

Elders and members of the Skillman Church of Christ

The “assurances” left me even more convinced that being taken over by The Hills (please don’t say Hills Church of Christ since it’s not their name) isn’t the logical next step. When brother Minnick “negotiated” that Hills “would agree to not sell a building that was gifted to them within five years” still has me out of breath.

I would caution all those in favor to rethink their position if the motivation is to continue to worship at our building as The Hills’ “assurances” and Bill’s telling of the story are problematic and should be a major eye opener.

It seems our Elders feel they are in the weak position (and in a hurry, which I don’t understand) in this negotiation, when in fact we hold all the cards. A decision made under duress is rarely the right one. Is the Hills exerting pressure? If so, why?

If we’re attempting to attract a younger audience, I believe a more liberal service with instruments was previously suggested and was denied by our Elders. Yet, this is exactly what The Hills will do. Why is it a good idea now and not then? The evidence now is that it was good idea then, and one we should immediately undertake. I would venture Skillman could fill a stage with musicians right now without having to recruit outside our membership.

Before we give Skillman away let’s implement what was previously recommended and have our own two services of a band and acapella. We can ask The Hills for only their advice regarding our Skillman services. If they refuse to help us as we are, it’s obvious they have no interest in Skillman as an individual congregation...they only have interest in taking our church for free.

With respect to contributions, I feel what was presented by brother Calvin was misleading and a bit disappointing. No mention of an unprecedented global pandemic, and no mention of the likelihood that some members (including Donna and myself) are withholding church donations because of this continued, seemingly head long, pursuit to be taken over. Just can’t get my head around this.

If we try to rebuild our current church and are unsuccessful in growing membership and revenue to a sustainable level, then sell our assets and relocate to a smaller building-- with less overhead, less strain on finances, (we will be flush with cash, \$15,000,000,00 or so). Yes, The Hills can then bid on the assets too.

If we allow The Hills to take us over now, we will have ZERO assets. ZERO options. At the whim of a congregation that doesn’t list itself as a “Church of Christ”.

They’ll probably rename the church to something that leaves off “Church of Christ” and additionally, may discover that inner-city Dallas is tougher than they thought it would be and then sell the property. Where are we then?

It seems many yes voters aren’t seeing the whole picture. Buying the sizzle.

--Joel Bozarth, member since birth—62 years