

Say What | Resolutions and Revelation | John Wight

SUMMARY KEYWORDS

Youth ministry, quorum president, parliamentary procedure, World Conference, resolution process, common consent, youth delegation, bylaws

SPEAKERS

Kassie Ripsam, John Wight, Mary Anne Bennett-Ripsam

Kassie Ripsam 00:27

Hello and welcome to Say What, a Project Zion Podcast series that tries to get answers, about life and faith for the youth of the church. We're your hosts, Marianne and Kassie. And for this episode of Say What, we've invited evangelist and Community of Christ parliamentarian extraordinaire, John Wight, to join us today, and we'll talk about how resolutions and revelations make it to World Conference and beyond. And who knows, we might get a few other things out of him while we're talking. So let's get started. So just to as a starter, just tell us a little bit about yourself, like interests and hobbies and stuff.

John Wight 01:06

Well, my name is John Wight. I live in Blue Springs, Missouri, with my wife Carol. We have six children and six grandchildren. I retired last year. I enjoy scuba diving. I enjoy backpacking, and that's probably enough about me.

Kassie Ripsam 01:27

Well, we have several getting to know you questions that we ask every person we interview. Marianne...

Mary Anne Bennett-Ripsam 01:34

So, the first one would be, do you think you would survive like a zombie apocalypse?

John Wight 01:41

Yeah, I really think so. Because as old as I am, I think zombies might just figure I was one of them and leave me alone.

Mary Anne Bennett-Ripsam 01:51

Okay.

Kassie Ripsam 01:52

Well, do you ever talk to inanimate objects like a computer or cars or anything? Well, I like, for example, I apologize to things I bump into.

John Wight 02:06

I do that all the time. I'm constantly talking. I'm not sure that there is anything that I don't talk to... computers, wrenches, hammers, can openers, cars, etc, etc, etc. So I'm right there with you.

Mary Anne Bennett-Ripsam 02:21

So what part of a driver's test do you think you would most likely fail or perform poorly in?

John Wight 02:31

Yeah, the one that pops into my mind right off is the one that says you're supposed to have both hands on the wheel at all times. I just never did get that into my habit. So I'm sure I would flunk that part of the test.

Mary Anne Bennett-Ripsam 02:44

Yeah, especially like, for example, a friend drove me home from senior high camp, and he had one of those cars that stayed in lane for you, and he the car had to constantly remind him to keep his hands on the wheel. When we got back , like, I don't have to do this.

Kassie Ripsam 03:02

So, our younger sister wants to know, what is the weirdest dream you've ever had?

John Wight 03:10

That's a really tough question for me. I've never been able to remember my dreams more than for maybe a couple of minutes after waking up, I remember having some weird ones, but I really can't remember any of the details. And the older I've gotten, the harder it has gotten for me to remember anything. So sorry, I can't have a better answer for you.

Kassie Ripsam 03:35

No, it's all right. She's the same way. Um, to be more serious, tell us about your Youth Service Award in 1981.

John Wight 03:45

Well, let me first say that I was truly humbled to receive that award. I had been involved in youth ministry from my senior year in college when I was elected district youth leader in Lansing district, up in Michigan. This is back when we had districts. That kind of involvement continued when I was elected district youth leader when I moved to Southern Illinois. But I think the award was really because of a couple of specific kinds of ministry. Namely, I developed something we called wilderness experiences, which involved backpacking in the mountains, sailing to the Bahamas, and similar kinds of outdoor things. And probably even more important was a camping program that I directed for inner city youth from St Louis and East St Louis and youth with cystic fibrosis. I'm pretty sure that I was blessed far more than the youth, but I was grateful to receive the award.

Kassie Ripsam 04:56

That sounds really interesting. So. So how would working in the with the youth in the 80s differ from working with the youth now, and how would it be similar?

John Wight 05:07

Yeah, that's a tough question. I guess the first thing that comes to my mind would be the technological developments since the 80s, being able to reach out to more and more youth and be able to stay in more regular contact with them would be a huge difference from what we worked with in the 80s. But the bottom line, I guess, would be that I would have to say that I believe trying to encourage youth to recognize that they are persons of worth, and encourage them to seek God's direction in their lives. Is pretty much the same now as it was then. There are just some different methods of trying to share that message today.

Kassie Ripsam 05:56

Completely different fashion sense too, I guess,

John Wight 06:01

Very true.

Mary Anne Bennett-Ripsam 06:04

So one of your BIOS says that you were president of a quorum. Tell us, what is a quorum and what were your duties as president?

John Wight 06:13

Yeah, this gets a little bit complicated, so let me try to keep it as short as possible. A quorum is a name applied to a group of people holding a specific priesthood office. There are other names used for various groups, such as councils and orders. For example, there is the Order of Evangelists, the Order of Bishops, the Council of 12 Apostles, the Quorum of High Priests. Each quorum, council or order, has specific ministerial and administrative functions of one kind or another. In the case of the seventies, each quorum is an entity to itself and does things like provide for educational opportunities for its members, identifying and shepherding the approval of calls to the office of seventy within the area covered by the given quorum, and other functions that are unique To each quorum. Each quorum has a president who presides over the group and coordinates their activities. I served in this role of being a quorum president from 1998 until 2023 the quorum presidents also form the Council of Presidents of Seventy, which, again, is an entity to itself, just like each of the quorums of seventy are, the Council of Presidents of Seventy is an entity, and this council is responsible for considering recommendations for ordination to the office of seventy, coordinating educational materials as appropriate for all seventies, working closely with the Council of 12 Apostles in ministries of outreach and invitation, among other things. One of the presidents of seventy is elected to serve as the senior president of seventy to preside over the work of the Council of Presidents of 70. And I served in that role from 2010 until 2023.

Kassie Ripsam 08:35

That's a lot.

Mary Anne Bennett-Ripsam 08:38

So you currently hold the office of evangelist. How is that office different than the office of seventy or president of seventy?

John Wight 08:48

Yeah, as I alluded to in my previous answer, and as indicated in one of the church's publications, seventies are known as ministers of evangelism through witnessing, inviting and church planting. In other words, focusing on inviting individuals, households and families, to respond to Christ's call to discipleship and to experience all aspects of Christ's peace. Evangelists are referred to in that same publication as ministers of blessing through spiritual companionship, sanctuary and revival. In many ways, these two offices are very similar, because they are focused on bringing the peace of Jesus Christ into the lives of people in a variety of ways. Put simply, seventies focus primarily on inviting people into relationship with Jesus Christ and evangelists focus primarily on providing special blessings to provide support and direction for life to individuals who seek that kind of ministry.

Kassie Ripsam 10:10

Okay, so, what exactly does a parliamentarian of the Community of Christ do, and what does it mean to be a member of the National Association of parliamentarians.

John Wight 10:21

Yeah, this one's going to take a little while. Let me. Let me take those questions in reverse order, if I may. The National Association of Parliamentarians was incorporated in 1933 and now has over 6000 members, and even though the name of the organization is National Association of Parliamentarians, there are a number of members from countries other than the US, but the vast majority are indeed from here. Probably the best way to answer your question is to quote from NAP's website, where they say, "becoming a member of NAP is the first step in the journey toward promoting fair, inclusive, democratic decision making in organizations, business meetings." And there are three basic membership categories in NAP, and they are: a member, a registered parliamentarian, that you have to go through a rather lengthy test to get, and then the highest level is Professional Registered Parliamentarian, and that involves a lot more study, a lot more testing, and so forth. I am now a Professional Registered Parliamentarian, Retired. That is an official designation, having that retired added after that title, but that is, that's what I was certified as, and am able to continue that even though I am retired from doing a lot of parliamentary work. Again, from the website, the goal of membership in NAP is, "promoting fair, inclusive, democratic decision making in organizations, business meetings." And by the way, let me add that NAP is very committed to reaching out to young people to share its vision. So if you, or any of our young listeners, are interested in pursuing parliamentary procedure, I would recommend that you go to their website, which is parliamentarians.org and you'll find some of the specific programs and opportunities available to young people. As for as for what a parliamentarian does in Community of Christ and applying those kinds of principles and such, putting it simply, is to try to offer advice, counsel and direction relative to parliamentary procedure. This involves discussion with and providing advice to the First Presidency prior to and during World Conference, serving on the conference organization and procedures team, serving on the World Conference Resolution Review Committee, providing a draft set of standing rules, which provide specific guidelines for the World Conference, developing a list of

parliamentary actions that will be used during conference, including what those mean and how they would be handled, being available to consult with delegates privately during conference on questions they may have, and as the old saying goes, other duties as assigned. So some people think that the role of the parliamentarian is really only one that applies during conference. The reality, though, is that the aforementioned responsibilities begin shortly after one conference adjourns, and then they continue through the next conference. So if you have other questions that's kind of in a nutshell, what it means to be a parliamentarian, and what a parliamentarian does in Community of Christ.

Kassie Ripsam 14:33

Well, we were attending world conference last year, and we were able to get a broader understanding of how policies get established into the Community of Christ, and we understand that the different sections of the Doctrine and Covenants are divine counsel given to different presidents of the church. How do these communications from God get into the Scriptures? And do all of them become scripture?

John Wight 15:01

Yeah, this is one of those things that that particularly fascinated me when I was quite young. I am the son of an appointee minister for the church. I was an appointee myself, but I grew up being the son of an appointee, and so I've never missed a World Conference in my life. And as a young person, I was fascinated with how the procedure worked. I was fascinated with parliamentary procedure, especially how it related to this subject of words of counsel, divine counsel, from the prophet, president of the church. Now, let me say that there have been some changes to this process through the years, and I've been able to observe many of those. But let me try to answer your question relative to how these have been handled. Most recently, the prophet president shares divine words of counsel with the church prior to conference. Now, let me just add quickly, it used to be that those were all sealed up until conference began. They were opened and kept confidential until the quorums, councils and orders had seen them. But now, the prophet president shares the message, the words of counsel, with the church prior to conference, so that they have some time to think about it, pray about it, and so forth. Then the official conference process during the week of conference involves the quorums, councils, orders, caucuses and mass meetings discussing the words of counsel in their individual group sessions and deciding whether or not they as a group, support those words and want them to be included in the Doctrine and Covenants. Each of these groups then reports back to the conference the results of their deliberations and their votes. Then the document goes before the whole conference for debate and a vote. Now, that vote includes authorization to include the words of counsel in the Doctrine and Covenants, and hence to be considered scripture, as you asked in your question. Now I am not a historian, so even as old as I am, I can't say whether or not any words of counsel have ever not been approved and included in the Doctrine and Covenants. I can tell you though, that in 1968 when what is now section 149 was presented to the church, some questions were raised that resulted in then President W Wallace Smith bringing additional words of counsel to the church in an effort to answer and clarify those questions and concerns. That document was also approved by the conference, and is included in the Doctrine and Covenants as section 149 A. So there you have it again, in a nutshell.

Mary Anne Bennett-Ripsam 18:11

So to back up a bit, so you were talking about the rules of what you said, Robert's Rules or something like that. How does someone get with you to ask about those rules to you know, clarify things.

John Wight 18:32

Sure, I sit on the rostrum right behind the presidency, and that way they look over their shoulder at me if they have any questions about parliamentary procedure during the legislative sessions. When they, between the legislative sessions, or if I just run into somebody in the hall, they are free to talk to me, ask me a question. And, I spent a good bit of time at the last World Conference having people come up to me after the legislative sessions and ask questions about a variety of things. And so that's how that works. It's, it's an informal, uh, kind of a thing. I just try to make myself available so that they can come down to the rostrum in motion for me after the legislative session is adjourned, and then we talk things through.

Mary Anne Bennett-Ripsam 19:22

Okay, cool. So what is the process to just kind of branch off what Kassie asked? What is the process to get a resolution to World Conference?

John Wight 19:36

Yeah, the process for getting a resolution before the World Conference is covered quite nicely in a resolution that was approved by the Conference of 2016. Again, it's, there have been processes through the years. They've changed as the church has developed, as those jurisdictions have developed, and so forth. And so the the resolution that was approved in 2016 is the latest one. And so, rather than me trying to come up with words to describe the process, I think it would probably be quicker, and probably easier, to understand if I just share a portion of that resolution. And this is from World Conference resolution 1290 as it was amended in 2016, so let me just share this resolved, that in order for legislation to come before the World Conference, such legislation must be submitted to the First Presidency no later than one year prior to the opening day of each world conference. That resolved that during World conferences, provision shall be made for meetings of quorums, councils, the Presiding Bishopric and orders of the world church and of caucuses authorized by the First Presidency for fellowship, spiritual growth, educational pursuits, and to consider pre-submitted legislation and other matters to be brought before the World Conference, and be it further resolved that with the approval of the First Presidency, legislation from councils, quorums, the Presiding Bishopric and orders of the World Church and of authorized caucuses may be submitted during the World Conference if such legislation is of an urgent nature or is required because of actions taken during the current World Conference, and be it further resolved, World Conference resolutions 1214, 1218, and 1254, be rescinded. So this is the the resolution that guides how resolutions can be presented to World Conference now and and the the one thing that I would like to note is that that next to the last resolve, leaves the door open for resolutions to come during conference if the First Presidency determines that they are of an urgent enough nature to do that. As you may recall, it said that resolutions had to be presented by mission centers, quorums, councils, orders and so forth, at least one year prior to the beginning of the next World Conference. Now the reason, the main reason for that, is so that the translations can be done into the various languages that are provided for and and to make sure that everything is in order before it comes to the World Conference. So, there's that one year of preparation, translation and so forth. That is not applied if something comes from the orders, councils and so and so

forth, and the work and the First Presidency decides that, yes, this is of an urgent enough nature that we need to proceed with it, even though it did not come in a year before. Yeah, I believe you asked about amendments. Is that right?

Mary Anne Bennett-Ripsam 23:09

Yes, yeah, yeah. How do we put forward an amendment for it?

John Wight 23:14

Yeah, as they can be offered during consideration of a given resolution, a delegate simply moves to amend by adding words in specific places or striking out and replacing portions of the resolution, or by substituting the entire resolution with a different resolution. There are a number of specific rules that govern this process, such as that you cannot consider more than a main motion, an amendment and an amendment to the amendment at a given time. In other words, you can't have six motions out on the floor and 13 amendments. You know, you're, you've got one motion, you can have one amendment and one amendment to the amendment at a time, and the, another example of a rule that applies to this is that the content of a substitute amendment has to address the same topic, the same area of interest as the original motion, or same thing applies to the first amendment. You can't substitute with something that's clear out in left field that doesn't have anything to do with what the immediate previous motion had to do with as a motion or as an amendment. There may also, yeah, oh, go ahead.

Mary Anne Bennett-Ripsam 24:41

So for example, you can't have like they're talking about grammar and say the second paragraph and then all of a sudden, someone's talking about something they don't like in, like the fifth paragraph, or something like that.

John Wight 24:52

Well, you can include more than one of those kinds of corrections in the same amendment. It's. But you know, it's how it's worded. And you can, you can say, I move to amend by striking this and inserting that, and by striking this and inserting that and by inserting that. So as long as it's all to do with the with the same motion and it's all included, it can be done that way when you're amending something. Yes.

Mary Anne Bennett-Ripsam 25:26

Very interesting.

Kassie Ripsam 25:26

Well, okay, sometimes what is said at lecterns can get a bit confusing, like point of order, amendment, amendment to the amendment, and call the question. Tell us how do you think the principle that the principles of Robert's Rules that we use at World Conference and common consent, what we usually use at the congregation level, could be used together to make world conference meetings flow better and be more understandable to any person in attendance.

John Wight 25:57

Yeah, this is a very interesting question. We could probably do a whole podcast just on this one question alone. Let me begin by saying that to a certain extent, we are already doing this. We have

been using what is known as an alternative common consent process for several conferences for items that the presidency believes would be more appropriate for using the, that approach, that method . This allows for discussion and expression of levels of support, rather than everybody having to vote one way or another. It allows people to speak to the subject more than once, etc, etc, etc. There are a number of other things that are built into this alternative method of common consent consideration that are used that are quite different than RONR. Now "Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised," sorry, I slipped into using the letters, I apologize. Now, having said that, let me say that in my humble opinion, parliamentary procedure as outlined in Robert's Rules of Order, has in many ways, tried to incorporate common consent philosophies and approaches that you named. For example, Roberts identifies various fundamental principles of parliamentary procedure, such as the rule of the majority, the rights of the minority to be heard, equality of opinion, protection of absentees, and one subject at a time. General Henry Robert published his first book way back in 1867 and I'd like to share just a part of his writing. I'd like to share a quote with you that kind of illustrates where he was coming from and why he even bothered with this. This is, again, it's, copied or printed in the the most recent edition, which is the 12th edition. It says this, "in 1867 Robert was promoted to Major and ordered to San Francisco, which was then a turbulent community made up of people recently arrived from every state as he and his wife worked with persons from different parts of the country in several organizations seeking to improve social conditions there, they found themselves in the midst of a strange situation. Remarking on it many years later, in a lecture in Cincinnati, he stated that quote, 'friction as to what constituted parliamentary law was indeed no uncommon thing.' Each member of these organizations had brought from his home state, different and often strong convictions as to what we were correct Parliament, what were correct parliamentary rules, and a presiding officer usually followed the customs of the locality from which they came. Under these conditions, confusion and misunderstanding had reached a point where issues of procedure consumed time that should have gone into the real work of the societies." And so he wrote Robert's Rules of Order in an effort to try to get away from spending all this time arguing about, well, should it be done this way or this way? Well, back home, we do it this way. Back my home, we do it this way. And so I think he was trying to provide something to those people that's like common consent, to provide for them a way to process without wasting a lot of time. And the one statement that I quoted already that I just love, where you know these. Um, principles, fundamental principles of parliamentary procedure. The one that, one of the ones that I quoted, is equality of opinion. For me, that's common consent. It says, Your opinion is no better than mine, mine is no better than hers, etc, etc. It says there is an equality of opinion. And so that lifts up, uh, everyone's opinion as being equal, and I just I love that, and for me, that's another indication of his desire to have something of common consent, even though it's handled a little differently than what we commonly think of as common consent. The Church has long used Robert's Rules of Order. Originally, it was identified as the church's parliamentary authority within a resolution, or resolutions in 2002 though the church adopted a revised set of bylaws in which the current, it says the current edition of RONR as being the church's parliamentary authority. And, in that set of bylaws, it was called article eight, and that it just says, Yep, it's Robert's Rules of Order. With subsequent renumbering due to some additional bylaws being added, that particular article regarding our parliamentary authority is now Article Nine. So I think it's very short. So let me just read to you what it says, and it might give you a little better idea of why we use this book as our parliamentary authority. "The Rules contained in the current edition of Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised shall govern all conferences of the church in all cases where they are culturally appropriate and where they are not in conflict with these rules of order or any special rules of order adopted by the appropriate

conference. In cultures where Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised is not known or generally used, locally appropriate rules shall be utilized to guarantee the rights of individual members and groups to participate fully in the deliberative process." And I really appreciate the way that is worded, because it recognizes that it doesn't have to be this rigid thing for everybody. It's partly related to what is culturally acceptable or culturally usable. So I, I really do appreciate that it's my feeling that the church has felt that parliamentary procedure was, as Robert's statement suggests, a healthy way to strive for common consent, which has been a strong principle of the church from its beginning. I believe that leadership has been very open to looking for additional ways to bring that principle into our consideration of the church's business. There has been strong support, back to your question about common consent and parliamentary procedure, there has been strong support for exploring ways to do this for several years now, as a group, including a professional registered parliamentarian, has been exploring possibilities the alternative common consent process is a good example of the openness to figuring out ways to make those two principles work together.

Kassie Ripsam 33:29

I was just about to point out there seems to be some faults in the common consents, like, say you're in a line to get to the lectern. And

Mary Anne Bennett-Ripsam 33:43

That's, that's Robert's Rules,

Kassie Ripsam 33:45

I know, but, but in but in the common consent in Robert's Rules seems to have false in it, because you were as if you're in a line to get to the lectern, and do you want to make an amendment? Someone in front of you suddenly calls the question, and you can no longer do that.

John Wight 34:07

Yeah. And let me, let me just say that that the system that's used at World Conference by the First Presidency and that is generated, or that uses the lectern operators as the input people. It is designed so that the whoever is in the chair, whichever member of the presidency is in the chair, looks at a screen, and they can see exactly what everybody has put their card in to do. It used to be, and I remember this. I mean, this is, this is, I'm old enough that I do remember this. It used to be that whoever wanted to speak would have to stand and just yell out, Mr. President, and then the President would have to identify the one that they wanted to recognize. And so there was kind of this joke about how, yeah, he's got the biggest mouth, so he always gets called on But now everybody has to go to the lectern and put in their card with what they want to do. The lectern operator puts that into a computer system, and that shows up on this screen. So the presidency has in front of them everything that people want to do. And I can tell you from personal observation that if the presidency does not believe there has been enough time for discussion, they will not call up someone who has or call on someone who has put in that they want to call for the previous question. They want to give everybody a chance, or at least enough of a chance, to speak. They also observe fairly religiously, no pun intended, the rule of alternates, and that means that one person in favor of gets to speak, and then one person opposed,

one person in favor of, one person opposed. And again, that goes back to what I quoted from General Robert that, you know, the equality of opinion. And so there's, there is this effort to make sure that people are hearing enough from those who are opposed and those who are in favor, and so the the things that happen because of the of the system actually is much better now than it used to be, where it was just the chair was relying on the voice that they heard. And so even though it may seem somewhat unfair, somehow unfair, it's actually a lot better than it used to be, and the the the chances of getting recognized are much better now than they used to be, I guess is the best way for me to say it. It has always been a question mark. Am I going to get recognized? Well, let's find out. And so there's always that chance, regardless of the system that's being used, or even if parliamentary procedure is or is not being used, there's always a chance you won't have the opportunity to speak just because of how things work. But I again, I can tell you that every effort is made to provide sufficient time and opportunity for debate, for discussion, for questions and so forth before someone calls for the question.

Mary Anne Bennett-Ripsam 37:39

That's awesome. Love. Love that people are making progress towards these things, you know. So we would love to dream big for a moment. I would like you to venture there with us. How could we establish, say, a non-geographical delegation of youth or young adults to represent the young voices at World Conference.

John Wight 38:07

Yeah, this is, this is a little bit complicated, because the bylaws are very clear about who would be a delegate, how they become a delegate, who they represent, and it's, it's all based on mission centers. The mission centers elect their delegates. And so to move to this kind of of a non geographical delegation would require an amendment of the bylaws, which is a fairly complicated process. But I'm not trying to discourage you in any way. If you, if you want to pursue that, I would recommend that you do that now. I would also recommend, though, that if you want to to pursue that, that you discuss it first with your apostle. That would, that would probably help to have input from him or her. And so it's because it is a rather complicated process to to get a bylaw amendment. It's, it just takes a little bit more effort. It's, it's a little bit more complicated process than some of the things that we do. In this day and age, there may be a much better chance for that with technology becoming what it has become, and I'm sure that will continue, but because the bylaws are very, very specific about how jurisdictions will be formed, how delegates will be elected by mission centers and so forth. Now there's also in the bylaws a list of those officials, leaders of the church that are ex officio members. And what that means is they are, in essence, delegates because of their office. The presidency would be that, the Presiding Bishopric, the presidents of 70 ... those are all the sorts of people who are ex officio and so, but all of that is included in the bylaws, and so that's why I am still referring back to the bylaws. Any kind of change in how the delegations are chosen, would require, anything different than what we've been doing, would require an amendment to the bylaws.

Kassie Ripsam 40:34

So okay, that is, I have

Mary Anne Bennett-Ripsam 40:37

great information,

Kassie Ripsam 40:38

yeah

John Wight 40:40

But I don't want to discourage you, because I think you know, we have to keep trying new stuff and seeing how it flies. So I'm just saying that you know, you can't just come to conference with a resolution to that effect, it's a little more complicated than that.

Kassie Ripsam 40:56

Okay, last question, if you could have coffee or tea or Mountain Dew, with which, with anyone alive or not, who would it be and what would you ask them?

John Wight 41:15

Okay, I have to ask you. How did you find out about my love of Mountain Dew?

Kassie Ripsam 41:21

A little bird told us.

John Wight 41:24

Yeah. Well, at the risk of sounding somewhat trite or obvious or silly or something, I will tell you that the first thing that came to my mind was Jesus. I would love to ask him what more we can do to invite people into relationship with him, and what more we can do as his disciples to help promote the peaceable kingdom on earth. Then, I would have a list of several 100 more questions, but I'm not sure you want me to read all of those to you for this podcast.

Kassie Ripsam 42:04

But that example you gave, what do you think his answer would be?

John Wight 42:11

Um, yes, yeah. I think it would well in terms of of, what can we do? What can, you know, more can we do to invite people? I think he might say, well, you need to encourage every one of my disciples to go and tell somebody the story of the gospel, to tell people about why I came, and share their testimony with people and offer to them the opportunity to get to know Jesus in ways that would bless their lives. I'm sure that he would be much, much more eloquent than that, but I think that's, you know, that's kind of what he did, was to encourage people to to go and tell somebody and share the message with somebody.

Mary Anne Bennett-Ripsam 43:02

I think if everybody in the church were to be persistent enough to invite successfully one person, we would have a pretty, pretty big portion of this country covered at least.

John Wight 43:20

Yep, amen. There was a great song, contemporary Christian song, several years ago that was titled in it. And it, I mean the the words were incorporated into the song, but it was titled, "Each One Reach One," exactly what you're saying. And I love that song because of the message that it gave that like you just did.

Kassie Ripsam 43:43

It's like contemporary Christian song several years ago.

John Wight 43:48

It was contemporary at some time.

Kassie Ripsam 43:55

This has been great. Thank you for letting for allowing us to ask our questions.

John Wight 44:02

Thank you for having me. I enjoy talking about all of this stuff.

Mary Anne Bennett-Ripsam 44:10

Good to have you.

John Wight 44:10

Thank you. It's good to be here.

Mary Anne Bennett-Ripsam 44:13

We want to thank you, our listeners for joining us for this episode of Say What sure to join us again next time, and don't forget to put on your whole armor of God and Be ready to risk something new. Go in love.