oversight have refused to accept the false teachings which have been taught and practiced by brethren King, Puckett, York, Hazelip and others.

We invite anyone who reads this article to study further with us. It is our prayer that all might come into a knowledge of the truth on these matters, thereby creating unity again among the members at Taylor Boulevard.

With Christian love,

HAROLD BYERS, Elder  
L. L. DUKES, Elder  
FOREST HURST, Elder  
HAROLD VITTITOW, Elder

