

An Exchange That Took Place on a Reformed Baptist Discussion List

Dear James [White], Theodore, and (Reformed Baptist Discussion) List members:

Brethren,

I've been in and out of town taking care of my father's estate and have been unable to get this post to the list any faster. It is late in relation to the earlier posts, but I've had to work with extremely limited time.

First, an apology to the members of the list. When I posted the press release and review of Dr. Letis's book, *The Ecclesiastical Text*, it was for the purpose of **discussing,** not debating, the historical and doctrinal issues that Letis has raised. This has turned into something other than a discussion of Letis's work and views. Whether one agrees with Letis or not, I am presently convinced that he raises issues that are important to those who subscribe to **confessional** Christianity, as we do on this list.

As I stated in my original post, I can neither deny nor defend his views; time limitations and my own ignorance prohibit me from either. Since I am not presently convinced of Dr. Letis' views, I cannot be his advocate and have not presented myself thus. This is why I first sent the release/review to Stan and asked his permission to post it for **discussion.** As he will testify if called upon to do so, I told him then that I was no apologist for Dr. Letis. I had first invited Ted (Letis) to join the list to deal with any questions regarding his theories, because knowing the broad reading and expertise of some list members, I was sure there might be some who would raise questions with which I could not interact. But owing to his present disdain for internet theological discussions, Ted declined.

With the entrance of James White's post regarding Dr. Letis, I find myself in a **most** awkward position: I must heartily disagree with James's response, but not because of Letis's theories. Rather I am in deeply disappointed in his presentation of Letis to the members of the list. **This,** not Ted's work is the only reason I burden the rest of you with this post.

However, I must first begin by asking for forgiveness. James, when I had Ted's press release and book review posted to the list, I was aware that you were mentioned in it, and I should have expunged that comment before I posted

it. I had no intention of insulting you -- I don't even know you -- and it was remarkably bad judgment on my part to have let that go by. There is no excuse for it, and I bear the responsibility for having let that be posted to the list. For any grief or anger it may have provoked in you or your friends on the list, you have my deepest regrets. I repent before our Holy God, the congregation of His Holy angels, to you, James, and to the members of the list with genuine sorrow. Will you forgive me? (Luk 17:3)

Brother James, you are clearly a man of gifts and one whom the Lord apparently uses in the realm of debate and cult apologetics. For this I am thankful to the Lord. I have neither desire nor ability to debate you, nor to enter an email feud with you. Had you entered the discussion and said that you had suffered a miserable experience with Ted Letis, that he had been caustic with and condescending to you, I would have had no problem with your post.

Likewise, had you interacted with his published work and said his views were wrong *BECAUSE* of Biblical, historical, and theological reasons I would have read your post with great interest. This would have been useful to me and the members of the list, and I would have had no problem with your post.

I am deeply disappointed, however, that you chose to post statements that misrepresented Dr. Letis. If you had shown any inclination toward restating what you presented to the list about Ted, I would have found little reason to post anything about this subject again. However, you seem adamant in sticking with your presentation of Ted, and this is why I offer this final post.

I plead with you, James, to reconsider what you have said. Had you written these things in private, I would have seen no need to burden the list with this post. But since you have publicly declared these things, I believe it my obligation before the Lord to publicly reply. As

God's Word says, "speak every man truth to his neighbour."

For the benefit of those of you reading this, please let me make clear: I am not defending or denying the *work* of Theodore Letis. I am correcting several things said about *him* -- not his theories.

Brother James, you said:

> > > Theodore Letis is no friend of Baptists of any stripe (he believes us >> to be cultists, as he said in our little "debate" that Nina Fosdick already > >noted, www.aomin.org/TLetis.html). <

I reply to you once again, this is an inaccurate statement. You have painted with too broad a brush here. As I said, I am a Baptist who has corresponded with Ted on and off for three years. He has always been cordial, helpful, and willing to answer my questions. He has no problem with confessional Baptists as such (1644/1689) and invites them to *join* his institution. He could not do this if he were "no friend of Baptists of any stripe."

Again, you have his own testimony in The Revival of the Ecclesiastical Text and the Claims of the Anabaptists, footnote 19, p. 16, "May this treatise not be misunderstood as a polemic against Baptists. Some of my dearest and closest friends are of this persuasion."

Andrew Sandlin, who knows Dr. Letis well, has given me permission to quote his private correspondence with me: "Letis certainly is a friend to many Baptists. I have spent many hours with him and can attest to his affection for Baptists: I myself was a Reformed Baptist when I first met him years ago, and he never treated me any way but charitably."

As well, Ted has a continuing, good relationship with the Baptists at PCC.

In the mouth of two or three witnesses shall every word be established (2Co 13:1). You have Letis's own published statement, supported by my testimony and that of Andrew Sandlin. Others could be gathered, but I trust that I will not need to go further. Theodore Letis is a friend of *some* Baptists. Does he

consider certain Baptists to be cultists (particularly the KJV Only Baptists)? Yes, and he has vehemently said so publicly.

For you to declare on a *Baptist* list that he is "no friend of Baptists of any stripe" is inaccurate, and a statement that could easily prejudice the minds of the list members, whether you intended such a result or not. He welcomes *serious* inquiry of his work and posted his address, phone, and email for such correspondence.

So, when you ask,

[White]

> What aspect of Dr. Letis have I misrepresented, in light of the web debate
> we did?

my answer is this: If the only information one had was your web site with its sad debacle of the *debate/seminar* posted there, one *might* conclude that Ted is not friendly to Baptists. He certainly was not charitable toward you or BJU. Tragic as that is, it is not the whole story.

My sorrow, brother, is that he and *you* are not friends.

I repeat, your statement is inaccurate. Your presentation of him in public would be acceptable if you said that he believes *certain* Baptists to be cultists and then state *which* Baptists and *under what circumstances* he does so. This would be fair. Your presentation above is not.

You also said,

[White]

> > > He is a Lutheran Theonomist last I knew,<<<

This too is inaccurate. As a Lutheran who holds to the "two kingdom" theory. I am disappointed that you *appear* to be making this in a pejorative sense. This presently has nothing to do with his theory of

the text of Scripture. Have I misunderstood you?

[White]

> Again, I can only go on the basis of what he himself said. If you can
> point out where I am misrepresenting his own statements, made only a few
> years ago, please do so. Otherwise, I think I'll have to take his word
> over yours. BTW, his being a Lutheran and a theonomist was first said to
> me by Andrew Sandlin, as I recall.

I have read the *entire* debate on your site again. Nowhere does he state or intimate this. I have found nothing in any of the writings that supports your claim.

Letis himself emphatically denies *ever* being a Theonomist, and I have correspondence from him to that effect. According to him, he has never said to you or anyone else that he is a Theonomist. You need to produce the evidence that "he himself said" this or retract your statement.

I asked Andrew Sandlin regarding your recollection. He says, "Letis is not and never has been a theonomist . . . Letis may be sympathetic toward certain aims of theonomy, as many other non-theonomists are, but no confessional Lutheran could possibly be a theonomist." This is in harmony with Ted's statement.

Neither Sandlin nor Letis can be brought in to support your statement. While either may have said, written, or did something that gave you this impression, it appears you have misunderstood that information. Theodore Letis is not a Lutheran Theonomist.

You then said,

[White]

> > > who denies inerrancy.<<<

To which I responded,

> > This is a misleading statement in the way you have framed it.<<

You replied,

[White]

> There was no framing, and again, since I referenced the article, anyone
> would be free to read his own statements on the issue for themselves,
correct?<

Introducing Dr. Letis to a list *bristling* with inerrantists by stating without any explanation that he "denies inerrancy" would prejudice the mind of virtually anyone on this list. I am an inerrantist -- a Warfieldian inerrantist as most on this list are. If Ted is right, Warfield is the father of the inerrancy doctrine I subscribe to. Why? That's what I was taught by the elders of my church and by Morton Smith. Since my conversion, had *anybody* been identified to me as rejecting inerrancy, I would have considered him him an infidel or a liberal (redundant?). I would venture to say that many of us on the list would. One who doesn't believe inerrancy is usually thought to be someone who thinks the Bible is full of untruths, myths, and the like. This is not the case with Dr. Letis. If his theory is correct, *he* holds the view that our fathers in the faith held prior to Warfield. In fact -- if I understand all of this correctly -- if he's correct, he actually holds the doctrine of the WCF and 1689 confessions, and *we* don't! This is why it has been of interest to me and why I sought discussion.

So you may not have intentionally framed the inerrancy issue a particular way. However, I think it would have been fairer to have presented Letis as a Missouri Synod Lutheran who rejects *Warfieldian* inerrancy for what he believes to be the confessional position of the church.

{White]

> I'm sorry, my statement was accurate, as you yourself said. Why does he
> get the benefit of the doubt on all things, and my brief comments
> accompanying my reference to the web article get dissected on a completely
> different standard?

He doesn't get the benefit of the doubt in all things, brother. I have no

different standard for you: It is not good to have respect of persons in judgment (Pro24:23). Based on your web site, I have said to you *and* to him (numerous times), he treated you reprehensibly. Though I've heard his side of the debate issue, I do not hesitate to say that his condescension and haughtiness were sinful. I will also suggest that in his later caricature of you, *he* has misrepresented *you.* I have not "dissected" you "on a completely different standard" -- I'm simply responding to your misrepresentation of him on this list.

[White]

> I would suggest you would find Douglas Wilson a more useful source for
> ecclesiastical text
> theories. He and I did a "disputatio" on the subject a few years ago.

Thank you for the reference, brother. I read the *disputatio* with great interest. However, what I found myself thinking as I read Doug's position was, "This sounds like Ted Letis's theory." So I contacted Doug. He graciously told me that *he and you* and *he and Ted* were friends. And, he not only agreed in the main with Dr. Letis's view, he uses Ted's_Ecclesiastical Text_ as a text book for the men in the minister's school. Many of the men on this list read and endorse Wilson's work. I would think that they would find it surprising for Doug Wilson to consort with Ted the way you have described him. Though you said, >"For some reason his (Letis's) theories seem attractive to Reformed people who don't seem to know a lot about his full position,"< I don't think Wilson would be teaching this view to the ministers in his school if he didn't know a lot about his full position.

In my original post I wrote:

> >any of you *familiar* with his work? If so, what do you think?"

to which you replied,

> I think my response was clear. :-)

It is for the issue of clarity that I'm writing. You made inaccurate statements about some of the things he believes. I'm only dealing with

those.

[Jeff Pollard]

> >I was not asking for an opinion on his views on Baptists: I am familiar
>> with that. And this, you have not accurately given us.

[White]

> I stand by his own statements,

Your Theonomy-L debate web site is not all there is to Dr. Letis, and your statement that he is "no friend of Baptists of any stripe," may be an understandable caricature, but inaccurate (by his own published statements and the testimony of others). "His own statements" do not support your contention.

[Jeff Pollard]

> >If he has misrepresented you, then as a Christian brother, he needs to
> >repent and ask your forgiveness. If he has, I pray that he will do
>> so.How about your misrepresentation of him above?

[White]

> I have found none, and stand, again, by his own statements over yours. The text speaks for itself.

His own statements *in the text* confirm that 1) he believes *some* Baptists to be cultists and 2) that he treated you wretchedly. But they do not confirm that he is no friend of Baptists of any stripe nor that he is a Lutheran Theonomist.

{White}

> > > Sometime last year Dr. Letis spoke at the Atlanta Bible College. Those
> > familiar with the institution know that this institution is
> >anti-Trinitarian. Since I had recently debated, by e-mail, a professor
>> at that school, I contacted Dr. Letis and asked him if he could
personally
> >affirm the historical doctrine of the deity of Christ. His response was
> >short: "You are an idiot. --T. Letis." I wrote back, "That may well be
> >>true, however, can you affirm....." He did not reply.<

This is the last thing I'll deal with. I must go out of town again, and I'm out of time.

Ted's unkind remark makes me shudder. It sounds perilously close to our Lord's admonition, "and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council: but whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire" (Mat 5:22).

However, his refusal to speak further to you is not evidence that he rejects the doctrine of the Incarnation. It's evidence that he has a low opinion of you and doesn't want to speak further to you. It doesn't *prove* that he denies the deity of Christ.

Ted is a *confessing* Missouri Synod Lutheran. He claims orthodoxy and his church requires it of him. Every Lord's Day he and the congregation to which he belongs audibly confess before God and the holy angels the Apostle's Creed and the Athanasian Creed. If it can be shown that he's lying when he repeats them, or if you can produce from his published works or his public statements that he in fact *denies* the deity of Christ or has some aberrant view, then it is your duty to expose him.

PCC, Wilson, or Sandlin would not share their pulpits or give a platform to a man that denies the deity of Christ, unless of course, they've all become so sloppy that they haven't checked him out.

Let me close by saying this:

1) I hold you, James and Ted, to be my brothers in Christ. I will pray for you both, and I plead with you to be reconciled in the bonds of Christian love.

2) James, I want to say as plainly as possible, I have had no prior argument with you. I have responded to your presentation of Dr. Letis to the list, that's it. Both Sandlin and Wilson affirmed that they considered themselves your friends. They were in no way *ganging up* on you, and I didn't contact them for that reason. You brought them up in the conversation. They simply answered my questions for the sake of clarity. I tried to call you on one of my days home as well, but the number I had just rang . . . no answerphone. The only reason I heard from Sandlin and Wilson is because they had answerphones and returned my call. If you are displeased with anyone, let it be me. I take full responsibility for the entire matter.

Both Sandlin and Wilson will happily answer any questions regarding our

correspondence; and if I have misrepresented or misquoted them, you, or Ted Letis, I've sent each a copy of this post for their immediate reproof and correction.

As I am unfamiliar with your works, James, I have ordered several of them, that I may know you and your work better. I hope our future correspondence and fellowship in Christ will be edifying to each other and honoring to Christ. I trust you will receive my correspondence, especially your work on the KJV Only issue.

3) For those of you who are interested, Letis has forwarded an eight page reply to Dr. Thurman Wisdom's critique of him. I will be glad to forward it to you for your perusal. If for no other reason, you may be interested simply to see that Letis can reply graciously to Baptists that disagree with him. A pity that this was not the spirit of the White/Letis encounter on Theonomy-L.

4) To the members of the list, my apologies for subjecting you to a less than edifying event. And I'm sorry we didn't have a profitable discussion of the issue at hand. I will now fade away into the lurk mode.

Speak ye every man the truth to his neighbour; execute the judgment of truth and peace in your gates: And let none of you imagine evil in your hearts against his neighbour; and love no false oath: for all these are things that I hate, saith the LORD. Zec 8:16, 17.

your servant and brother in Jesus Christ,
Jeff Pollard
Providence Baptist Church
Ball, LA

Another Exchange Between a Layman and the Alpha/Omega organization



Subj: **Dr. Letis And The King James Only Movement** Date: 1/30/02 9:03:38 PM
Central Standard Time From: doulos@aomin.org To:
<mailto:canonsofdort@aol.com>canonsofdort@aol.com

Dear Paul [Moore, laymen],

>Dear Mr. White, I emailed you some time back and requested that you remove
>Dr. Ted Letis from the category under KING JAMES ONLY. I am a member of a
>confessional Reformed church(in good standing).Your site has the issue
>concerning KING JAMES ONLY under apologetics and then places the material
>relating to Ted Letis under the KING JAMES ONLY MOVEMENT. It is at this
>page: <http://aomin.org/kjvo.html> I think that it is clear that Ted Letis
>is not KING JAMES ONLY and he has nothing in common with the others that
>advocate it on your page. Now if you disagree with his position then fine.
>But to place him on a page that lumps him with a position that he doesn't
>advocate and with those he doesn't agree with is wrong. You are
>misrepresenting him to others that visit your site. At least be honest and
>place him in a category away from those that are KING JAMES ONLY. YOU
also
>make mention that Ted Letis mocks inerrancy. You know the context in which
>he takes issue with the word and your usage of the web page leaves those
>with the impression he has a low view of scripture(and this is not the
>case). It is simple: Your current page misrepresents Ted Letis and his
>views. It does this by vague and unclear references to his views, without
>explanation, and it does so by placing him in a category on your site that
>is not accurate. Please do the right thing and make corrections. Thanks,
>Paul Moore

As to your objections regarding listing Dr. Letis in the KJV Only section...first, where else would we put him, the Mormonism section? Atheism Section? Secondly, anyone who reads the debate between Dr. Letis and Dr. White from the theonomy-I mailing list, posted on our website, will know his position: anyone listening to the Dividing Line

radio broadcasts we did will likewise know his position, and will be able to differentiate his position from a KJV Only type person like D.A. Waite or Peter Ruckman. However, given that Dr. Letis appears at KJV Only schools like Pensacola, and KJV Only radio programs like Southwest Radio Church, and appears along with D.A. Waite on that same program attacking Dr. White's book, why should we "not" include him in the KJV Only section? If he does not wish to be listed in that area, he might want to quit appearing on the KJV Only programs.

In Christian Service,

Warren Smith
Alpha & Omega Ministries



My response to Warren's response

Subj: **Re: Dr. Letis And The King James Only Movement** Date: 1/31/02 10:50:25
PM Central Standard Time From: <mailto:CanonsofDortCanonsofDort> To:
doulos@aomin.org

Dear Mr. Smith,
Please note the following:

- 1) Should we conclude that President Bush is a second -degree, separated Baptist fundamentalist, or a racist, because he spoke at Bob Jones University?
- 2) Dr. Letis was neither informed, nor would he have consented to appearing on a radio station with D.A. Waite. He was deceived by the radio station on this point which never informed him that Waite would be appearing right after he did. This was both unethical and unfair on the part of the radio station. Furthermore, I am informed that White asked to go on the same radio station to offer a rebuttal, but was refused. Would his appearance on such an occasion signify his support of everything that goes on that station? Do you not see how

distorted are your arguments?


3) In light of Dr. Letis' critique of White in the back of his book, plus his extensive critique of KJV only advocates, including D.A. Waite and the Dean Burgon Society, White's listing of Letis as KJV only is the zenith of dishonesty and an expression of the dirtiest of dirty politics, which White now has a public track record for, wrongly accusing Letis of being a theonomist, an antitrinitarian and a Baptist hater. The fact that a Baptist went on a Reformed Baptist discussion list to defend Letis on this last point is ironic beyond belief. In the long run, this stupidity will hurt White, not Letis.

4) Finally, my request about how Letis is treated on White's webpage is not prompted by Dr. Letis, who had no idea I was placing such a request.

What is really pitiful is your web site is filled with "KJV Only "links and articles. Dr. Letis has nothing in common with Riplinger, Marrs, Ruckman. As for speaking at different places-Dr. Letis is a real scholar with an earned Ph.D and he speaks at various societies and colleges and universities about the subject he is an expert in. Your site is misleading, knowing full well many people will not investigate further than your articles, and it doesnt engage Dr. Leits' position. His positions are clearly defined in his books(you give no reference to them where people can examine them). You speak aspects of the truth but never the WHOLE truth in context.

Dr. Letis is an orthodox Christian in the Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod. He confesses the Nicene Creed and
Your web site, concerning him, is very misleading.

Take care, Paul

Subj: **Re: Dr. Letis And The King James Only Movement**
Date: 2/6/02 11:30:28 PM Central Standard Time
From: doulos@aomin.org
: <mailto:CanonsofDort@aol.com>CanonsofDort@aol.com

Dear Paul,

1) Should we conclude that President Bush is a second -degree, separated Baptist fundamentalist, or a racist, because he spoke at Bob Jones University?

Irrelevant: anyone who listens to the programs and reads the debate knows what Dr. Letis' position is. Again, where else are we going to list this, especially since Letis is constantly critiquing The King James Only Controversy and likening it to the work of Gail Riplinger, etc.? It is all the same subject, and only the shallow thinker automatically assumes that the listing of the material in that section means Letis is KJV Only as Waite or Ruckman are KJV Only.

2) Dr. Letis was neither informed, nor would he have consented to appearing on a radio station with D.A. Waite. He was deceived by the radio station on this point which never informed him that Waite would be appearing right after he did. This was both unethical and unfair on the part of the radio station.

Problem is, it wasn't a radio station. It was a radio program, the Southwest Radio Church. Everyone knows the position of the Southwest Radio Church and that it is KJV Only. And while it is possible they did not mention Waite to him, it is highly unlikely as well; they aired his programs "after" Waite's. And while Letis had innumerable opportunities to refute KJV Onlyism on the program, and refute its practitioners by name, he did not do so (why?). Also, it was "obvious" that the interviewer "was" KJV Only, and Letis played along just so as to attack The King James Only Controversy. He did NOT challenge the interviewer's promotion of KJV Onlyism. Again, even a brief review of the relevant Dividing Line programs shows this to be the case. Have you "listened" to these programs? If not, why not?

Furthermore, I am informed that White asked to go on the same radio station to offer a rebuttal, but was refused. Would his appearance on such an occasion signify his support of everything that goes on that station? Do you not see how distorted are your arguments?

No, I only see how irrational that argument was. How could it possibly be construed as being KJV Only to go on a KJV Only program to offer a rebuttal to their attacks against you? The distortion is in that kind of argumentation, not the observation that Dr. Letis, while rejecting the fundamentalist kind of KJV Onlyism of Waite today (he at one time attempted to be in the leadership of the Dean Burgon Society, but was rebuffed), has engaged in numerous activities that were sponsored by, and intended to promote the acceptance of, KJV Onlyism.

3) In light of Dr. Letis' critique of White in the back of his book, plus his extensive critique of KJV only advocates, including D.A. Waite and the Dean Burgon Society, White's listing of Letis as KJV only is the zenith of dishonesty and an expression of the dirtiest of dirty politics,

For the last time: any person who assumes that the listing of these materials in the KJV Only section makes every person discussed therein KJV Only is simply engaging in absurd irrationality. A person who "reads" the dialogues and "listens" to the programs knows better: a person who refuses to do so and just continues the attack without considering these facts is obviously not acting rationally.

which White now has a public track record for, wrongly accusing Letis of being a theonomist,

Accusing? You assume such would be an accusation: he posted on the theonomy-I list; at the time he was a Lutheran; he was at the time associated with Andrew Sandlin and the folks at Chalcedon. Rushdooney was a theonomist. Andrew Sandlin made comments that seemed to indicate a position favorable to Chalcedon's views on the part of Letis. Given Letis' changes in viewpoint over the past number of years, there is no way of knowing where he is today theologically (especially since he refuses to answer simple and direct questions from Dr. White, replying with words such as "You are an idiot" when asked to affirm his belief in the historic doctrine of the deity of Christ). But again, you are in great error to think it would be an "accusation" to say he does or did entertain theonomic belief. Dr. White happens to have very close friends who are theonomists.

an antitrinitarian and a Baptist hater.

He spoke at an antitrinitarian school on a subject amenable to the viewpoint of that school. Why he chose to do so is unknown; he will not explain his actions. To raise the issue is one thing: to leap from that to the "conclusion" that he is antitrinitarian is unwarranted, and Dr. White has never done so. As to his comments on Baptists, they are present in his own words in the theonomy-I debate, which is all Dr. White has ever repeated. It is undoubtedly the embarrassing nature of those very words that promoted Dr. Letis' request that the debate be removed from the A&O website. When we offered Letis the opportunity to add a rejoinder/clarification to the article rather than pulling it, he refused.

The fact that a Baptist went on a Reformed Baptist discussion list to defend Letis on this last point is ironic beyond belief. In the long run, this stupidity will hurt White, not Letis.

I have no idea what you are referring to: Reformed Baptists are Baptists, so why that would be ironic is unknown; as to the stupidity, every point you have raised so far has been responded to fully.

4) Finally, my request about how Letis is treated on White's webpage is not prompted by Dr. Letis, who had no idea I was placing such a request.

What is really pitiful is your web site is filled with "KJV Only" links and articles. Dr. Letis has nothing in common with Riplinger, Marrs, Ruckman. As for speaking at different places-Dr. Letis is a real scholar with an earned Ph.D and he speaks at various societies and colleges and universities about the subject he is an expert in.

For the last time, it is irrational to ignore the actual material on the site the way you are. Please attempt to control your bias or your emotions so as to consider this fact. It destroys the entirety of your credibility to close your eyes so tightly to the refutation of this oft-repeated accusation on your part. Any person with a semblance of rationality and fairness can see why the interaction with Letis is placed where it is. Only a completely irrational person would say we identify

Letis as KJV Only. There is nothing more to be said on this subject, and any further repetition of this irrational assertion will be ignored.

Your site is misleading, knowing full well many people will not investigate further than your articles, and it doesn't engage Dr. Letis' position. His positions are clearly defined in his books (you give no reference to them where people can examine them).

More errors: LISTEN to the Dividing Line programs where we interacted directly with Letis' appearance on the Southwest Radio Church programs and where Dr. White specifically READ from Letis' books.

You speak aspects of the truth but never the WHOLE truth in context.

Dr. Letis is an orthodox Christian in the Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod. He confesses the Nicene Creed and
Your web site, concerning him, is very misleading.

Or, sir, you are intent upon believing that, all facts to the contrary notwithstanding.

In Christian Service,

Warren Smith
Alpha & Omega Ministries

Subj: **Re: Dr. Letis And The King James Only Movement**
Date: 2/12/02 1:21:18 AM Central Standard Time
From: doulos@aomin.org



To: <mailto:CanonsofDort@aol.com> CanonsofDort@aol.com

Sent from the Internet ([Details](#))

Dear Paul,

>

> Since your ministry is centered about debating I can not begin to match
> your ministry in the art of debate.

>

> But I will ask you again to deal with Dr. Letis' books that have his
> material. Not his "
> appearance" on shows or web sites.

Why? Is what he says not important? Is what he writes on a website debate
not important? Is it your assertion that only what Dr. Letis has written
in his books is important and every other form of communication that he has
used should be ignored?

> Dr. Letis is a true scholar who has had
> his work praised by scholars from Yales, Harvard, etd. He speaks at schools
> and locations to deal with the material he is an expert with.

Yes, including schools and radio shows that are very well known for
promoting the KJV only position.

> I will stand

> byt the following:

>

>!) Dr. Letis has Luthern beliefs and has had regardless of friendships and
> affiliations with Theonomists(Dr. White is friends and has worked with
> Paedobaptists but he is not one).

>2) Dr. Letis's position in not KJV Only(regardless of whether he "knows" some
> or has "been on a radio show" ran by some).

Yet, when he appeared on the radio show in question, he must have done so
with full knowledge of the views of the host and everyone who had been on
the show before him because he was part of a series of shows responding to
Dr. White's book on the KJV Only position.

> I would ask you do the following:

>

>Take Dr. Letis' book, "The Ecclesiastical Text" and do a "critique" of it on
>your site. Explain why you are not in agreement.
>That is fine.
>But to debate me and have me chase your irrelevant arguments around
because
>your ministry is a master at debating is not going to work.

You're the one who e-mailed us. It was you who said that we were being dishonest. I simply responded fully to your accusations and encouraged you to listen to the programs in question. Have you done so yet?

>Get Dr. Letis work and deal with the material(if you are able).

We are the ones who are dealing with his material. One can easily read his comments or hear them on our website. You however, are the one who apparently has yet to do that.

>I say this because I have been helped tremendously by Dr. Letis in the past
>in areas not dealing with the KJV issue. He was helpful in leading me out of
>the PCUSA and elements of liberalism. I would ask you to please consider my
>request.
>Your web site's handling of Dr. Letis is simply unfair(considering the way you
>interact with the printed works of the real "KJV Only" people).

Again, and for the last time, we simply let Dr. Letis speak for himself both in written form and audibly on Southwest Radio Church. If you have a problem with what he said, then you should take this issue up with him.

In Christian Service,

Warren Smith
Alpha & Omega Ministries

Subj: **Re: Dr. Letis And The King James Only Movement**

Date: 2/12/02 10:45:30 PM Central Standard Time

From: <mailto:CanonsofDortCanonsofDort>



To: doulos@aomin.org

Dear Rev. Smith:

I assert that his written work, which has been praised by scholars from many universities, is the core of his beliefs. Deal with his published materials.

Now I can see that you will never do the above. You have chosen to post a Internet fight between Rev. White and Dr. Letis. Imagine for a moment teachers advocating two opposing positions. It happens that the two get in a heated debate where they insult each other when upset. So instead of engaging the issues that the two disagree over one decides to post or repeat the "fight" instead of engaging the material.

The reality is this. You have to attack Dr. Letis because of his speaking engagements, radio interviews and so forth because his published work is too difficult for you to deal with.

You simply can't handle the "Ecclesiastical Text" on your web site. Your only hope to deal with Dr. Letis is to have White play the role of attacked martyr("that bad Ted called me names")and to attack his speaking engagements (Dr. Letis speaks at various conferences, schools and churches to deal with his Ph.D. material). "Dr. Letis was on a radio show with those KJV Only guys," and "Dr. Letis spoke at a school that was not Trinitarian." Yeah-your ministry got him. Nailed Dr. Letis good. You caught and exposed him. He is actually teaching and giving lectures! Wow! Can you believe that? I mean don't actually engage his material that is published. Why waste your time doing that? What purpose would that serve? You can focus on the stuff that really matters. His radio interviews and speaking engagements! Boy, that Dr. White is on the ball! He really knows his stuff!

Must make you all proud! Keep up the good work!

Paul Moore