

Aug 13, 2007

Michael, I see that you still have the same attitude toward me. I am truly amazed. Keith.

Aug. 13, 2007

Brother Keith,

First I will ask what attitude you think I have toward you.

Keith, I still have a great respect for you and your knowledge of the Bible. I have a great love for you and what you have done in the past. My heart breaks over the things which have happened over the past couple of years. Having said that, I still believe you are in violation of 2 John 9-11 in giving your support and fellowship to an unrepentant false teacher---Dave Miller. I think you know that he taught false doctrine yet you will ignore what he taught---this I do not understand. (I noticed that I called you brother---both out of respect and love for you as a brother in Christ---but you did not call me such.) Also, I am, personally, as disappointed in you as in any other person I know in these matters (this again is because of the great respect I have had for you).

Second, you are the one who said that those who oppose Dave Miller (of which I am one) are "vile."

Brother Keith, when did I become "vile"? Was I "vile" when you stayed in our home during the Gospel meeting you had here? Was I "vile" those numerous years you spoke on the Bellview lectures? Was I "vile" those times I spoke on the MSOP lectures? Was I "vile" those times that we ate together at different locations? Or did I become "vile" when I opposed one false teacher---Dave Miller? Do you know the pain it caused me when I heard you make that comment at Sunny Slope?

Third, you are the one who said that those publications opposed to Dave Miller are "lying."

I did ask you to document and prove that I (Defender) have printed lies about Dave Miller. I deny that I have printed any lies about him. You are the one who made the accusation, what is wrong with proving the charge that you made?

Fourth, I do believe you (as all of us) should be held accountable for what you/we say.

You made these statements in a public venue. Those statements were sent out by tape (both audio and video) and by word of mouth. Even though you stated that you were not representing MSOP, we both know that you do represent them at all times---especially in a public venue as the lectures there and when the question dealt specifically with MSOP. Since you made the statements at Sunny Slope and the lectures they host, they must either be in agreement with you or repudiate what you said.

Likewise, I must be held accountable for what I say and what I write. If I have published "lies," then I need to be held accountable for those lies. I have given you the opportunity to do that very thing. Additionally, if I have printed lies about someone, I need to repent of those lies. You are being given the opportunity to show (document and prove) the lies you state that those opposing Dave Miller (of which I as editor of Defender am) have published and thus give me the opportunity to make correction. However, you chose not to do this and have instead brought up what you perceive is my attitude about you.

Fraternally,

Michael

Aug. 14, 2007

Brother Mike, I did not say you were vile, I said that the attacks were. Your name is not mentioned in my quote so what gave you the idea I was talking about your writings? Such is evil surmising and I will not comment again. Keith

Aug. 14, 2007

Brother Keith,

It is true that you did not mention my name in your statement. What you stated was: "these people are as vile a group, and I do mean vile as I have ever read after in my life." You did not say, "these attacks" you said "these people." Thus, what people? Please specify what people you were talking about!

Second, it would have been easy for you to have said that you were not speaking of me, but you did not do that. Now why is that beloved brother Keith? If you did not include me in "these people are as vile a group," then why didn't you simply state something along the lines, "Michael, I did not have reference to you"?

Third, you stated in the context of "these people are as vile a group" that "if you're going to believe some of these publications you're going to have a problem because those brethren are lying to you." "These publications" is a plural statement as is "those brethren." The only publications that I know of that have been writing in opposition to Dave Miller are Contending For The Faith and Defender. If you meant other publications than these two (we both know that plural statements mean two or more), what other publications?

Now notice that in your statement about "these people are as vile a group" you stated "I have every read after." The "these publications" are tied directly to "read after." If Contending For The Faith and Defender are the only publications writing in opposition to Dave Miller (and thus that you have "read after"), then how could you not be including me in "these people are as vile a group"? Now how does that come under the evil surmising that you state?

Fraternally,

Michael Hatcher