ON THE HOME FRONT

Much has been made and it should be about the four preachers Getwell preachers speaking during our upcoming Spiritual Sword lectureship. Here at Getwell we have been blessed with sound talented preachers over the years. We have also been blessed with wise courageous elders. There is one important figure that is perhaps being overlooked Daniel Patrick Phillips, known as Pat. Pat, has been at Getwell for 42 years. We sometimes take Pat for granted and don't realize what a talented song leader he is. I put pen to paper and crunched some numbers. At Getwell he has led singing approximately at 6,552 worship services and at these services led approximately (allowing for three songs per service) 19,656 songs. Pat has worked with 5 preachers here at Getwell and is a very competent gospel preacher in his own right. You may ask why I point this out, but I watch a lot of baseball and one thing mention a great deal is staying power which means a great deal in baseball but let me submit to you it means a great deal more in the Church and in our spiritual lives. Pat has staying power and he continues to run the race and fight the good fight.

The “Praise and Harmony” workshop took place at the Germantown Church of Christ this past Saturday, September 7th. It was conducted by Keith Lancaster. The main point of the workshop was to give pointers on improving our worship in song to our Lord. It was time well spent.

One of the joys of teaching a teen class, which I have been doing for many years are some of the questions and insights from my students. One such question came from JaQuan Smith. The question concerned prayer. The NFL season began Sunday and many people are praying for their favorite team. His question was “Whose team does God answer the prayers for?” I was stumped for a moment but not JaQuan he quickly responded, “the Saints”. Smart kid, huh! Ron Wallace
Running the Christian Race (Pt. 2)

Bradley Smith

Last week, we began a study of a few aspects of running the Christian race. We mentioned that you must enter correctly, have the right diet, and be disciplined. This week, we will examine a few more parts of this same study.

Remember That Someone is Watching
If you have ever been to a race or have ever seen one on television, you know that there is a crowd standing and watching the runners. There are different groups that are watching us run the Christian race. Those in the world are watching, so we must always be running at peak performance (Mat. 5:14-16). Our brothers and sisters in Christ (fellow runners) are watching, so we must help one another on the way to that mutual goal (Heb. 10:24). We also must be aware that Jesus Christ, the ultimate Judge is watching, so must run by the rules that He has set (John 12:48).

You Must Run to Win
Some people run races not intending to win, simply to have fun or for exercise. We all have a goal in this Christian race, to get to Heaven (2 Tim. 4:8). We must run to obtain that goal (1 Cor. 9:24). A crown of life is promised to those who persevere (Rev. 2:10). This Christian race is one that can be won. How do we know that it is possible? The Lord has promised that He will be with us (Mat. 28:20, Heb. 13:5). This race is possible to win because the Lord has promised us that we can win. Unfortunately though, some quit before the race is completed. We can read in Galatians 5:4 of people who had “…fallen from grace.” This means that they were once running that race, but by the course of time, they had stopped running.

The Christian race is the best race that we can run because of that prize which lies at the end (1 Cor. 9:25-27, 1 Pet. 1:3-5). Let us always strive to run that race in a way that is pleasing to God. We hope this study has been beneficial to all as we seek to run the Christian race.
Dr. Pete Etchells, lecturer and science writer, expounded on the idea of creating our own meaning when he said:

> Whenever I get involved in conversations about the meaning of life, and where everything's headed, I can't help but feel that there's an underlying assumption that because these are "big" questions, they necessarily need big answers. There aren't any, though. We're not here for a universal purpose, and there is no grand plan, no matter how tempting it is to believe it. But that's absolutely fine, because it means that if there aren't any big answers, the little ones are all the more important. So every day, I take my dog for a walk in the field near my house. Sometimes I get to see a pretty sunset, but usually it's either bucketing down and I get soaked, or cold, or the field is full of mud and bugs and dog [poop], and it's a pain to navigate through.

**Whatever the situation, though, my dog has the most ridiculous fun ever, and being a part of that little moment of joy is what it's all about.**

So, the answer to the meaning of life is make curry, build a bookshelf, or wander through a muddy field full of dog poop and watch your dog have fun? The problem with this “create-your-own-meaning” approach is twofold. First, it refuses to take the word “meaning” seriously. It is a semantic game in which the word can be applied to anything. Meaning “for you” might be watching your dog run, “for me” it might be watching paint dry, “for him” it might be watching grass grow, etc. Just because an activity may bring momentary tranquility or pleasure to a person does not endow it with any objective meaning. A person's arbitrary attachment of the word “meaning” to something does not somehow create meaning in any real sense—not for that person or for others. Abraham Lincoln once sagely quipped: “How many legs does a calf have if you call its tail a leg? Four. Just because you call a tail a leg does not make it so.” Attaching the words “meaning” and “purpose” to a bowl of shrimp and grits or a sushi roll will never be sufficient to answer the “most urgent question” of life.

The second insurmountable problem for this approach of creating meaning is that those who propound it intentionally hide the dark truth that necessarily follows. They often paint a picture of self-created meaning in rosy terms of a tranquil couple viewing a sunset, a man walking his beloved dog, or a parent running and laughing with a child. What they are forced to omit, if they want to keep up the ruse, is that self-created “meaning” can manifest itself through any behavior, including genocide, serial killing, torture, terminal drug addiction, overdose, etc. Using the proponents’ own logic, a man could just as easily say he finds meaning in killing other people’s dogs in the park as in watching his own pet frolic playfully. As Sommers and Rosenberg accurately stated:

> Darwinism thus puts the capstone on a process which since Newton’s time has driven teleology to the explanatory sideline. In short it has made Darwinians into metaphysical Nihilists denying that there is any meaning or purpose to the universe, its contents and its cosmic history. But in making Darwinians into metaphysical nihilists, the solvent algorithm should have made them into **ethical nihilists** too. For intrinsic values and obligations make sense only against a backdrop of purposes, goals, and ends which are not merely instrumental. **But the Darwinian philosophers have shied away from this implication.**

If human existence has no real meaning, then neither do moral or ethical ideas. We may like to think that humans would adhere to some type of generally accepted guidelines, but we would have no grounds to insist that they do. I may “create my own meaning” by reading a book to a child, while another person may contend that they find meaning in killing their parents and cannibalism. There is no rational grounds upon which a person could argue that reading a book to a child is more meaningful than murder and cannibalism. After all, as Camus said, “Let me repeat. None of all this has any real meaning.” As philosopher John-Paul Sartre declared: “Everything is indeed permitted if God does not exist.” The create-your-own-meaning approach fails miserably.