

What Really Happened to the Church?

A Study of Puritanism, Classic Modernism, Neo-Liberalism, Neo-Orthodoxy, Neo-Evangelicalism, Fundamentalism & Neo-Fundamentalism In the History of the Church

By Pastor Kelly Sensenig

Where is the average church today in relationship to where it was 50 years ago? What has caused the church to adopt non-separated attitudes? Why are the separated, independent, Baptist and Bible churches of today, called legalistic? Why are they laughed at, or scorned, by many other churches? Why are they looked upon as some kind of cult? Why are they told that they don't love people any longer and that they are more interested in petty issues? The answer to all these questions can be found in this study, which traces the history of the church from Puritanism to our present day. Many churches today have followed the New-Evangelical thought or mindset instead of remaining true to Biblical separation from apostasy and worldliness. The inroads of this "New Evangelicalism" has resulted in weak churches that are unseparated and follow the standards of the world system in many ways, instead of the standards of separation, as set forth in the Word of God. Many churches that were once separated in their position against liberalism, have been weakened through the years, by the inroads of this New Evangelical thought. Therefore, they are peddling the new sound of rock music and gathering together in huge ecumenical rallies, in order to unite with the unbelief of liberalism, all in the name of Christ.

Why are various churches remaining separate from the trends of many other churches and their involvement in ecumenicalism? Why do some churches remain separate from modern ecumenical rallies and refuse to adopt the psychological standards that are being proposed today? Why do some churches remain separate from contemporary Christian music, which comes from the rock culture? Why are some churches called legalistic? **The answer to all of these questions is found in the New Evangelical Movement, which has destroyed the teaching of Biblical separation and holiness, in the modern church today.** As we will see, this movement is simply a middle of the road position between liberal thought and fundamentalism, which has always taught separation from apostasy and holiness in every area of life. New Evangelicalism simply tries to bridge the two opposing movements together by accepting liberals into fellowships and ecumenical rallies and cooperating with them. They also follow the unholy standards that flow out of liberal theology or teaching, which emphasizes man's pleasure more than God and His holy standards.

Instead of accepting a totally separate position with historic liberalism in all of its forms, this movement decides to cooperate to some degree with liberalism and its churches. It compromises with liberal teaching and fails to teach both church and personal

separation from the errors and unholy lifestyle generated from liberal philosophies. Much of the church has swallowed the lie of this system of thought called New Evangelicalism, which we will study in greater detail later.

Those churches, which are hanging on and remaining true to Biblical separation, are looked down upon as divisive and unloving in every way. However, the average person sitting in church does not realize that it's the New Evangelical churches that have caused the division from the historically Bible separated churches. The shoe must be placed upon the other foot. Before you call any church ministry legalistic, read this study. There are churches which are simply following historic Biblical separation, as maintained in the Bible and honored by the movement of Fundamentalism, which counteracted liberal teaching and worldly living (Rom. 12:2). There are still churches which have refused to adopt the New Evangelical thought, which so many other churches have brought into their ministries, within the last 50 years. The history and roots of what various churches believe and teach, regarding separation, is part of the historic fundamental debate with liberalism, which took place at the turn of the previous century (1900's). There are still churches that stand as an ongoing representation of what fundamentalism taught and upheld, as it combated historic Liberalism, New orthodoxy, and New Evangelicalism throughout the years.

It is a sad, but true reality, that many Christians are ignorant of history. In this study I have compiled together from different sources the history of Puritanism, Liberalism, New-Orthodoxy, New Evangelical, and New Fundamentalist thought, which has destroyed the lines of separation within most Bible believing churches today. This study is a historical study that was written to gain a factual understanding of how compromise has found its way into the churches over the centuries, and what has happened to the church within the last 50 or 60 years. **We must remember that facts are stubborn things!** You cannot undo history. What has happened has happened. The truth can be found in history and we need to investigate the demise of church separation within the United States specifically.

This study was written so Christians can possess a better understanding of what really took place in the historic battle between Fundamentalism and Liberalism and how a train-affect of Neo-orthodoxy and New Evangelicalism flowed forth from this historic battle. Much of this information is a compilation of accurate historical facts concerning what has happened. I am indebted to many researchers. It is hard to be original when simply presenting accurate historical facts. **But remember that facts are stubborn things.** I trust this study will be informative and become a reference tool for all of us concerning the history of separation. It will also give us an accurate understanding why there are still independent, fundamental church ministries maintaining a separated Bible position. It was written to give us a historical perspective on what has happened in many churches today.

Puritanism

Puritanism began in England because of the condition of the state church. The Reformation had not done a good job at changing the teachings and rituals of this state church. Therefore, the Puritan movement aimed at purifying the Church of England from error and dead orthodoxy. Thus, their name puritan was derived.

With the thought of purifying in our thinking, we must remember to purify our own lives in light of Christ's coming and do what is right and holy.

1 John 3:2-3

“Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is. And every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself, even as he is pure.”

God wants us to cleanse and purify ourselves as believers from everything that is false and wrong.

2 Corinthians 7:1

“Having therefore these promises, dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God.”

The Puritan movement began in 1558 under the rule of Elizabeth the First. Puritans made a return to the Bible and solid Biblical teaching. They emphasized salvation and godly living. Their return to truth is what ultimately effected America. Some of the Puritans wanted to remain in the Church of England and try to reform it from within. However, there were other Puritans who chose to separate from the Church of England (known as separatists) in order to obey the command to separate from unbelief, unbelievers and all apostasy which was being accepted in the Church of England in that day. These Puritans formed a separatist group, which withdrew from the Anglican Church completely. They obeyed the command in 2 Corinthians 6:17 which says: “Wherefore come out from among them (unbelievers), and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean *thing*; and I will receive you.”

It was these Pilgrim separatist people that migrated to the United States. They established the New World and formed what became known as the Congregational Churches within our early American history of the pilgrim colonies (1625-1649). *The migration of these separatists and Puritan people to the New World came about due to their persecution by the state church of England.* Many fled for refuge to other European countries and to America. The desire for freedom of worship brought thousands of Puritans into the United States. They first settled in Massachusetts. The early pilgrims, known as the separatist group, landed in Plymouth in 1640. They were strong believers who were people of the book. These separatist believers (“Pilgrim Fathers”) helped the other incoming Puritans to develop a more separated position

from the “mother church” of England. The Separatists and Puritans who formed the colonies were God fearing people who wanted to live separated lives and follow the teachings of the Bible. *America has a Christian heritage of separation. Puritan teaching, which emphasized salvation and godly living, as outlined in the Bible, laid the Christian foundation for the United States.* It’s sad when you realize how America has departed from its original history of separated Puritan belief.

Psalm 33:12 says:

“Blessed *is* the nation whose God *is* the LORD; *and* the people *whom* he hath chosen for his own inheritance.”

The history or heritage of America is such that it once honored God and the Bible. It once stood for godliness, as those early puritan separated believers wanted to follow the truth of Scripture. Today, America has abandoned its founding history. It cannot even say “one nation under God” in the pledge to the flag. It has taken prayer and the Bible out of the schools and anything that relates to God. We have forsaken our heritage.

Psalm 9:17 says:

“The wicked shall be turned into hell, *and* all the nations that forget God.”

While the puritans did a great work in England and the United States, there were forces at work to destroy their return to the Bible and truth. In the 1700’s and 1800’s European modernism was born. In the midst of the puritan work in returning to the Bible, there were forces departing from the Bible. The battle of the ages between truth and error has never ceased.

Modernism or Liberalism

The term modernism or liberalism is given to that movement which attempted to update ancient doctrines or teachings of the Bible by changing their meaning or rejecting them altogether. *This movement wanted to modernize the Bible by changing the meaning of the doctrines of the Bible.* Modernistic thought attempted to make the Bible say something different than what it was originally meant to convey as given by God. This system redefines or modernizes the traditional doctrines of Christianity as found in the Bible. Thus, this departure from truth and redefining of Biblical truth is known as modernism or *religious liberalism*. When a person attempts to change the attended meaning of the Gospel, redemption and other Biblical truths, they are termed as liberals or modernists. Modernism was the earlier name, which soon gave way to liberalism. *Any attempt to distort, dilute and deny Biblical doctrine came to be known as modernism or theological liberalism.*

What is known today as **classical or standard liberalism** flourished in Europe in the nineteenth century (1800's) and crossed over the ocean into the United States in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (1800's & 1900's). This is known as **old liberal theology**, which captured the mainline denominations in the United States. This old-line liberal theology de-emphasized God alone as being in control of man's creation and destiny. Evolutionary thought was adopted and the myth of creation was introduced in European churches. For the classical liberal, God has simply turned His work over to the forces of nature for the eons of time in order to build the universe, as we know it today. The classic liberal views God much like he views man. He had a low view of God. Classical liberalism elevates human reasoning and thinking above God and what He says in His Word. **Classic liberalism** was built upon humanistic reasoning and philosophy, as we will study. *Their aim was to build a type of utopian world through the humanitarian efforts of mankind.* Mankind would one day be unified through this world effort to promote peace and prosperity among all of mankind.

Historic Liberalism has always taught the humanistic optimism and eschatology that society is moving toward the realization of the kingdom of God. Their idea of the kingdom involves a complete political, social and economical state of perfection within the world of humanity, where starvation will be ruled out and the human potential or love realized. The world's redemption and salvation in the liberal mind is associated with the freedom or deliverance of society from their economical struggles and political pressures.

Old modernist philosophy has always attempted to take the terms of the Bible and attach new meanings to them in order to fit these words into the changing culture of society. Only when this is done can Christianity be relevant. Their idea is to reject religious belief based on the Biblical authority. All beliefs must pass the test of reason and experience. One's mind must continually be open to new ideas. The claim of liberalism is that the Bible is merely the work of writers who were limited by their times. The Bible is not an infallible or supernatural record given to us by God. It sought to harmonize science with the Scriptures. Science and natural law must be attached to the Bible in order to explain its teachings. Therefore, the miraculous or supernatural is ruled out.

The Bible warns the early church of the struggles it would face as false teachers seek to destroy the foundational teachings of Christianity. These warnings are appropriate for the church, as it would continue to exist and stand on truth. There would be those who attempt to destroy the truth of God's Word. Such is the case of historic modernism as it invaded the church of Europe and the United States.

Matthew 7:15 says:

"Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves."

Acts 20:29 says:

“For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock.”

These verses are a forewarning of what would take place throughout the history of the separated and fundamental church. This was true in the days of Paul as it is in our own day. The church would be faced with unbelief and skepticism throughout its entire existence. It would have to counteract and fight the anti-God system that would seek to invade and destroy its Biblical doctrines. It would have to protect its people from spiritual erosion. There was corruption that would set into the early church. This is why Paul forewarned of these wolves or false teachers that would creep into the church. Another specific fulfillment of these Scriptures occurred when modernism crept into America in the latter part of the 1800's.

Let's consider the history of what really happened. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (1600's & 1700's) the church in Europe became infected by unbelief. English Deism, French naturalism or skepticism and German rationalism began to make gradual inroads into the professing church within Europe. *These poisonous teachings and others were actually European modernism, which began to overtake the church in Europe.* I will briefly share some of the main teachings that form the basis for modernistic thought. These beliefs might be considered as the small streams that helped the raging river of modernism to take shape both in Europe and then within America.

1. Deism (emphasis on transcendence of God)

Deism actually believed in the immanence of God or a God who was not interested in the affairs of the world. This means that He created the earth but has no continuing involvement with any events throughout the history of the earth. It teaches that God is not interested in human experience. We know that this simply is not true according to what the Bible says. God has plenty of involvement within the world.

Modernism may fittingly be said to have begun with the deists, a group of "free-thinkers" who were active during the early part of the 18th century (1700's) in England, where they actually founded the Masonic Lodge. The deists taught that all religions are equally true since all of them, including Christianity, are merely republications of the original religion of nature. Reason, the deists insisted, and not the Bible is the supreme authority, since it is to human reason that the original religion of nature is most clearly revealed. And with this outlook it is not surprising that some of the deists denied the reality of the miracles of the Bible. One of those that did so was Thomas Woolston (1669-1731), who ridiculed Christ's miracles and even the biblical account of Christ's resurrection.

Deism was part of the liberal thought that invaded England through French philosophers. **Francis Bacon** was a famous English philosopher and **David Hume** was the famous Scottish skeptic. **Voltaire** and **Descartes** are some of the famous French philosophers that had an impact upon the philosophy of deism. Descartes reasoned that everything could be solved by the mind and without God (“I think, therefore I am”). One could accept nothing but what the mind could mathematically conceive of. Therefore, if miracles break the laws of nature, then they cannot be true. *These philosophers had shifted from theological themes to a study of man and his rationalistic thinking.* All problems could be solved without the help of God, since God was not presently interested in the affairs of mankind according to deism philosophy.

Deism actually developed in England early in the 17th century and made its way into America during the very early 1700’s. Deism primarily taught that God created the universe out of nothing and then decided to remain uninvolved in the world’s affairs. Deism teaches that God merely governs the world through unchangeable and eternal laws, but He Himself is no longer involved in the events of the world. The classic illustration of deism is to represent God as a clockmaker. In one sense, God wound up the clock of this world once. Afterward, He departed from the world scene altogether and left the clock of history run its own course without any divine intervention. The Bible contradicts the teaching of deism. The Bible actually teaches that God is sovereign over the events of the world and history. *History is actually His-story.* God is involved with the events of the earth.

Daniel 4:35

“And all the inhabitants of the earth *are* reputed as nothing: and he doeth according to his will in the army of heaven, and *among* the inhabitants of the earth: and none can stay his hand, or say unto him, What doest thou?”

Daniel 2:21

“And he changeth the times and the seasons: he removeth kings, and setteth up kings: he giveth wisdom unto the wise, and knowledge to them that know understanding”

God has not left the world to operate on its own whim. God is in control of the events of this world and He declares what will come about in every area of earthly life, whether it deals with the seasons or the throne of power.

Acts 17:27

“That they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after him, and find him, though he be not far from every one of us.”

God is not some bygone clockmaker that cannot be communicated with. He is always waiting and ready to communicate with mankind. Deism is wrong! God is interested in

mankind (2 Peter 3:9). The reasoning of deism can leave the door open to reckless living. *Since deism teaches that God is no longer directly involved in the world of human events, then man must take the reigns and make his own way of life.* The Bible has something to say about this type of living or lifestyle.

2 Peter 2:10

“But chiefly them that walk after the flesh in the lust of uncleanness, and despise government. Presumptuous *are they*, selfwilled, they are not afraid to speak evil of dignities.”

Some of our founding fathers within this country were deists, such as Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson and George Washington. This was because of the philosophy of deism that came to America from England. Although they were not wicked men in their approach to living, they did accept the idea that God was not involved with the events of the world in any direct way. God was transcendent and not part of human experience in any way.

Deism within England actually took on a very liberal form. The liberal aspect of deism invaded America by the late 1800's. European deism rejected the teaching about the Trinity, the incarnation of Christ, the divine authority of the Bible, the atonement of Christ, the miracles or supernatural and any elect people called Israel. Deism concluded that all religions were basically the same. Deism was actually a rationalistic type of religion that accepted a certain body of religious thought as being true on the basis of human reason instead of following what the Bible or church may say. Moral principles are not the result of any divine revelation like the Bible, but originate from the structure of man's reasoning. Perhaps this is why Benjamin Franklin, who was a deist, tore away most of the pages of the Bible. After he was tearing out the pages of the Bible that dealt with the cross, miracles, Israel or any supernatural happening, there was practically nothing left of the Bible except its covers!

2. Naturalism (emphasis on the natural world)

Naturalism is associated with the movements of deism and is a belief system developed from observing the physical world. All truth can be arrived at by viewing the surrounding world. *In fact, the universe of matter and energy is all that the world really is.* This rules out God because God is a spiritual entity. It also rules out the spirit within man because this is not part of the natural world. It also concludes that there is no survival after death because the spiritual part of man does not exist. There is no immortality of any kind. The only thing that is true and lasting is the natural universe of world and matter.

German rationalists found a less offensive way of denying the miracles of Christ. These miracles, they asserted, were actual events, which took place according to the laws of nature. The disciples, however, *only thought* that these remarkable occurrences were miracles because they were ignorant of these natural laws. **H. E. G. Paulus** (1761-1851), theological professor at Heidelberg, was especially active in devising a naturalistic explanation for each one of the miracles of Christ. Jesus' walking on the water, Paulus explained, was an illusion of the disciples. Actually Jesus was walking on the shore and in the mist was taken for a ghost. In the feeding of the five thousand Jesus and His disciples simply set a good example of sharing which was followed by others, and soon there was food enough for everybody. According to Paulus, Christ's resurrection took place because He did not really die upon the cross but merely swooned. The coolness of the tomb revived Him, and when an earthquake had rolled away the stone at the door of the tomb, He stripped off His grave clothes and put on a gardener's garment, which He had managed to procure.

These rationalistic explanations of the miracle-narratives in the Gospels were vigorously attacked by **David Strauss** (1808-74), who published his famous *Life of Jesus* in 1835. The miracle narratives, he insisted, were simply myths. They were popular expressions of certain religious ideas, which had been awakened in the minds of early Christians by the impact of Jesus' life. In other words, Strauss argued that there was no reason to try and explain what really happened in the miracle accounts of the Bible because the miracles themselves were simply myths.

The Bible surely condemns this kind of naturalistic thought. God is a real being who has and does do the miraculous. To come to any other conclusion is humanistic reasoning. God can upset natural laws and has done so in the act of creation and whenever He chooses to do so. I believe in miracles, for I believe in God! *The Bible condemns all human reasoning and tells us to simply express faith in the Creator.*

Hebrews 11:1-3

“Now faith (not natural laws) is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen. For by it the elders obtained a good report. Through faith (not natural laws) we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear.”

God created the worlds out of nothing! He could do this because He is God. God did not have to follow the natural laws as naturalism insists. God can do the miraculous and break the laws of nature. Man cannot understand how God can do this because he is not God. The problem with naturalistic thought is that man wants to bring God down to his own level. The creature no longer wants to worship the Creator.

3. Rationalism (emphasis on logic)

The philosophy of rationalism placed an emphasis on the role of reason or the mind. This philosophy taught that knowledge is gained through reasoning of the mind without any other revelation. This is dangerous because the mind left to itself does not seek God.

Romans 3:10-12

“As it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one: There is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one.”

We must also remember that a mind left unchecked by God’s inward conscience will go astray. This is what happens to all societies that abandon truth for their own rationalistic ideas. This is what happened in Europe during the 18th and 19th centuries.

Romans 1:21 says:

“Because that, when they knew God, they glorified *him* not as God, neither were thankful; but became **vain in their imaginations**, and their foolish heart was darkened.”

Romans 1:28 says:

“And even as they did not like to retain God **in *their knowledge***, God gave them over to a **reprobate (unfit or worthless) mind**, to do those things which are not convenient.”

When truth is rejected, in time the ability to recognize and to receive truth is impaired (see John 3:19-20). This is what happened in Europe. There comes a time when the lights go out. And I want to say that the lights went out in Europe! The poisonous modernism of deism, naturalism and rationalism within Europe had infected society and blinded their eyes to truth. The Bible says that we must beware of the philosophies of men.

Colossians 2:8

“Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ.”

We must simply understand that the history of Modernism or Liberalism had its origin in Europe, particularly in Germany and France and was merely the rationalistic thinking of that time which began to be applied to Christianity. This drift did not happen all at once but gradually increased in strength throughout the 17th and 18th centuries. By the 19th century (1800’s) the damage was done. A liberal spirit was evident everywhere in Europe and infected much of the religious community. The Bible was no longer looked upon as the revelation from God. The miracles of the Bible were not true miracles. Man was not hopeless in his sin but was progressing upward as evolutionary thought was

developed. The doctrine of eternal Hell was denied by many. The leaven of unbelief was everywhere.

Matthew 16:6 says:

“Then Jesus said unto them, Take heed and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees.”

The people did not understand what Jesus meant by leaven. They thought He was referring to real bread, but Jesus had something else in His thinking.

Matthew 16:11-12

“How is it that ye do not understand that I spake *it* not to you concerning bread, that ye should beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees? Then understood they how that he bade *them* not beware of the leaven of bread, but of the doctrine of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees.”

False teaching or doctrine has always been presented as leaven or yeast, which permeates the entire loaf of bread. The false teaching of any time or generation will always have a leavening affect upon the church and society if it is not stopped. This is what occurred in Europe as modernism leavened the church and society as a whole. The European continent was entrenched in the rationalistic and humanistic thought of the era.

*The roots of secular humanism were born with European modernism. Humanism is the attempt to live your life apart from God's existence and truth. The humanistic framework was clearly seen in the Age of man's reason. On the heels of rationalistic enlightenment followed the development that evolutionary thought. This worked well with the present belief that human reasoning must dictate everything that is true. It was now the dawn of the "scientific era." Many men felt they were on the verge of discovering the secrets of the universe and solving the problems of mankind. It was the age of *Enlightenment* or *human reason*. Man was to no longer be bound to church creeds or customs. He was to graduate from religious thought into his own school of thought and nothing was to offend his human reasoning or nature. This kind of teaching had its effect on the European churches. *Rationalistic teachers and other anti-Christian thinkers such as Locke, Berkeley, Hume, Voltaire, Rousseau, Kant, Hegel, Schleiermacher, Baur, Strauss, Ritschl, Harnack, Troelsch, Marx, and Darwin led the movement to dethrone God and place man in God's place.**

John Locke (1632-1704) was a famous English philosopher who promoted the idea of rationalism. He declared that Christianity must be acceptable by human reasoning. The truths of the Bible must be believable by human standards of reasoning. This emphasis upon human reasoning began to be seen more and more within Europe as the writings of Locke and other men like him were circulated. The naturalists rejected the

miraculous and supernatural parts of the Bible because they did not fit into their human reasoning. **George Berkley** (1665-1776) built upon the teaching of Locke. He declared that things are “exactly what they are experienced to be. the experienced qualities make the essence of the object.” He taught that all knowledge existed in the mind of man. He denied any special revelation by God and the supernatural.

David Hume (1711-1776) was a Scottish skeptic who carried the ideas of Locke and Berkley to their logical conclusion by denying all spiritual realities. He rejected all the miracles of the Bible and reasoned that we could not know objective truth.

Voltaire (1694-1788) was the most famous French philosopher who totally rejected the Christian faith. He declared that religion was only a natural development from human reasoning and was not given by God in a supernatural revelation. This of course is simply not true.

2 Peter 1:20-21 says:

“Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation. For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as *they were* moved by the Holy Ghost.”

2 Timothy 3:16 says:

“All scripture *is* given by inspiration of God, and *is* profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness”

These verses clearly tell us that the Scripture was given to man in a supernatural way. The Bible was not the result of natural human reasoning and susceptible to error. The philosophers are absolutely wrong in their view of the Scriptures and directed Europe into deception of the worst kind – spiritual deception.

This period of rationalistic thought and deism within Europe (1700's & 1800's) eventually became called the **Age of Enlightenment**. *However, instead of being a time of enlightenment it actually became a time of darkness. **The Age of Enlightenment gave birth to agnosticism, skepticism and the emphasis on rationalism. It brought forth the scientific method as the basis for proving all truth. This is what would form the basis for all liberalism in America.*** Man was supposedly emerging from a time of immaturity where he needed to no longer depend upon the Bible for help or assistance. Man was *evolving* on a new journey that would allow him to make spiritual progress through his own human reasoning. He now can rationalize what is true and discover what is right for himself. He was entering into a time of **Renaissance** or “new birth” experience. He was becoming intellectually awakened to truth. It was a time or era dubbed as the “revival of learning.” *Emphasis was now placed upon the glory of man instead of the glory of God! Man was now the*

focus of the universe instead of God! The ability of human reasoning and science were now going to solve the riddles of life.

The rationalistic philosophies rejected divine revelation and undermined Biblical Christianity. Man would no longer need to follow Biblical dogmas. He was enlightened to think on his own or possess “free thought” about the origin of life. *Out of this period of humanistic enlightenment, where man was seen to be evolving into a better person, came the **theory of evolution**.*

Human effort or rationale can now find all the answers to the origin of life and also to life’s questions. Furthermore, all of this can be done without the sole revelation of God’s Word. From this type of reasoning came the idea of the so-called scholar **Rousseau** who emphasized that man was basically good. This has long been the basis of all liberalism in America. The deism and rationalism began to eat away at Christianity like a cancer. **Immanuel Kant** (1724-1804) wrote in 1784 that Enlightenment was “man’s coming to age.” This was the seed of evolutionary thought. Kant taught that man was emerging from his immaturity as he sought the rationalistic approach to life, which was called “**Idealism**.” Idealism was the philosophy that reality does not lie in the physical realm but in the mind. Man was evolving in the realm of the intellectual. The theme parading that day was this: “Have courage to use your own understanding.” *The stress of deism and rationalism always seemed to focus on man’s goodness.* Kant wrote, “We ought, therefore we can.” This is the root of humanistic and liberal theology today. Kant rejected the teaching of man’s total depravity and sinfulness. He saw man as a creature who was able to do right if he chose to do right.

One can readily see that the liberalism which came to America had its roots in the English and European rationalism and deism of the day. These systems of thought would be the roots of modernism in America. These modernistic philosophies that degraded the Bible came to America from Europe through England and were promoted among the religious institutions.

This so-called age of Enlightenment or Age of Reason had a profound impact upon the modernism that would spread to America. Many of the fundamental concepts of this time period would be introduced in America at the turn of the 20th century.

One German theologian named **Georg Hegel** (1770-1831) was among the European fathers of American liberalism, which would one day reach the shores in this continent. Hegel was considered to be the most influential German philosopher of the first half of the 19th century. He wanted to reconcile theology and human philosophy as well as religion and human reasoning. Hegel was a pantheist, who did not believe in a personal and omnipotent God as the Bible presents. He concluded that there is no final word from God. Therefore, there are no absolutes. This opened up the door for man to

do as he pleases. The teaching of Hegel had a very profound influence upon later theologians.

Another German theologian whose name was **Frederich Schleiermacher** (1768-1834) was the most leading proponent and influential person that affected the ultimate spread of liberalism in America. He studied the rationalistic writings of such philosophers as **Kant** and even **Plato**, the famous Greek philosopher and most influential ancient philosopher who ever lived. ***It has been said that Schleiermacher did not form a school of thought but an era!*** He was the pioneer of **modern Biblical criticism** that is still going on today. He denied the fall of man and that human nature has the potential good and God consciousness attached to it. He denied the authority of the Bible by doing away with inspiration. He rejected the deity of Christ and the Trinity. He rejected the virgin birth of Christ and the return of Christ. *Many of Schleiermacher's ideas would become the foundation of liberalism when it would eventually spread to America in the late 1800's and turn of the 20th century.* **This is why Schleiermacher has been called the father of liberal Protestant theology.** He rejected the reformation theology that was being preached. In his approach, he took a middle of the road position between secular philosophy and orthodox Christianity. He tried to develop a theology on feeling. He taught that true religion was not found in philosophical reasoning or in the historic doctrines of Christianity. All truth was to be found in *feeling*, where the individual could *experience* God. In one sense, Schleiermacher was the father of neo-orthodoxy, which emphasized subjective experience over Biblical truth. Schleiermacher made religious experiences as the starting point of all reality. This was called **empiricism**. To him religion was merely a feeling of inner dependence upon God. One could reject the cardinal teachings of the Bible and still have a wonderful and loving relationship with God. The heart of Christianity was the "joy of experiencing God" and not Biblical teachings of truth revolving around salvation, the deity of Christ and other teachings. *Schleiermacher is the source from which all the current religious experiences of today had their origin.* All of the liberal theologians of the latter nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (late 1800's & early 1900's) borrowed from Schleiermacher teaching on religious empiricism. Schleiermacher taught that the ideas about Christ and salvation were not important. What was important was to experience Christ and redemption in your everyday life instead of believing in the historical death and resurrection. This of course is the basis of the modern day social gospel of liberalism, where the salvation of people is the transformation of society through feeding the poor.

Ferdinand Baur (1792-1862) was another rationalistic philosopher that closely followed Hegel's teachings. Baur was the founder of the Tubingen School of New Testament criticism. He questioned the reliability of the Gospels and taught radical views on Christianity. He was convinced that the traditional views of Christianity, which dealt with salvation, the incarnation and resurrection, were all wrong. He was another teacher who rejected the supernatural. He said that there were conflicts between

Peter's theology to the Jews and Paul's theology to the Gentiles. **David Strauss** (1808-1874) was a student of Baur. He denied the historical accuracy of the Bible. He viewed the Bible as being full of myths, which was a concept derived from Hegel's philosophies. He taught that Jesus was not a person but the symbol of the Absolute Idea of human society. Thus, the true God-man was not Jesus as an individual but the entire human race in its progression over evil.

Albrecht Ritschl (1822-1889) was another rationalistic student of Bauer. He was a German theologian who taught that religion must be practical. He rejected the teaching on original sin, incarnation and the deity of Christ. He rejected the substitutionary work of Christ. He also rejected the resurrection of Christ, the miracles and other cardinal doctrines. He also emphasized the concept of the kingdom of God. He taught that the kingdom of God was the acts of love, which are shared with fellow man. The inspiration to love forms the basis of the kingdom. This type of teaching was the groundwork for the liberal kingdom concept that would be spread throughout America by modernism. The concept of the kingdom is distorted by historic liberalism. *The kingdom in Scripture is not viewed as an expression of man's love or social assistance to others. It is viewed as an eschatological event that is yet to come upon the earth.*

Daniel 7:13-14

"I saw in the night visions, and, behold, *one* like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. 14 And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him: his dominion *is* an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom *that* which shall not be destroyed."

Revelation 11:15

"And the seventh angel sounded; and there were great voices in heaven, saying, The kingdoms of this world are become *the kingdoms* of our Lord, and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever."

The Bible teaches that the kingdom does not have anything to do with meat or drink as it is distributed to people.

Romans 14:17

"For the kingdom of God is not meat and drink; but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost."

Jesus also taught that the kingdom is not in this world today. This is because it has a future fulfillment attached to it.

John 18:36

“Jesus answered, My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is my kingdom not from hence.”

Jesus taught that the kingdom is not in the world today! In fact, the liberal idea that the kingdom is established by love goes contrary to what Jesus says here. In order to establish the kingdom there will be the need for force. So it will be when Jesus returns to this earth (see Isaiah 63:1-4). The truth about the kingdom cannot be equated with the world as we try to fix the physical, social and political ills of this world. The liberal Social-Kingdom idea has always taught that the kingdom of God is the progressive social organization and improvement of mankind. The main task of the church is to establish a social order. *The liberal is more interested in the social redemption of mankind than in the spiritual redemption of mankind.* Furthermore, they regard the kingdom of God as the process of redeeming mankind from their physical and economic plight.

Walter Rauschenbush (1861-1918) became one of the leading spokesmen in America for this liberal concept of the kingdom. He is known as the “Father of the Social Gospel.” He was born in Rochester New York and came to call himself a Christian socialist. He rejected the sacrifice of Christ and denied a literal Hell and Second Coming. His main teaching was to transform society. He called for a social order of fairness and concern for the well being of man that would replace the idea of American capitalism, which pushed people in order to receive greedy profit.

Adolph Von Harnack (1851-1930) was another German theologian who was of this rationalistic age or reasoning. He was a follower of Ritschl. He popularized Ritschl’s views through the best seller, “What is Christianity?” Which was published in 1901. Von Harnack emphasized the need to *reconcile culture with the Christian faith. Culture could order life.* Harnack said that the teachings of Jesus and the disciples were cultural and should be observed and reasoned from their cultural time. This same kind of thinking is still prevalent in modern liberalism. A heavy emphasis is placed upon culture instead of the actual sayings of the Bible. *The mindset that the Bible must be culturally relevant in order to be true is a dangerous premise to stand upon.* When a person believes this they will reject those Biblical truths that don’t seem to fit into their own culture. This is what Harnack did. They will also change the Bible to fit into the culture of the day. *We must remember that we do not measure the Bible by the cultural standard; we measure the culture by the Biblical standard.*

2 Timothy 2:9 says:

“Wherein I suffer trouble, as an evil doer, *even* unto bonds; but the word of God is not bound.”

We must remember that the proclamation and true meaning of the Word of God is not bound or chained to the rationalistic ideas of a culture or society. Paul was in prison but the truth of the Word of God cannot be chained. The truth of the Word of God will still prevail no matter what man tries to do to it. Nothing can chain the Word of God. When we try to use culture or society as a way to change the meaning of the Bible, then we are trying to bind the truth. However, God says that the truth cannot be bound. It cannot effectively be pushed into a rationalistic hole and be left to die to man's opinions. Truth will always be truth no matter what man tries to do to it. The truth will also continue to be spread forth.

Peter warns about those people who attempt to torture the true meaning of Scripture by applying it to their culture or ideas.

2 Peter 3:16

“As also in all *his* epistles, speaking in them of these things; in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as *they do* also the other scriptures, unto their own destruction.”

The word “wrest” means to twist, turn or torture the Scriptures. It was the word used to indicate how the early Christians were tortured on the racks of Rome. This was a horrible death. Their bodies would be slowly twisted out of proportion. Metaphorically, this is what certain people do to the Bible. They twist the Scriptures out of their obvious meaning and teaching. They pervert and in a spiritual sense torture the true meaning of the text of Scripture in order to suit their own culture or set of ideas.

Harnack also emphasized the need to see only the important teachings of the Bible and disregard the less important teachings of the Bible, which he called “husks.” The primary teaching of the Bible was called the “kernel” teaching of gospel. This gospel was the advancement of the kingdom. We must overcome evil by advancing the kingdom. This alone will give true meaning to life.

Ernst Troelsch (1865-1923) was another strong influence within European Liberalism. He was a professor of philosophy at Berlin and taught that the study of all religions would give a deeper insight to the Christian faith. All religions were beneficial. This would be mindset or idea of liberalism when it came into the United States. Liberalism would attempt to see the good in all the religions. They would say that all the world religions would ultimately lead to God and salvation. Many have this idea today. However, it is a lie of the devil. Religions do not lead to God or salvation.

Jesus said in John 14:6:

“Jesus saith unto him, I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me.”

Matthew 7:13-14

“Enter ye in at the strait gate: for wide *is* the gate, and broad *is* the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat: Because strait *is* the gate, and narrow *is* the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it.”

It is a fanciful dream to believe that all religions lead to God and the way of salvation. Only a demon deceived unbeliever would believe that they do. Troelsch also stressed the idea that God was found active in the “world process” or the remaking of society. He also stressed that religion should be based upon scientific laws such as evolution. He stressed that missions should educate people and not try to convert them. He taught that the future held a Neo-Platonic Nirvana. Troelsch simply taught every liberal idea that was in the book marked “Liberal.”

This was some of the background and forerunning of modernism before it invaded the United States. All of this type of European deism, rationalism and the combination of secular philosophy with Christian teaching found its way into America. *It was a European mix of poisonous teaching that would ultimately infect the churches in America.* The fundamental concepts of the Age of Enlightenment would become the overriding teachings of modernism that would spread through America like a plague. The poison from Europe would make its way to the coast of North America. European liberal theologians who had accepted Schleiermacher’s ideas sailed across the Atlantic and introduced these ideas to American religious institutions and the denominational structures of the church.

The “**higher criticism**” of the Bible by German theologians was their attempt to destroy the supernatural element of the Bible and undermine the historic doctrines of Christianity. The higher criticism of the Bible rejected the inspiration of the Bible and attempted to rationalize God’s truth by viewing it from man’s reasoning. This higher criticism would provide the foundation for American modernism.

The Bible warns about accepting man’s rationalistic knowledge, which he accepts as truth.

1 Timothy 6:20-21

“O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane *and* vain babblings, and oppositions of science (“knowledge”) falsely so called: Which some professing have erred concerning the faith. Grace *be* with thee. Amen.”

Rationalistic man made knowledge is unholy and ungodly in its claims (“profane”). It is nothing more than empty and fruitless talk (“vain babbling”). You might as well go into the chicken coop and talk to the chickens with this type of nonsense. It is a type of intelligence or knowledge that man creates which is utterly false (“falsely so called”).

We have been exposing the European philosophies or beliefs that helped the raging river of modernism to take shape in America. There are several others of important note.

4. Marxism

Marxism is another philosophy that effected European thought and became part of the modernistic trends that invaded America as historic liberalism. **Karl Marx** (1818 –1883) was a German economist, philosopher, and revolutionist whose writings form the basis of the body of ideas known as Marxism. He produced much of the theory of modern socialism and communism. Marx's father, Heinrich, was a Jewish lawyer who had converted his family to Christianity partly in order to preserve his job. Karl himself was baptized in the Evangelical church. As a student at the University of Berlin, young Marx was strongly influenced by the German philosophy of **Hegel** who taught that the state was the highest part of man's social achievement in life. Hegel emphasized family love, but the Hegel viewed the state as the higher expression of family love. Marx bought into these ideas and concepts to form the basis of his Marxist theology. Marx was against Christianity and religion. *His philosophy was that of capitalism, which was a system of social organization whereby the production and distribution of goods are owned and controlled collectively by the government.* Man was to love the state more than anything else. The state was according to Hegel, "the divine or actual God." This of course is the roots of **Liberation Theology**.

Jesus taught something different than Hegel or Marx; Jesus taught that we are to love Him more than anything else in all the world.

Luke 14:26

"If any *man* come to me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple."

Liberation theology or teaching can be traced back to the social concerns of Kant, Hegel and Marx. These teachers were more concerned about the social problems in people's lives than over the lost condition of people and their need of salvation. This teaching is popular in poor countries and is a key teaching of the Roman Catholic Church today. *Liberation theology is the teaching that expresses the need for humans to be delivered or liberated from economical, political and social bondage instead of from the spiritual bondage of their sins.* It points to the political and social deliverance of people instead of their redemption from sin. It is more interested in social teaching than in Biblical teaching. It is the attempt to unite Biblical theology with social and political concerns. The basic teaching of Liberation Theology or Marxism forms the basis of the **Social Gospel** which liberals adopt today. The social Gospel deals with the social and political ills of society without being concerned about the lost estate of mankind.

The Bible does not teach that the primary emphasis of the church is to transform society from a social and political level. Our primary calling is to transform society on a spiritual level by seeing souls saved. This is the only real lasting impact that we can make on society. Saved souls who receive the life-changing message of Jesus Christ is the only way that society can be changed in any lasting measure. The corporate mandate of the church is to win the lost and not to feed the poor and legislate society.

Historic liberalism has long been guilty of only feeding the poor and failing to give them the true Gospel of God's saving grace. They equate feeding the hungry as the actual Gospel message and mandate for the church today. This is what has come to be known as the Social Gospel. This is a false premise. Let me most assuredly say that the primary mandate and responsibility of the church is not to feed the poor but to preach the Gospel and see people saved.

Acts 15:14

“Simeon hath declared how God at the first did visit the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for his name.”

This verse has great dispensational significance in that it speaks of God's primary purpose for this age. This purpose is to take out a people from lost humanity that would bear His name. *In short, the purpose and mandate of the church is to share the Gospel and see souls saved.*

Mark 16:15

“And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature.”

Christ gave the mandate to go into the entire world and share the Gospel with the lost. He did not say that we must feed the entire world as the church. *The church was not established by Christ in order to feed the entire world nor is it the mandate of the church to feed the world.* Many churches get out of focus on this point. There is not one Scripture that concludes that the primary purpose of the church is to feed hungry people. The early church did not concentrate on merely the social ills of society. They took the Gospel to a lost and dying world realizing that the Gospel is the power of God unto salvation.

The early church was not a mass storing house for food and distribution center for the poor. The early church was a teaching center that prepared people to take the Gospel unto the ends of the globe. *Friend, the answer for the social ills of the world is not food, it is the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ.* When people get saved through the preaching of the Gospel their hearts can be changed and they can become interested in the needs of others as the Scripture tells us to do (1 John 3:17; Eph. 4:28; Gal. 6:10). This

in return will help to curb the hunger problem in this world. Those hunger programs today that only feed starving people but fail to preach the Gospel to the lost are presenting the social Gospel. If reputable groups feed and share the saving message of Christ with the lost then they are not guilty of the crime of Liberalism. The point is that the church does not have the responsibility to feed the world.

Although we can help the poor physically, we are not to neglect sharing the Gospel with them. Jesus preached the gospel to the poor (see Luke 7:22, 4:18). Jesus always gave priority to the preaching of the Gospel. This is something that the liberals have always missed! They cannot see past the physical and preach the gospel to the poor.

The liberal notion that we must transform society economically, socially, politically and create a type of utopia world of peaceful existence is surely the lost cry of the Liberal. World War I broke this liberal dream. The Bible teaches that there will never be a united society that exists in peace until the Prince of Peace returns.

Isaiah 9:6

“For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace.”

We have been exposing the philosophies or beliefs that helped the raging river of modernism to take shape both in Europe and America.

These philosophies originated in Europe and made their way into the United States the last part of the 19th century and the dawning of the 20th century.

5. Evolution

Evolution was the natural outgrowth from the age of so called Enlightenment where man was the center of everything. If there was no God who was interested in the affairs of mankind (deism), then mankind was ready to pronounce how he arrived and developed in this world. Likewise, if there were no miracles or supernatural acts as concluded by deism and the naturalistic and rationalistic thoughts, then man could reason what truth was and be in control of his own destiny. He was ready to invent his own hypothesis for life and accept the myth of evolutionary thought.

The key influential figure in Europe that popularized evolutionary thought was **Charles Darwin**. Darwin was born in England in 1809 and died in 1882. He came out of his mother's womb by the creative act of God. And he was not holding a banana in his hand when he came out of his mother's womb! I say this because Darwin was the preacher of evolutionary thought.

Psalm 139:13-16 tells us how Charles Darwin was created:

“For thou hast possessed my reins: thou hast covered me in my mother’s womb. I will praise thee; for I am fearfully *and* wonderfully made: marvellous *are* thy works; and *that* my soul knoweth right well. My substance was not hid from thee, when I was made in secret, *and* curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth. Thine eyes did see my substance, yet being unperfect; and in thy book all *my members* were written, *which* in continuance were fashioned, when *as yet there was* none of them.”

Charles Darwin did not originate from a lower life form. He originated in the womb of his mother like any other child by the creative act of God. Darwin was the man who popularized evolutionary thought. He actually was not the first man to invent these theories. His own grandfather Erasmus Darwin believed in evolutionary thought along with about eleven other men such as Lamarck, who lived in France. Darwin wrote a book in 1859 called “**The Origin of Species.**” This was Darwin’s Bible. He postulated that all living forms of life developed from simpler forms by a series of gradual steps. Man’s closest ancestors were the monkeys.

Man has no supporting evidence for evolution to this day. Evolution is the great myth that came from Europe. I heard on the news just the other day that they have recently discovered some bones of a man or woman that might be part of the missing link of evolution. They are said to be three million years old.

Psalm 14:1 says:

“The fool hath said in his heart, *There is no God.*”

The Bible disproves evolutionary thought. One thing man cannot do is prove evolution. But you can be sure that the Bible disproves this theory of Europe.

Genesis 1:24-26

“And God said, Let the earth bring forth the living creature **after his kind**, cattle, and creeping thing, and beast of the earth **after his kind**: and it was so. And God made the beast of the earth **after his kind**, and cattle **after their kind**, and every thing that creepeth upon the earth **after his kind**: and God saw that *it was* good. And God said, **Let us make man in our image**, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth.”

There is no evolutionary thought in these verses of the Bible. When God created the plants and animals he created them to produce after their own kind. Man was created in the likeness of God’s image, which was unlike the plants and animals within the rest of the world. There would be no possibility for evolution to occur. There could be no crossing of the family lines. Plants beget other plants. Dogs beget dogs. Horses beget horses. Lions beget lions.

1 Corinthians 15:39 says:

“All flesh **is not the same flesh**: but *there is one kind of flesh of men*, another flesh of beasts, another of fishes, *and* another of birds.”

All flesh is not the same flesh nor was it ever the same flesh at one time in the ancient past in some pool of water. *The Bible declares that nothing has evolved from one life form into another.* Man stands alone as man. Monkeys stand alone as monkeys. Fish stand alone as fish. Birds stand alone as birds. God originally created the animals to produce after their own kind. This is why there is a distinction between the animal kingdom to this day. This is also why man is distinct from the animal world. Every species is different because God created them this way and because they continually produced after their same species. The theory that Darwin presented in his book said that everything living came from one or two life species of some sort in the ancient past. I have a book called the Bible today which tells me all about the origin of the species! The Bible says that God created all the animals to produce after their own kind. There is no missing link to find!

Charles Darwin was another very influential leader of the European Modernism, which quickly increased in popularity. Liberalism accepted parts of the rationalistic philosophy and naturalistic teaching of the day. It was effected by the social concepts adopted from Marxism. It rejected creationism and catered to the evolutionary teaching of the day, which was being popularized. *This spread of Liberalism within Europe really took hold from the middle to the end of the 19th century, and by the early 1900s had become the predominant theology among Christian leaders in Germany and most other parts of Europe.* This modernism rejected the historic Christian doctrines and denied the supernatural accounts in the Bible. European deism, rationalism, naturalism, Marxism and now evolutionary teaching infected the churches like a cancer.

6. Unitarianism

Unitarianism was also a teaching that was popularized in English European thought. The beginnings of Unitarianism are traced to **John Biddle** (1615-1652). In actuality, the teachings that rejected the trinity can be traced all the way back to men like **Origin** and **Arius**. These teachings began to gain more acceptance within the time of the Reformation. It was not long before these teachings spread to England and were vigorously adopted in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The actual first Unitarian congregation was formed in England in 1774. However, the teaching was flourishing long before this time. The teaching rejected the doctrine of the trinity. *It was actually named Unitarianism because it was opposite of Trinitarianism which the Bible teaches. The name “Unitarian” indicates that God only exists in one person rather than three.* In rejecting the oneness of the three persons of the Godhead (that each person

was the One true God) it flatly rejected the deity of Christ. The Unitarian conclusion was that only the Father could be God and not the Son.

God said in Genesis 1:26:

“... Let **us** make man in **our** image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth.”

Genesis 3:22-23 says:

“And the LORD God said, Behold, the man is become as one of **us**, to know good and evil: and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever: Therefore the **LORD** God sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground from whence he was taken.”

Genesis 11:7

“Go to, let **us** go down, and there confound their language, that they may not understand one another’s speech.”

It’s here that we see the Biblical concept that God is three persons. *He is not three Gods but is three persons.* There is only one God who is the LORD (Deut. 6:4) but He exists in three persons. This is the Biblical teaching, which we call Trinitarianism. This is the biblical and orthodox teaching, which correctly identifies three persons within the Godhead. *There are three distinct persons within the Godhead that are all equally the same one God.* This means that Jesus is God. The Father, Son and Holy Spirit share the same existence as the One true God. Unitarianism fails to see that the Bible teaches three persons and the unity of One God. Just because there are three persons within the Godhead does not mean that God is three separate Gods. *God is One God that chooses to express His existence in three distinct persons.*

Unitarianism rejects this Biblical teaching and minimizes Jesus to a mere man who cannot be equal with the Father in His existence as God. Therefore, Christ is not truly God. This is a damnable teaching because Jesus said that if a person does not believe that He is one with the Father in His existence as Jehovah, then they will be forever damned in their sins (John 8:19,24). Jesus was saying that He is Jehovah and we must believe that He is God. Do you know why? It’s because only God can save your soul from Hell.

Churches in England began to accept this teaching and changed from Trinitarianism to Unitarian in their belief system. Unitarianism spread to the United States along with the other poisonous philosophies of Europe. New England Congregationalism gave birth to the Unitarian philosophy in the late 1700’s. Some of the congregations in the United States did not even realize the subtle shift from the Biblical teaching of the trinity to the rejection of this doctrine until it was too late. New England was especially hit with this

Unitarian teaching. This is why even today you find many Unitarian churches in England. Way back in 1802, the oldest pilgrim church in America, which was founded at Plymouth in 1620, actually became Unitarian in its belief. One must wonder how a once separatist puritan church could be swayed by such a belief system as this. It's because they developed a *mood of compromise*. Whenever this occurs, error will eventually entrench itself.

Unitarianism was actually the early beginnings of liberalism. English Unitarianism took root and **Jonathan Mayhew**, a liberal Arminian preacher of Boston, was a leading proponent of the teaching that man was basically good. He denied the sinful depravity of man. He taught that unregenerate man could strive after holiness and was accepted before God. This Unitarianism with its false view of the trinity and its other liberal ideas spread throughout Massachusetts and influenced other northern regions.

In 1961 the American Unitarian Church and Universalist Church of America merged and formed the Unitarian Universalist Association. This was because they both rejected the Biblical teaching of the trinity. These congregations eventually repudiated all the great doctrines of the Bible. They deny the divine inspiration of the Bible and its absolute authority. They teach a variety of liberal views about God, which include that He is merely a force or principle or a created being which is not supernatural. Other groups deny His existence altogether. They also teach that there is no hell and that eventually everyone will be saved. A loving God could never send anyone to hell. Man is not a sinner in need of salvation. His salvation is how he develops in his character in everyday life. The church has never wanted a doctrinal statement. They wanted to be "freethinking." But in doing this they have become totally liberal in every area. This is what happens when we do not have the Bible as the absolute standard of truth to base our belief upon.

The Unitarian Universalist Church is as dead as a doe doe bird. How can a church have life when they reject the Lord of life? William Ellery Channing (1780-1842) was a popular spokesman for Unitarian doctrine. He was the pastor of Federal Street Church of Boston. The American Unitarian Association was formed in 1825. Ralph Waldo Emerson (1803-1882) who is known for his essays and poetry was once an ordained Unitarian preacher in the Second Church of Boston. Unitarianism became very popular in the 19th century.

Other Congregationalists did not side with this Unitarian teaching and chose a more gradual path or longer road in their liberal corruption. Another type of **New England Theology** developed that began to shift away from the old Puritan teachings. This teaching taught what was labeled the **Governmental Theory of Christ's death** or atonement. A Dutch man by the name of **Hugo Grotius** began to subtly overshadow the teaching of Jonathan Edwards who taught the substitutionary death of Christ and the sure damnation of sinners. Grotius taught that it was not necessary for God to

receive a payment for the sins of the lost. He reasoned that God was only acting as a benevolent governor or ruler of the universe that was trying to maintain respect for His own established laws of moral virtue through the atonement. In other words, God was using the death of Christ as a way to stir people to follow His moral laws of government instead of living as they please. The atonement was not substitutionary but **Jonathan Edwards Junior** (1754-1801) also popularized this view to some degree. The more radical wing of this New England Theology also rejected the doctrinal teaching of the imputation of sin from Adam and guilt by association with Adam. *Their teaching was that man sins because he is sinful. They rejected the notion that man sins because he is already sinful through association with Adam.* **Charles G. Finney** (1792-1875) taught this concept and through this developed the false teaching of **perfectionism**. These departures from the truth were the seedbeds of even farther departures that would occur as modernism tried to make farther inroads into the country. The mixing of truth with error always will eventually breed more error throughout time.

We must remember that old statement:
“Error rides on the back of truth.”

So what really happened with all of these streams of thought running throughout Europe? What would be the result of deism, naturalism, rationalism, Marxism, evolutionism and Unitarianism running ramped in Europe? It's not difficult to see what happened. Unregenerate "Christian" professors in European Bible seminaries who rejected the Word of God as the only source of authority gladly accepted the humanistic thinking of the day and set out to apply these philosophies such as deism, naturalism, rationalism, social order, evolution and Unitarian belief to the Bible and Christianity. *The result was tragic: The Bible was considered simply another human book, inspired only in the sense that Shakespeare's writings were "inspired."* Man wrote his own Bible. **The big bad wolf of modernism had blown down the already weakened house of truth and stability within Europe.**

Jesus Christ was now considered to be a mere man who was good and influential, but only a mere man nonetheless. European Modernists taught that the Bible did not come to us by direct revelation from God through the Holy Spirit's work, but came to us, rather, through a human evolutionary process. Supposedly, as **men's ideas** about God became more sophisticated, the writers of the Bible drew an increasingly more sophisticated picture of God, until we come to the supposed higher theological ideas of the N.T.

We must remember that the Bible is not the product of the sophisticated ideas of man; it's God's very words, which He has conveyed to mankind.

1 Thessalonians 2:13

“For this cause also thank we God without ceasing, because, when ye received the word of God which ye heard of us, ye received *it* not as the word of men, but as it is in truth, the word of God, which effectually worketh also in you that believe.”

This modernistic poison of European thought eventually jumped the Atlantic Ocean and was introduced to American religious institutions and denominations through men who studied in the prestigious (though apostate) European seminaries. These liberal European professors visited American schools and churches. This thought then infected the theological seminaries and church-related colleges in the United States. It began to affect the great citadels of learning and permeate denominational structures.

B. H. Carroll said:

“Modernism, like another cuckoo, laid its eggs in our schools, deceiving the conservative, not only into incubating for it but feeding its young, fooled by the notion that it was caring for its very own.”

The position of religious humanism which these institutions and denominations accepted became known as “modernism” here in the United States. Many men were engaged in spreading the European principles of apostasy within the United States.

Horace Bushnell (1802-1876) – was an American clergyman who was to America what Schleiermacher was to Europe. In contrast to the dramatic conversions that evangelists of his day were advocating, Bushnell became influential in his teaching that children can grow into Christianity over period of time instead of through an instantaneous event. Bushnell with this theory rejected the doctrine of original sin. He suggested that a child was born good and would stay that way if properly nurtured. Of course, the Bible rejects this theory. Even your two-year-old child rejects this theory!

Psalm 51:5

“Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me.”

One of the leading and most influential men who promoted this modernistic teaching in the United States was **William Newton Clark** (1840-1912), was a Baptist theologian an educator who taught Christian theology at Colgate in Hamilton New York. This was the first Baptist seminary founded in America in the year 1817. It was said to be founded by thirteen men, thirteen prayers and thirteen dollars. However, the liberal Clark captured the seminary in 1890. Clark wrote a book entitled “An Outline in Christian Theology” which was full of liberal ideas. *It was the first systematic theology of American Liberalism.* The grass roots of liberalism were seen in this theological work. Clark denied the inspiration of the Bible. He declared that the Bible did not bring to us the entire revelation of God. He rejected the trinity and deity of Christ. He left the origins of the world to the scientists and their study of evolution. He redefined sin as

simply a departure from the duty of doing what is right. Like Bushnell, he claimed that there is no inherited guilt from Adam or any ancestor. Of course, the Bible says that we are all sinners because of our tie with Adam.

Romans 5:12

“Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.”

Clark also emphasized the fatherhood of God concept, which all liberals emphasize today. They claim that we are all the children of God and God is the Father of us all. The Bible condemns this liberal teaching.

Galatians 3:26

“For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus.”

John 8:44

“Ye are of *your* father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it.”

The Bible clearly reveals that we are not all God’s children. It distinctly says that God is not the Father of every human being. Some people have the devil as their father. Only those people who place their faith in Jesus Christ for salvation become the children of God.

John 1:12 says:

“But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, *even* to them that believe on his name.”

Clark also did not criticize those who believed that Christ had a human father. In other words, he did not press the issue with the virgin birth of Christ. However, the Bible says that Christ was born of the virgin Mary free from the taint of human sin. He was born into this world as the true God and not as mere man.

Matthew 1:23 says:

“Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us.”

Clark also disregarded the saving work of Jesus Christ upon the cross. He also taught the idea of a spiritual resurrection instead of a bodily resurrection from the grave (see 2 Timothy 2:17-18). This has always been the liberal teaching. If Jesus did not rise physically from the grave, then He could not present His sacrifice upon the cross in Heaven. He could not intercede for us as our great High Priest. But the Bible says that

He did bodily arise from the dead in order to intercede for us at the right hand of the Father.

Romans 4:25

“Who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification.”

Hebrews 9:12

“Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption *for us*.”

Hebrews 7:25

“Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them.”

The resurrection of Christ was not vital to Christianity according to Clark. But Paul says that if Christ has not bodily risen from the grave then we are yet in our sins and are going to all die and go to hell.

1 Corinthians 15:17-18

“And if Christ be not raised, your faith *is* vain; ye are yet in your sins. Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished.”

Clark also taught that God did not have a future plan that He had mapped out. He rejected the idea of a literal millennium. The words in the book of Revelation and the other passages dealing with future things were simply taken in a non-literal way. He spiritualized the prophecies and assigned to them only spiritual meanings instead of literal fulfillment. The coming of Christ was not a literal event but only the promise of His spiritual presence with us. He rejected the return of Christ and opted for only a spiritual advancement of Christ’s kingdom here on earth. The kingdom was seen in its historic liberal concept of social order.

The teachings of Clark were very influential. It was his teachings that directed **Harry Emerson Fosdick** (1878-1969) into modernism. Fosdick was trained in Clark’s school and was persuaded by his liberal ideas. This man became another leading spokesman for liberal ideas and thought. He was a popular pastor and radio speaker and author of many books. *His books probably did more harm than any other liberal books that were written in the day.* They tried to destroy the Bible and led great masses of people away from the truth of the Bible. While a pastor of the Baptist church at Montclair, New Jersey, Fosdick began to preach the social gospel and emphasized that the kingdom of God was the order of a social justice and humanitarian improvement. We have already mentioned the liberal ideas of Walter Rauschenbusch (1861-1918), was the Baptist pastor in New York and professor in Rochester Seminary in 1902. He was the leading figure of the social gospel. Fosdick bought into these ideas since he worked in

the well-known place in New York called “Hell’s kitchen” while he was a student at Union. This was a place where poor immigrants and other poor people would gather for food. It became so disheartening to Fosdick that he began to visualize and preach that the true Gospel was meeting the humanitarian needs of society.

Fosdick also began to go against expository preaching in his day. His theory was that congregations were no longer interested in texts. His sermons began to be more like lectures geared to solve the problems of people by giving them new techniques and attitudes. Fosdick used psychology to try and solve the human problems of defeat and despair, which preceded the teaching of Norman Vincent Peal and his “Positive Thinking.” The Bible clearly tells us to not use the inventions of man to try and solve our problems in life. We have the promises of God’s Word and the divine power and a divine nature to give us the kind of help that we need to live fulfilled and complete. When we feel ripped apart at the seams, we can rest in God’s plan for help and not man’s psychological inventions and theories. *We do not have to look for the answers of life in human nature (psychology), but in the divine nature (God’s nature).*

2 Peter 1:2-4 says:

“Grace and peace be multiplied unto you through the knowledge of God, and of Jesus our Lord, According as his divine power hath given unto us all things that *pertain* unto life and godliness, through the knowledge of him that hath called us to glory and virtue: Whereby are given unto us exceeding great and precious promises: that by these ye might be partakers of the divine nature, having escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust.”

God promises that we have divine power and divine nature to assist us in life. The new nature gives us the drive to live for God while the power gives us the fuel or strength to live for God. God has supplied everything to meet our needs. There is a divine side to meet all of our needs in life. The human side always falls short. God is the answer to our needs. Let us not be blindsided by the world and its gimmicks.

Fosdick was the popular professor of **Union Theological Seminary** in New York. Godly Presbyterian men of the 1830’s, who stood for truth and sound doctrine, established this seminary. *However, it was taken over by liberalism and became the known hotbed for infidel teaching.* While there Fosdick put into print a book entitled, “The Modern use of the Bible” which integrated evolution into the Bible. The book should have been called, “The Modern Misuse of the Bible.”

Another sermon that Fosdick preached was entitled, “The peril of worshipping Jesus.” He did not promote the need to worship Christ since Christ was not God. However, the Bible declares that Jesus is God and that we are to only worship God. Jesus received worship while he was here upon earth (Matt. 8:2, 9:18, 14:33, 15:25). This is because

Jesus was the true Messiah and God who came down from Heaven to offer salvation. He was God in the flesh.

John 1:1

“In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.”

Fosdick in all of his blind liberalism rejected the substitutionary death of Christ. He was quoted as saying, “the substitutionary atonement, where one suffers in the place of others is in the view of modern ideas of justice an immoral outrage.” These are the types of heretical teachings that were being propagated in the earlier part of the 20th century within the United States. Of course, the Bible teaches that it is an outrage to deny the substitutionary death of Christ.

2 Peter 2:1-2

“But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction. And many shall follow their pernicious ways; by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of.”

William Adams Brown was a faculty figure of Union Theological Seminary (cemetery) in those days. He became a popular religious liberal. He taught many liberal ideas such as the false notion that salvation was not an act but a process going on throughout the ages.” Another faculty member at Union Theological Seminary, **A. C. McGiffort**, taught that the early converts of Christianity could take Jesus as their Lord and Saviour without believing that Jesus was God. He said, “ is essentially no more divine than we are or nature is.” **H. P. Van Dusen** of Union Seminary wrote, “it is a mistaken to claim that in Jesus, the whole Being of God was present, that God’s purpose was fully expressed through Him.” Other members of this school such as **G. A. J. Ross** said: “I believe that long ago Christ Buddah have met in that large world of the spirit and I cannot but believe that it was a meeting marked by mutual love and veneration. He placed Jesus Christ on the same level as Buddah, which the Bible strictly forbids.

1 Timothy 2:5

“For *there is* one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus.”

Jesus Christ alone is the bridge between God and man. This is because Jesus Christ is the God-man who alone can bridge the gap between a holy God and lost sinners. The liberal teaching has always been to eliminate the deity of Christ.

Other liberal teachers such as **E. E. Aubrey** of the faculty of the University of Chicago said that “Jesus is not the Creator who made Heaven and earth, nor is he all of God.” But what does the Bible say:

John 1:3

“All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made.”

E. S. Brightman of Boston University, Methodist’s largest institution at the time wrote in one of his books: “The Christian Church will come to recognize in Buddhism, Confucianism, and Modernism *other roads to God*. The Christian will treat representatives of these religions as brothers and not as heathen enemies of the faith.” The Bible destroys such blasphemous statements as these. Jesus said that He was the only way to God (John 14:6) and that the narrow road leads to the rest and enjoyment of eternal life whereas the broad leads to judgment and terror. *There are not many roads to God!*

Newton Theological institution in Massachusetts (Baptist seminary) was taken over by Liberalism by the later 1920’s because of men such as Frederick Anderson who would not take a stand on the virgin birth of Christ. Rochester Theological Seminary in New York was taken over by liberalism. It was the professing conservative, **Augustus H. Strong**, who wrote the **Strong’s Concordance of the Bible** and **Systematic Theology**, who must take the blame for the downfall of this institution. Strong began to weaken in his stand and no longer took a strong stand. Strong became president in the seminary in 1872. Although Strong was conservative in his early career, he later adopted theistic evolution, a low view of inspiration and pantheistic ideas. It was actually Strong who brought Walter Rauschenbusch on to the faculty in 1902. Crozer theological seminary (Chester, Pennsylvania) went sour by allowing such men as Henry C. Vedder, the Baptist historian to teach his liberal comments about the substitutionary death of Christ. The same was true for the once great Presbyterian seminaries such as Xenia Theological Seminary and Western Theological Seminary in Pittsburgh Pennsylvania. It was also true for McCormick Theological Seminary (Hanover, Indiana), Lane Theological Seminary (Cincinnati, Ohio), Union Theological Seminary (New York City) and even Princeton Theological Seminary where Charles Hodge and Benjamin Warfield taught. Princeton once had the fighting Gresham Machen on faculty and for many years hosted the famous Keswick conferences where great speakers such as C. I. Scofield, Griffith Thomas and David Baron taught until 1918. All of these fundamental seminaries went down the modernistic path of compromise and unbelief.

All the denominations suffered the hands of the modernistic trends from Europe. The Northern Baptist Convention (NBC) was formed on May 16-17, 1907 in Washington D.C. and was an organization with both liberals and conservatives in leadership. The

Baptist seminaries in the North (Crozer, Colgate, Newton, Rochester) would all eventually fall to modernism. The earlier formed Southern Baptist Convention (May 8, 1845) would also cooperate with modernism.

Many other liberal leaders of the day and time were saying and writing horrendous blasphemies against the truth of the Bible. Early modernists of the historic liberal teaching would include such men as Washington Gladden, Lyman Abbott (pastor of Plymouth Church in Brooklyn), Shailer Matthews (dean of the divinity school at the University of Chicago), E. Stanley Jones, Ralph Sockman, Elton Trueblood, John Haynes Homes, W. E. Garrison and James Pike are some of the more well known liberals.

Jude 4 warns us of these types of men when it says:

“For there are certain men crept in unawares, who were before of old ordained to this condemnation, ungodly men, turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ.”

The General Teaching of Classical Modernism

Modernists do not believe the Bible's historical accounts are accurate and do not believe the miracles actually happened. They do not believe there actually was an Adam and an Eve, a Garden of Eden, a worldwide Flood, nor do they believe the miracles recorded in Exodus and other parts of the O.T. happened as recorded, but believe these are religious myths much like the Hindu stories. According to modernism, the first five books of the Bible were not written by the historical Moses who received Revelation from the hand of God. The modernist believes the Pentateuch was not assembled together in its present state until the time of Israel's kings. *Most Modernists do not believe in the Virgin Birth, deity, substitutionary death, resurrection and Second Coming of Jesus Christ.* They do not believe that the Gospel accounts of Christ's life are factual and assume that we do not today have an accurate idea of what Jesus Christ was truly like. At best, Jesus was a good man or teacher. Modernism places a heavy emphasis on Christ's humanity instead of recognizing His deity. Liberals believe that man is basically good (innate goodness of man) and deny the fact of the total depravity of man and original sin. The modernist has a low view of sin. He is bent on identifying Christianity with the surrounding culture. The liberal is optimistic about human progress and is concerned about human personality and its development. As we've seen, the liberal notion was to bring in the kingdom by the transformation of a society (social gospel). The kingdom was not some future supernatural age, but was here upon the earth right now through the applications and principles of the ethics of Jesus. This would hopefully one-day lead toward a utopia or peaceful existence among mankind. Liberalism did not teach any solid absolutes or dogmatic assertions in truth and morals. Everything was subject to questioning and change. Liberal

teaching is that the world is an open system. *The whole idea of liberalism was to make Christianity palatable to the people. It needed to be adapted to the spirit of the age.*

Liberalism seemed to infect everything over a short period of time. It even affected the Bible. One primary example of the continual spread of modernism throughout the years is found in *the writings* of the men who translated the Revised Standard Version of 1951. Modernistic apostates produced this Revised Version of an already corrupted version of the Bible. Consider a few excerpts from their books:

"The dates and figures found in the first five books of the Bible turn out to be altogether unreliable" (Julius Brewer, *The Literature of the O.T.*).

"The writers of the N.T. made mistakes in interpreting some of the O.T. prophecies" (James Moffatt, *The Approach to the N.T.*).

One cannot of course place John on the same level with the synoptic Gospels [Matthew, Mark, Luke] as A HISTORICAL SOURCE" (William Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity*).

"We do not press that gospel [John] for too great verbal accuracy in its record of the sayings of Jesus" (Willard L. Sperry, *Rebuilding Our World*).

"According to the ENTHUSIASTIC TRADITIONS which had come down through the FOLKLORE of the people of Israel, Methuselah lived 969 years" (Walter R. Bowie, *Great Men of the Bible*).

"The story of Abraham comes down from ancient times; and how much of it is fact and how much of it is LEGEND, no one can positively tell" (*Ibid.*, Bowie).

These statements flatly deny the inspiration of the Bible. Jesus said that every jot and tittle of the Old Testament Scriptures was true and important.

Matthew 5:18

"For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled."

"He [Jesus Christ] was given to overstatements, in his case, not a personal idiosyncrasy, but a characteristic of the oriental world" (Henry F. Cadbury, *Jesus, What Manner of Man?*).

But Jesus gave this testimony of the Scriptures in John 10:35:

"...the scripture cannot be broken."

"As to the miraculous, one can hardly doubt that time and tradition would heighten this element in the story of Jesus" (Ibid., Cadbury).

John 20:30-31

"And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book: But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name."

"A psychology of God, IF that is what Jesus was, is not available" (Ibid., Cadbury).

John 1:18

"No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared *him*."

"Revelation has sometimes been understood to consist in a holy book. ... Even on Christian soil it has sometimes been held that the books of the Bible were practically dictated to the writers through the Holy Spirit. ... I DO NOT THINK THAT THIS IS THE DISTINCTIVELY CHRISTIAN POSITION. If God once wrote His revelation in an inerrant book, He certainly failed to provide any means by which this could be passed on without contamination through human fallibility. ... The true Christian position is the Bible CONTAINS the record of revelation" (Clarence T. Craig, *The Beginning of Christianity*).

2 Peter 1:20-21

"Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation. For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as *they were* moved by the Holy Ghost."

"We cannot take the Bible as a whole and in every part as stating with divine authority what we must believe and do" (Millar Burrows, *Outline of Biblical Theology*).

2 Timothy 3:16-17

"All scripture *is* given by inspiration of God, and *is* profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: That the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works."

"The mere fact that a tomb was found empty was capable of many explanations. The very last one that would be credible to a modern man would be the explanation of a physical resurrection of the body" (Ibid., Craig).

John 20:27

"Then saith he to Thomas, Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust *it* into my side: and be not faithless, but believing."

"This phrase ['Thus saith the Lord'] is an almost unfailing mark of SPURIOUSNESS" (William A. Irwin, *The Problem of Ezekiel*).

Ezekiel 2:4 can be given to the liberal thinker since he is like a stubborn ox:
"For *they are* impudent (stubborn) children and stiffhearted. I do send thee unto them; and thou shalt say unto them, Thus saith the Lord GOD."

"What REALLY happened at the Red Sea WE CAN NO LONGER KNOW" (*Ibid.*, James).

Exodus 14:27-28

"And Moses stretched forth his hand over the sea, and the sea returned to his strength when the morning appeared; and the Egyptians fled against it; and the LORD overthrew the Egyptians in the midst of the sea. And the waters returned, and covered the chariots, and the horsemen, *and* all the host of Pharaoh that came into the sea after them; there remained not so much as one of them."

A more recent illustration of modernism comes from the pen of John Shelby Spong, a bishop in the Episcopal Church in America:

"Am I suggesting that these stories of the virgin birth are not literally true? The answer is a simple and direct 'Yes.' Of course these narratives are not literally true. Stars do not wander, angels do not sing, virgins do not give birth, magi do not travel to a distant land to present gifts to a baby, and shepherds do not go in search of a newborn savior. ... To talk of a Father God who has a divine-human son by a virgin woman is a mythology that our generation would never have created, and obviously, could not use. To speak of a Father God so enraged by human evil that he requires propitiation for our sins that we cannot pay and thus demands the death of the divine-human son as a guilt offering is a ludicrous idea to our century. THE SACRIFICIAL CONCEPT THAT FOCUSES ON THE SAVING BLOOD OF JESUS THAT SOMEHOW WASHES ME CLEAN, SO POPULAR IN EVANGELICAL AND FUNDAMENTALIST CIRCLES, IS BY AND LARGE REPUGNANT TO US TODAY" (John Spong, *Rescuing the Bible from Fundamentalism: A Bishop Rethinks the Meaning of Scripture*, Harper, 1991, pp. 215,234).

Of course, the Bible dogmatically affirms the Virgin Birth of Christ.

Matthew 1:23 says:

"Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us."

Isaiah 7:14

“Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign; Behold, a virgin (not maiden as the RSV says) shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel.”

These statements were from the very men who translated the RSV. It's no wonder that there were biased corruptions in this modernized Bible. *It is any wonder that all the liberal churches today cater to this Bible of modernism?* Their preachers and Bible in the pews are the RSV. Modernistic corruptions and liberal tendencies can be seen in other modern Bibles, which have followed the same corrupt manuscript evidence that the RSV followed. This is why we must open our eyes and honestly evaluate what is going on in the translation of modern Bibles. When liberal fingers can translate the Bible, then you will get gender free Bibles and the disintegration of true Bible text.

It is shocking to see how these *supposed Christian scholars* deny the Holy Scriptures. The translators of the Revised Version were wicked modernists. They were men who introduced wicked readings of their own to support their liberal beliefs. The uses of the “Thee,” “Thou” and “Thine” was used to signify deity but were stripped in the Revised Standard Version because these liberal minded men rejected the deity of Christ. Modernism flies under many flags, and not all modernists are as bold and plain speaking as Bishop Spong, but all deny the perfect inspiration of Holy Scripture and question the miraculous. They all question who Jesus really was.

Once again, it is important to remember that all of this was prophesied by the Holy Spirit. The Lord's Apostles warned that many unregenerate false teachers would creep into the churches and would deceive many, and in fact, such false teachers were already active during the times of the Apostles (See Mt. 7:15-23; Ac. 20:28-30; Ro. 16:17-28; 2 Co. 11:1-20; Ga. 2:4; Ph. 3:1,2; 3:18-19; Col. 2:4-8; 1 Tim. 4:1-3; 6:20-21; 2 Ti. 2:14-21; 3:1-13; 4:1-4; Tit. 1:10-16; 3:9-11; 2 Pet. 2:1-22; 3:1-18; 1 Jo. 2:18-19; 4:1-6; 2 Jo. 7-11; Jude 3-19; Rev. 2:2,6, Rev. 2:14-15; Rev. 2:20-23; Rev. 3:15-17).

The European deism and rationalistic thinking of man was pushed upon these American religious institutions where many of these men and such like taught the rationalistic ideas generated from Europe. It was then pushed into the denominational structure of the church, which prior to the turn of the century was fundamental and preached the Gospel. The schools of old Methodism and Lutheranism and such like were attacked by this poisonous philosophy from Europe. *Men with their denominational ties were actually trained to reject Biblical truth and took their criticism of the Bible into heir pulpits and churches. Thus, the corruption of denominationaslim established itself within their religious structures.*

We must once again remember that schools such as Yale, Princeton (Charles Hodge) and Harvard were all founded upon the truth of the Bible and students were expected to believe the truth. *The driving force behind the early American institutions was the*

preparation of the ministers for the churches. In the seventeenth century (1600's) the majority of the graduates from college entered the ministry. By 1750 the percentage dropped to 50 percent. Nonreligious subjects were beginning to crowd out the religious teachings of the institutions that were once great citadels of Biblical learning. In 1801, only 22 percent of college graduates entered the ministry and by 1900 the average was down to 6.5 percent. Before the Civil War, nine out of ten college presidents were clergymen. However, when modernism established a beachhead in these great citadels of learning, the truth gradually became corrupted. That's why today the institutions of secularized learning are totally corrupted and devoid of the truth. Liberalism has devastated the countries learning centers. Liberals crept into the learning institutions, colleges, churches and denominational executive offices. There is one truth of Scripture that comes to mind as we see how the stand for the Bible broke down and liberal ideas were accepted and introduced into America.

1 Corinthians 5:6

"Your glorying *is* not good. Know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump?"

These men and others with their language of liberalism, which they received from this European mix of error, actually were responsible for the rotting of American citadels of truth and churches. Their accepted presence and teachings began to leaven the entire teaching structure in America and the denominational structure that stood for truth. Liberalism flexed its muscles and began to invade the universities, seminaries and institutions for religious learning. The tornado of modernism had swept into many leading denominational seminaries and caused the erosion of truth.

Trained men in these leavened or corrupted centers of learning now began to take this modern approach to solving man's problems back to their denominational structures and began to poison the people with this radical teachings and false interpretations of the Bible. The old saying is true: "**As the seminaries go, so goes the denominations.**" In return, the minds of those within the congregations, especially those of the young, were taken by this new modern way of thinking that was trying to upgrade the Bible. This cycle would spawn more liberal thinkers who to this day continue to tear down the faith or truth of the Bible. **By 1900** Modernism had gained a strong foothold on the denominational structures. **By 1930** Modernism had clearly entrenched itself within the denominational structure. We can imagine the frustration that many strong fundamentalists within the denominations had.

George Dollar has said:

"Thus, the image of America thirty years later is that of a great land which has left the old paths and turned to the vagaries and the uncertainties of a new type of Christianity and church. Tragedy is written all across the scene."

Men such as the Presbyterian Gresham Machen (1881-1937) must have had their hearts broken as they witnessed the demise of their beloved denominations for which they had given their lives. That modernism has leavened most denominations is evident. In the book "The Battle for the Bible," the evangelical leader Harold Lindsell noted, "It is not unfair to allege that among denominations like Episcopal, United Methodist, United Presbyterian, United Church of Christ, the Lutheran Church in America, and the Presbyterian Church U.S. there is not a single theological seminary that takes a stand in favor of biblical infallibility. And there is not a single seminary where there are not faculty members who disavow one or more of the major teachings of the Christian faith."

The mainline denominational structures did become corrupted as a result of liberalism. There were those people who began to embrace these liberal tendencies and refused to walk in the old ways of truth.

Jeremiah 6:16 says:

"Thus saith the LORD, Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where *is* the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls. But they said, We will not walk *therein*."

This was the sad lot and refusal of multitudes as the modernistic teachings and tendencies invaded the great learning centers of our land and the denominational churches in America. They said, "**We will not walk therein.**" There was this escalating rejection of truth and refusal to accept what was right.

- What would happen to America and Biblical truth?
- Would there be any hope for the survival of truth?
- Would there be any people to stand firm and remain on the other side of the fence and say that this type of departure from truth was wrong?

Yes, there were the fundamentalists! They were the group of believers within the denominations that wanted to stand in the ways and "ask for the old paths where *is* the good way, and walk therein."

Fundamentalism

As modernism began to filter into the churches, the Bible believing saints within the denominational churches became spiritual alarmed. They were witnessing the gradual deterioration of their beloved denominations and spread of anti-biblical teaching. *There were those within every denomination that studied the Bible and preached the Gospel.* Yes, there were those within all the denominations who saw their need to uphold truth in spite of their certain denominational distinctives and their denominations friendliness

and beginning dialogue with the liberals. These faithful believers within the denominational structures wanted to hold to the truth.

Men such as Carl McIntire became an internationally known Fundamentalist leader who wanted to rid the Presbyterian denomination and mission field of modernists. He became a stone that would not budge with liberalism. Other men such as **Walter Maier** (1893-1950) of the Missouri Lutheran Synod was a popular professor and radio broadcaster who actually built a radio empire. He was professor at Concordia Seminary between 1922-1950. Maier was world renowned for his broadcast called "The Lutheran Hour" which was heard on 1,200 stations. Maier's preaching was Christ centered and Gospel exalting. He was a mighty radio preacher that carried Christ to the nations. Maier did not consider himself a Fundamentalist but he did preach the Gospel and was not doubt alarmed to see the modernistic trends overtaking Lutheranism. His radio preaching was as widely known as the of the "The Old Fashioned Revival Hour" of Charles E. Fuller through the 1940's. Those who were labeled Fundamentalists appreciated his strong stand on sin and his clear Gospel preaching.

The birth of fundamentalism arose because of the corruption of liberalism within the denominational structures and learning centers of our country. Fundamentalism arose out of the doctrinal controversy, which drifted into the churches in America at the turn of the century. As we have seen, this occurred when the European modernism began to take root within the various denominations. Fundamentalism is an American church phenomena, but it arose because of theological problems which came from Europe.

Though there were some who resisted modernism in Europe, it more easily spread there than in America because of the fact that the Christendom in Europe was already largely apostate when modernism arose. Apart from Roman Catholicism, Protestant state churches were the predominant forms of Christianity in Europe, and since most of these groups taught infant baptism and were very ritualistic, they had become filled with unregenerate members and spiritual death long before the end of the 19th century. They had no power to resist modernism, and the comparatively few independent churches in Europe were not influential enough to cause much of an uproar against the modernistic teaching.

The situation was different in America. There are no state-controlled and affiliated denominations in the U.S. and America had been blessed with many powerful revival movements in the 18th and 19th centuries. Christianity in the U.S. was therefore much livelier than in Europe. *As the false teaching began to gain followers in U.S. denominations, Christian leaders who were saved and who believed the Bible began to take a stand against it.* The battles that followed were called **The Fundamentalist/Modernist Controversy**. This would be the historic battles between Modernism and Fundamentalism. These battles were very evident through the 1920's.

By 1918 the Liberals and the Fundamentalists had stated their positions and organized their movements in the country.

In May 1922, the outspoken liberal Harry Emerson Fosdick, preached a sermon entitled, "Shall the Fundamentalists Win?" He charged Fundamentalism as being "illiberal and intolerant." He also said that Fundamentalists were anti-intellectual and unwilling to expand their minds to include the broad advancements in science. His sermon concluded that churches in America should include both those people with strict religious belief and liberal persuasion. His message was a plea for toleration and a charge that Fundamentalism was cantankerous and unloving. He was an outspoken and defiant liberal of the day. It's interesting that Clarence E. Macartney, a Presbyterian minister, responded to this message in a sermon entitled "Shall Unbelief win?" In this message he identified the clear differences between Liberalism and historic Christianity. He wanted to band the liberal Fosdick from the association of all Presbyterians because he espoused doctrine that was contrary to the Presbyterian Church. Fosdick was a Baptist and was forced to become a Presbyterian minister. This he rejected and resigned from his position in the church where he preached.

The battles of the 20's were raging. In 1925 William Pettingill wrote in the issue of "Serving and Waiting" these words:

"The fight is on and it grows hotter. Let us praise God for that. A fight is much better than a disgraceful surrender and a fight is necessary just now that the truth of the Gospel may continue with us."

Historically, Fundamentalism has been used to identify one holding to the **five fundamentals** of the faith adopted by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church U.S.A. in 1910. The five fundamentals were the miracles of Christ, the virgin birth of Christ, the substitutionary atonement of Christ, the bodily resurrection of Christ and the inspiration of Scriptures.

Fundamentalism can be defined as that movement which began to counteract the rise of Modernism in the United States and religious denominations. ***A fundamentalist was a person known to have unqualified acceptance of Bible truth and who was determined to live a holy life through absolute obedient to the Scriptures. They were considered to be an anti-modernist and identified someone who stood for the historic doctrines of the faith.*** The motto of those early Fundamentalists was to hold fast to the truth and not allow the tides or modernism to sweep through the denominational structures.

Their cry was that of Revelation 2:25:

"But that which ye have *already* hold fast till I come."

The original Fundamentalists were the legitimate heirs of historical New Testament Christianity. They were the faithful who wanted to stand by the doctrines passed down through the church centuries.

The noted theological liberal Kirsopp Lake even concluded that fundamentalism was nothing new. He said, "It is nothing of the kind: it is the...survival of a theology which was once universally held by all Christians." He goes on to say, "The Fundamentalist may be wrong; I think that he is. But it is we who have departed from the tradition, not he..." You see, the absolute truth of the Bible is on the Fundamentalist side. We have remained in what Kirsopp calls tradition. *It is the tradition of the Scriptures.*

2 Thessalonians 2:15

"Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word, or our epistle."

Today the term "fundamentalism" has come to mean any number of things and is usually used in a derogatory and slanderous way toward Bible-believers by those who do not believe the Scriptures. It is also used to describe all sorts of extremists, such as the churches in the southeastern part of the United States which believe handling snakes is a necessary part of worship, or the demonically-possessed Jim Jones who caused the mass suicide of his followers years ago, or the radical racist groups in America are considered Fundamentalists. This is a word, which is misunderstood throughout the years.

Even in its historical beginnings, Fundamentalism was seen to be a radical and harsh movement. *Those who followed the concept of standing on a set pattern of truths were considered to have a belief system that was outmoded.* The word itself became a term that was associated with a mean spirit and a cantankerous person. A Fundamentalist was regarded as offensive, ignorant and hopelessly engaged with the past. As we study the history of Fundamentalism along side of the rising tides of Classic Liberalism, Neo-Liberalism, Neo-Orthodoxy, Neo-Evangelicalism and Neo-Fundamentalism, we will see just how Fundamentalism was forced to change when open and subtle corruption continued to sweep into the church.

The battles between Fundamentalists and Liberals grew hotter as the years passed and as modernistic thinking increased in popularity in American denominations, theological schools, and Christian organizations. *Many Bible-believers separated themselves from those groups, which were giving modernism a home.* They formed new churches, denominations and organizations that would stand up for the truth in the tide of change.

Those who chose to separate from the modernistic denominations began to become independent from denominationalism and formed Bible Institutes and Colleges that

would stand up for the truth and counteract the now liberal learning centers of our society. Thus, we have the Bible Institute movement beginning and the Bible conference movements beginning. Toward the end of the nineteenth century (1800's) opponents of these new modernistic teachings began to gather together in great Bible conferences in various parts of the land. *Noted Bible teachers and preachers spoke to large throngs as they represented the many various denominations.* These conferences formed rallying points for those believers within the denominations who wanted to remain true to Scripture and promote a holy manner of living. These conferences had a significant influence in fighting the force of religious liberalism.

Many godly men and defenders of the truth also began to see the need for schools that would train and counteract this modernism, which had found its way into America. **They saw the need for replacement.** Since American institutions were falling to modernism, their desire was to create new organizations and schools that would counteract modernism. In the remaining part of the history of Fundamentalism, I would like to trace some of the men and movements that were created to counteract the rise and spread of Modernism.

A chart with various definitions, movements, and names was designed for the study of this paper. It will appear at the end of this study. The chart will systematically sort out much of what I am about to talk about in the following pages. It is a chart that I have personally created through many hours of research and work to be of help to the average reader who encounters words and movements that he has not previously known about. The chart was created through studying various works on fundamentalism and history in general. A key work consulted is David Beals history of Fundamentalism, which is a trustworthy and accurate study on fundamentalism. The work of George Dollar was also used among other smaller works. It may be helpful to get a general overview of the chart at this time before you engage in this ongoing study. I have tried to simplify the progress of Fundamentalism in this chart. You will be able to refer back to the chart as we engage in the course of our study.

1. Nonconformist Fundamentalism – remain in the denomination and fight but don't conform to the modernism (1857-1930).

Several movements sprang up in this era of time, which provided the groundwork for this type of Fundamentalism.

1. Prayer Meeting Movement (1857-1859)

The prayer meeting revivals that occurred in these years were the seedbed or foundation of the Fundamentalist movement. Americas first Great Awakening came under the preaching of Jonathan Edwards (1703-1758) and George Whitfield (1714-1770) and lasted approximately from the 1720s to the 1760s. The American colonies

needed to have their boat rocked by the strong preaching of these godly men. Great throngs of people were saved and the church became stronger. The second Great Awakening occurred approximately from the 1780s to the 1840s under the leadership of Timothy Dwight, Asahel Nettleton, John Leland and others. By this time America was prospering, gold was discovered in the West, the banking business was booming and industrial plants sprang up like mushrooms. Prosperity was in the minds and hearts of people, but not God. The past revivals in the forties gave way to spiritual neglect. The advent of a new era was underway. People were not allowing God to be part of their lives any longer. On October 12, 1857, Wall Street tumbled. Banks failed, factories went out of business, railroad construction halted and thousands were left unemployed. Many saw this as a sign of God's judgment for the nations serious neglect of spiritual matters. Added to all of this, the slavery issue had erupted into violence and the country was on the brink of a Civil War.

In the midst of the social, economic and spiritual dilemma that people created, there arose a man named **Jeremiah C. Lanphier**, who was a lay visitation worker at the Fulton Street Dutch Reformed Church in New York City. He announced that on Wednesday, September 23, the chapel behind the church would be open for a noonday prayer meeting for any that would come. This prayer meeting mushroomed and others copied the same pattern of prayer at noon. There were also short testimonies of salvation and deliverance given at these prayer meeting services. Soon shopkeepers in New York were hanging out signs at noonday, which read, "Closed-Be Back After Prayer Meeting." The police and fire departments opened their buildings for prayer services at noon. Numerous churches were overflowing with praying businessmen. Ministers made themselves available to those who needed spiritual help. Stories of conversions appeared on the front pages daily newspapers in New York, such as the New York Tribune. This prayer revival spread to other cities such as Philadelphia, Boston, Chicago and Atlanta. News about this spiritual awakening that began was spread all over the United States. It is estimated that during this 24-month prayer revival that over one million people came to Christ. Within the cities saloons were converted into prayer halls. The Atlanta police department dismissed half of its force because of reduced crime. Grocery storekeepers rolled out their barrels of beer and wine and poured it into the streets. The revival even spread to the nations army and navy.

All of this Great Awakening occurred because of one man's desire to have prayer in a little chapel at noon. His name was Jeremiah. *We are indebted to this man's desire to do something instead of nothing!* It's always too soon to quit and do nothing. We also must remember that God answers prayer.

2 Chronicles 7:14 says:

“If my people, which are called by my name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways; then will I hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin, and will heal their land.”

This is a promise given to Israel for the healing and restoration of their land crops. It cannot be taken as a blanket promise for national healing in America. However, this can be taken as a basic promise that God does bless as His people pray. *We must also remember the valuable lesson that God is in little things, such as a prayer meeting in a little chapel. Little is much when God is in it!* There were those who thought that the rebuilding of the temple under Zerrubabel was a small thing. But we must remember that God uses small things!

Zechariah 4:10 says:

“For who hath despised the day of small things? for they shall rejoice, and shall see the plummet in the hand of Zerubbabel *with* those seven; they *are* the eyes of the LORD, which run to and fro through the whole earth.”

This revival that resulted from these prayer meetings also strengthened the church. This was good because it braced the churches within the nation to withstand the crisis of the Civil War and prepared scores of Christian laymen to become spiritual leaders that would stand for truth as modernism would creep into the church.

Out of this American revival during the last half of the 1800's would grow a great influx of spiritual manpower for Christian work. In 1888 the Student Volunteer Movement was started to promote foreign missions. Dwight L. Moody and the YMCA were connected to this movement. Thousands of young people volunteered to become Sunday School workers, missionaries, pastors and evangelists. This became the seeds of the Bible School Movement.

2. The Fundamental Bible School Movement (1875-1920)

The Bible School Movement would also begin to help counteract the rise of liberal ideas. Fundamentalism would use the school movement to train people in truth and warn them about liberalism.

Spiritual men began to see the need of replacing the colleges that were beginning to give way to modernism. Therefore, there began the rise of the Bible Institutes. **T. DeWitt Talmadge** (1832-1902) the Presbyterian minister established a school in 1872 as part of his famous Tabernacle Brooklyn, New York. *However, the two major pioneers of the Bible Institute education was Albert B. Simpson, founder of the Christian and Missionary Alliance and Dwight L. Moody.* Simpson founded the Missionary Training School for Christian Evangelists in 1882, which is now called Nyac College in New York. Simpson visited H. Gratten Guinness's East London Bible Home

for Home and Foreign Missions, which had enrolled 7000 students in its first five years. He was inspired to see this type of schooling to get underway in America. Moody also feared that the leaven of communism and modernism would sweep across America if it were not for the rise of Bible education. Thus, he founded the Bible Institute for Home and Foreign Missions of the Chicago Evangelization Society. The first building was completed in 1889. This would later be called **Moody Bible Institute** following Moody's death. A. J. Gordon's Missionary Training School (now Gordon College) was also started this same year with such notable men as F. L. Chapell, James M. Gray, J. M. Stifler and Robert Cameron were part of the early faculty. The early Bible Institute programs offered a two-year program. Moody said in those early days of the Bible Institute and curriculum:

"Never mind the Greek and Hebrew; give them plain English and good Scripture. It is the Sword of the Lord that cuts deep."

Hebrews 4:12

"For the word of God *is* quick, and powerful, and sharper than any twoedged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and *is* a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart."

The theology curriculum of these early institutes included subjects such as Bible, Christian evidence and systematic theology. Many Bible Institutes taught Greek, church history, pastoral theology, homiletics, missions, Sunday School work, music (sacred song) and personal evangelism. During the 1920's and 1930's some schools expanded their curriculum to from two to three year courses, which allowed for more specialization in Biblical studies. *By this time many schools began to change their names from Bible training Schools to Bible Institutes.* Eventually, with the addition of a fourth year, most bible Institutes became degree-granting Bible Colleges.

In 1927, the Methodist evangelist **Bob Jones, Sr.** (1883-1968) founded **Bob Jones College** in Panama City Florida in order to promote high academic standards and emphasize the Bible. Later it was moved to Tennessee and then finally settled in Greenville South Carolina in 1947 and became **Bob Jones University**.

During the forty five years between the foundation of A. B. Simpson's Institute and the establishment of Bob Jones College (1927), some fifty five Bible Institutes and Colleges were founded to counteract the rise of Modernism. Some of the most significant included Toronto Bible College; Practical Bible Training School; Northwestern Bible School In Minneapolis Minnesota; Toccoa Falls Bible College in Georgia; The Bible Institute of Los Angeles; Philadelphia College of the Bible (Philadelphia School of the Bible) and Prairie Bible Institute in Alberta. *There were many more good Schools that sprang up all over the country in order to increase Bible training and motivate young people to evangelism and missionary work.* The three-year

Bible Institute that I attended was the Grand Rapids School of the Bible & Music in Grand Rapids Michigan. Lancaster School of the Bible (now Lancaster Bible College) and many other schools came into existence so that this nation could counteract the rising tide of modernistic thought and corruption by a return to sound Biblical teaching. *These interdenominational schools in their original structure became major voices of Fundamentalism that were designed to champion truth and capture the hearts of young people instead of modernism.*

3. The Fundamental Bible Conference Movement (1875-1920)

Another movement that sprang up in order to help counteract Modernism was the American Bible conferences. These interdenominational Bible Conferences that sprang up across America were designed to curtail the spread of Liberalism and warn people of its growing poison among the denominations. This movement is an important point in the spread of Fundamentalism throughout America. The Bible conference movement mushroomed all over the country in order to educate people to the great Christian beliefs held throughout the centuries.

One man that God used to help pave the way for the future Fundamentalist movement and in particular the Bible Conference Movement was **George C. Needham** (1840-1902). Needham was converted in the southern portion of Ireland during another Great Awakening or revival. He came under Charles Spurgeon's influence and ministry and attended his college in London. This man loved the Bible and established yearly Bible study meetings for the Irish people. Needham also toured all over Ireland during various evangelistic campaigns with the well-known **H. Gratten Guinness**. Then, in 1868, Needham came to America under Spurgeon's recommendation and spoke at the YMCA in Boston. Later, Needham sat under D L. Moody's training in Chicago at filled the Moody Church pulpit from 1879-1881. Needham remembered the old days when he had developed the Irish Bible study meetings. Those were precious days to him. He decided to do the same thing in America. Needham joined with another man by the name of James Inglis (1813-1872). These two men became the co-founders of the **Niagara Bible Conference**. Needham had the Bible Conference meetings within his soul and wanted to establish them within the United States. Within the New York City office of Inglis in 1868, brethren of various denominations met for the first time in this conference meeting. In 1869, the conference met in Philadelphia where a man by the name of **James Hall Brooks** (1830-1897) joined them. Brooks was a Presbyterian minister who would later become the dominant figure in the conferences. During his first meeting with the men, he preached on a passage that dealt with Christ's return.

1 Thessalonians 1:10

“And to wait for his Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead, *even* Jesus, which delivered us from the wrath to come.”

Needham remarked about that first sermon which he had heard from Brooks. “Well do we remember how it fired our young Irish heart to look upon, and listen to, the black-haired, black-eyed, robust giant of the West, then in the prime of his manhood. Vividly do we now recall his magnificent exposition of the text, ‘Waiting for the Son from Heaven.’

This reminds me of those disciples on the road to Emmaus who heard the Scriptures and had a burning desire to know truth.

Luke 24:32

“And they said one to another, Did not our heart burn within us, while he talked with us by the way, and while he opened to us the scriptures?”

In 1870 the conference was brought to ST. Louis and in 1871 the brethren gathered in Gault Canada. The next two years (1872-1874) there would be no meetings due to the deaths James Inglis and another staunch supporter of the Bible meetings named Charles Campbell. However, these meetings resumed under the leadership of Brooks in 1875 and developed into the famous Niagara Bible Conference which eventually met at the spot where the Niagara River joins Lake Ontario. It was here that the conference would meet from 1883 –1897. Other strong and influential leaders who would counteract the rise of liberalism also were connected with this conference. Their names were William J. Erdman (1834-1823); Henry Parsons (1823-1906); Fleming H. Revell (1849-1931); and Daniel W. Whittle (1840-1901). Through the years other giants of the faith were connected with this conference such as A. T. Pierson (1837-1911), William Moorehead (1836-1914) and Arno C. Gaebelin (1861-1945) who was the Methodist editor of the magazine entitled, “Our Hope.” Another Methodist was W. E. Blackstone (1841-1935) and the Baptists Amzi C. Dixon (1854-1925) and James Stifler (1839-1902). Of course, there were the Presbyterians C. I. Scofield (1843-1921); Nathaniel West (1826-1906); Wilbur Chapman (1859-1918); J. Hudson Taylor (1832-1905) who was the British man who founded China Inland Mission. William Nicholson (1822-1901) was a fundamental Reformed Episcopalian who also joined in with the prophetic teaching of this conference. The other editors of the Old Scofield Bible all spoke at this conference such as Henry Weston (President of Crozer Theological Seminary), James M. Gray (President of Moody Bible Institute), Elmore Harris (President of Toronto Bible Institute) and William Pettingil. Strong warriors of the faith were deeply rooted in the Bible conference movement. Many Presbyterian giants of Fundamentalism stood up and preached the truth fearlessly in these conferences. They were the majority in the fight against Modernism. However, there were strong Baptists. George C. Needham, A. J. Gordon and James Stifler were among the leading Baptists. *Gradually, Baptists arose to the majority within Fundamentalism over the Presbyterians as the 1920's came to a close.*

It is safe to say that Niagara was an important step in the rise of early Fundamentalism. These Niagara meetings inspired scores of people to dedicate their lives to Christ. It strengthened the Fundamental core of believers within the denominations. It spawned new missionary activity and evangelism. It inspired businessmen to become generous donors to Fundamentalist schools, churches, missions and publications. Previous to the Niagara meetings, there was little prophetic literature available. However, as a result of these meetings and the generous giving, much prophetic literature began to be written by the Niagara men (Brooks, Erdman, Kellogg, West, Blackstone - "Jesus is Coming," Pierson and Scofield). These men began to produce many studies on prophetic studies as well as cardinal doctrines of the faith such as the Holy Spirit and the person and work of Christ. Much fundamental literature came about through these meetings. Also, many other Bible Conferences began to spring up as a result of the success of this conference. Niagara also had a significant impact on the rise of the Bible Institute and college movement. *This conference with its leading men provided the groundwork, example and help for the spread of other fundamental conferences and Bible Institutes across America.*

I have taken the time to look at some history of this important Bible conference because it provided the seeds for many other Bible conferences to emerge all over the country. The speakers receive various invitations from other parts of the country to establish similar institutions. These men provided the leadership to begin other conferences across America. There was a growing interest in Bible conferences as religious Liberalism spread into the denominations. *These Bible conferences emphasized the fundamentals of the faith and coming of Christ in order to counteract the modernistic trends that were becoming noticeable within the denominations. **Most of the origins and essential features of Fundamentalism find their roots in Niagara.***

There was also the **American Bible and Prophetic Conferences** that mightily grew within these years (1878-1914). After the Civil War there was plenty of optimism in the country and industry was once again emerging. Labor unions were being formed to help workers and the horse drawn carriage was now going to be run by gasoline fueled, internal - combustion engine. Thomas Edison received a patent for his phonograph. Alexander Graham Bell received a patent for creating a device that would transfer a human voice over the wire.

At the same time there was also evil advancements taking place. Darwinism and liberal rationalism was confronting America's preachers and was spreading like wild fire. The Roman Catholic Church declared papal infallibility. Mary Baker Eddy (1821-1910) began her "Science and health Magazine" and Charles T. Russel (1852-1916) and his followers (Russelites, later to be called "Jehovah's Witnesses" in 1931) were declaring that the second Advent of Christ had occurred in 1874, that the Millennial Dawn had begun, and that the end of all things was slated for 1914.

In the midst of all this secular and spiritual change going on within America, Bible believers began to search the Scriptures for the true answers to life. In the midst of Liberalism, Romanism, cultism, rationalism and optimism for the future, there was a need to reexamine the truth. The believers were stirred to search and study the Scriptures like the Bereans of old.

Acts 17:11 says:

“These were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the scriptures daily, whether those things were so.”

The prophetic conferences were designed to address the subjects of prophecy. In view of the times there was a ringing call to address the subjects that dealt with the future and what God had planned for America and the world.

2 Peter 1:19 says:

“We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day star arise in your hearts.”

The prophetic conferences were designed to counteract the liberal concepts of the day that associated the kingdom as being in the world through the transformation of society (social gospel). These great prophetic gatherings emphasized the literal future reign of Christ and the Second Coming of Christ, which modernism rejected. The conferences wanted to reconfirm what the Bible said concerning the promised return of Christ that modernistic men were scorning within the last days.

2 Peter 3:3-6

“Knowing this first, that there shall come in the last days scoffers, walking after their own lusts, And saying, Where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as *they were* from the beginning of the creation. For this they willingly are ignorant of, that by the word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of the water and in the water: Whereby the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished.”

The first prophetic Bible conference was established as a result of 122 Bible preachers and teachers. Among these teachers there were 47 Presbyterians, 25 Baptists, 16 Episcopalians, 9 Congregationalists, 6 Methodists, 5 Evangelical Adventists, 4 Dutch Reformed, 1 Lutheran, 1 Catholic Apostolic (Irvingite), 1 Independent, and 7 unidentified. The preachers issued a call for a three day Bible conference on October 30-November 1, 1878 at New York City’s Holy Trinity Protestant Episcopal Church. This became the first of many American prophetic conferences held between 1878-

1914. The conferences taught the premillennial return of Christ and other related prophetic topics. Premillennialism teaches that Christ will return to earth before the Millennium. It teaches that Christ will bring in the kingdom and not mankind (see Revelation 19:11-16).

The men who actually organized the first prophetic conference included James H. Brooks, A. J. Gordon, William G. Moorehead, William R. Nicholson, Henry Parsons and Stephen H. Tyng. Most of the men who conducted the Niagara Bible conferences participated in this conference as well. These Fundamental men stood firmly for the imminent and premillennial return of Christ. They believed that Christ could return at any moment and would some day establish His literal kingdom upon earth.

Philippians 3:20

“For our conversation is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ.”

Titus 2:13

“Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ.”

Revelation 22:10

“And he saith unto me, Seal not the sayings of the prophecy of this book: for the time is at hand.”

Revelation 22:12

“And, behold, I come quickly; and my reward *is* with me, to give every man according as his work shall be.”

These verses promote an imminent return of Christ. This means that Christ could return at any moment. There is no prophecy that needs to be fulfilled in order for Christ to return. His coming is at the doors and ready to take place (James 5:9).

The Fundamentalist of the day stood in agreement concerning Christ's imminent and premillennial return. However, there was disagreement concerning the rapture and pretribulationism. A. J. Gordon placed the rapture at Christ's return to earth (post-tribulationism) because he spiritualized the tribulation period into a long era of time with an unknown beginning. Therefore, he could preach about the rapture and the imminent return of Christ and still be premillennial. There were others who were not in agreement with pretribulationism during these early days. Even two men who were the consulting editors of the Scofield Bible were not all pretribulational in their beliefs (William Erdman; William G. Moorehead). They actually held the post-tribulational rapture interpretation. Most of these men simply taught that the tribulational passages had received their fulfillment in the history of the church. Over the years, pretribulationism

became the majority teaching. That is why the later Bible Conference movements upheld the pretribulational view of Christ's coming. *It is interesting to conclude that as prophetic studies were being revived within the church once again, that eventually pretribulationism won the victory.* However, in those days as the prophetic truths of Scripture were being revived, there were those men who disagreed over this truth such as Robert Cameron, Nathaniel West and Henry Frost. Other men such as the conservative Charles Hodge who was connected with Princeton Theological Seminary was amillennial and posttribulational in his beliefs. Hodge frankly admitted that he was not an authority on future events. Some other conservative men such as A. T. Allis who was also on the faculty of Princeton did not agree with dispensationalism. Nonetheless, he was not liberal in his beliefs of the major doctrines.

There were those involved in the prophetic conferences of those days, which had a general type of dispensational overview of the Bible. They did not necessarily have a rigid or highly worked out dispensational view of the Scripture like Scofield or Lewis Sperry Chafer of Dallas Seminary would develop.

The Fundamentalists of the early Bible Conferences did not use these amillennial and posttribulational men as their targets of attack. It was the liberals that were the enemies and the purpose of these prophetic conferences was to teach a literal kingdom concept and the imminent return of Christ. The issue of the timing of the rapture became more heated in 1895. Actually, the issue of the rapture was the real factor that brought the old Niagara Bible Conference to a close by 1900. Beginning in the 1930's Baptist Fundamentalism began to be much more persistent in making premillennialism and many times pretribulationism a trademark of their faith and Fundamentalism.

However, many great fundamental giants of the day spoke at these prophetic conferences such as C. I. Scofield, A. C. Gaebelien (Methodist), Ford C. Ottmon, William Pettingill, William Moorehead, A. T. Pierson, A. C. Dixon, William Erdman, Robert Cameron, William R. Nicholson, E. P. Goodwin, Charles Trumbell, James. M. Gray and Charles Blanchard. The final American Prophetic Conference was held at Moody Church in 1914. These Bible conferences were an important part of Fundamentalism's strike against Modernism.

There were great multitudes of Bible conferences that continued to thrive after the prophetic Conferences. The Bible conference movement went into full swing. Great multitudes of people went to these Bible Conferences when World War 1 began since they were interested in the end times and what lies in the future. There was the well-known Montrose Bible Conference that was established in the eastern Blue Ridge mountains of Pennsylvania (1908) where great giants of the faith such as Harry Ironside (Moody Church), Paul Rood (Bible Institute of Los Angeles), M. R. DeHaan (Radio Bible class) Reuben A. Torrey spoke. Many other Bible conferences sprang up

all over the land throughout the years where giants of the faith would speak such as W. H. Griffith Thomas (1861-1924) and the Methodist evangelist L. M. Munhall (1843-1944) and Baptist Robert T. Ketcham (1889-1978) who was in demand at Fundamentalists' gatherings all over the land. There was the Boardwalk Bible Conference in Atlantic City and the famous Winona Lake Bible conference in Winona Lake Indiana. This conference was founded in 1895 by Reverend Solomon Dickey (1858-1920) who was the superintendent of the home missions in Indiana for the Presbyterian Church. Great speakers during these early days came to preach at Winona Lake such as the William Jennings Bryan (1860-1925), the Methodist G. Campbell Morgan (1863-1945), the Presbyterian Billy Sunday (1863-1935), the Baptist A. C. Dixon (1854-1925), the Presbyterian J. Gresham Machen (1881-1937) and the Baptist Greek scholar A. T. Robertson (1863-1934).

With the rise of Modernism in the country, Fundamental books and literature also were published to defend the Fundamentalist position. These books were written in connection with the Bible conference Movements. The publication of the **Old Scofield Reference Bible** came about in connection with the Sea Cliff Bible conference, which was held on the north shore of Long Island New York. This conference was really a continuation of the tradition of the Old Niagara Bible Conference. These conference meetings provided the setting for the Old Scofield Bible to be written.

The strong Fundamentalist and prolific writer, Arno Gaebelien (1861-1945), led the conference for its entire decade. Gaebelien recalls the night when he was with Dr. Scofield on a late evening walk. As they walked down the beach at Sea Cliff Dr. Scofield shared his desire to develop the dispensational Bible. Gaebelien was both excited and supportive. The next Sea Cliff Conference was the time when Scofield finalized his plans to go ahead with his Bible. Two wealthy laymen, John T. Pirie, owner of the Sea Cliff property, and Alwyn Ball, Jr., served as Scofield's financial sponsors so that he could pursue the project. John Pirie owned an apartment store in Chicago and the other was a real estate broker and member of a successful firm in New York City. *These two men contributed to the production of the single most influential publication in Fundamentalism's history, which was the Scofield Reference Bible.* This reminds me of the importance of believers faithfully supporting God's men so that God's work can increase and move forward.

Galatians 6:6 says:

"Let him that is taught in the word communicate (share financially) unto him that teacheth in all good things."

Galatians 6:10

"As we have therefore opportunity, let us do good unto all *men*, especially unto them who are of the household of faith."

These two businessmen took this challenge and look what God did with their money. We must remember the timeless principle that we have all heard before:

“Only one life twilt soon be past, only what’s done for Christ will last.”

Cyrus Ingerson Scofield (1843-1921) was born in Michigan and reared in Tennessee. He served in General Lee’s army in the Civil War and fought eighteen different battles. He was converted at the age of 36. He went into the ministry and served as pastor of the First Congregational Church in Dallas (now called the Scofield Memorial Church) from 1882-1895. At D.L. Moody’s request, he served as pastor of the Congregational Church at East Northfield, Massachusetts from 1895-1902. He then returned to the Dallas church, which agreed to give him the time he needed to research and finish his reference Bible. **Oxford University Press** released the Bible on **January 12, 1909** and within two years two million copies had been published. This was the single most influential publication in Fundamental’s history. A wealthy oil company owner in California named **Lyman Stewart** (1840-1923) contributed 1,000 dollars to launch the publications of Scofield’s Bible notes. This was a large sum of money in those days. God had intervened to have this monumental work published.

Another wealthy man, Lyman Stewart, whose heart was stirred at an old Niagara Bible Conference, championed the cause of preserving fundamental Christianity and wanted to hinder the inroads of modernism. He was burdened about the spread of Liberalism within the church. This man was reared in a Godly Presbyterian home in Titusville Pennsylvania. He learned as a little boy to tithe his income. While hearing A. C. Dixon (pastor of Moody Church in Chicago) speak at the Niagara Bible Conference, he realized that this man could help him publish fundamental literature to help champion the cause of Fundamentalism. This man desired to financially support the spread of literature that would speak against modernism. He wanted to share the funds necessary with Fundamentalist men in order to spread the truth. This reminds of the importance of Paul’s instruction which he gave to Timothy about the rich believers within the ranks of the church.

1 Timothy 6:17-18

“Charge them that are rich in this world, that they be not highminded, nor trust in uncertain riches, but in the living God, who giveth us richly all things to enjoy; That they do good, that they be rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to communicate (share).”

With the help of A. C. Dixon and the financial assistance backing him, a committee was arranged that established the Testimony Publishing Company. They published the monumental work to help combat the spread of Liberalism, which were called “**The Fundamentals**.” A. C. Dixon and R. A. Torrey edited these studies.

The Fundamentals were a series of twelve volumes of articles published between 1910-1915 to counteract the raging storm of Liberalism in the country. It was subtitled, "A Testimony to the Truth." This series of booklets or articles was editorially controlled by persons in the Bible school, revival and independent church movements associated with the Bible Institute of Los Angeles and Moody Bible Institute. These 83 articles covered the main themes of defending Christian doctrine (revelation, incarnation, atonement, resurrection, Holy Spirit), defending the inspiration of the Bible against German higher criticism, criticism of Romanism, Eddyism, Mormonism, rationalism, Darwinism, socialism) since these teachings were being pressed upon America. There was also a fresh emphasis in these volumes on evangelism and missions and a sample of personal testimonies by people telling how Christi worked in their lives. *Staunch believers who had fought the original war with modernistic trends and thoughts wrote the articles.* Over 3 million individual copies were distributed freely to English speaking Protestant ministers, missionaries and workers around the globe. The writers of the articles included Presbyterians, Anglicans, Baptists, Episcopalians, Independents, and others from Scotland, England, Canada as well as the United States.

It is interesting to note that Fundamentalism crossed denominational lines in the early days because of their agreement upon the major Bible doctrines of the historic Christian faith and their stand against unholy practices. At the turn of the 20th century and early part of the 20th century denominationalism was not corrupted by heresy. Because of this, there could be an agreement and working together among the denominational lines without compromising truth and identifying yourself with error and apostasy by interdenominationalism. Today this is surely not the case. It is interesting that all but nine of the 37 contributing authors to the "Fundamentals" were deceased by 1925. Among some of the giants were A.T. Pierson, William Moorehead, William Erdman, C.I. Scofield, A.C. Gabelein. Griffith Thomas, C. G. Moule and James M. Gray.

It was not long before the name "fundamentalist" was born and attached to all those people who believe in the doctrines pronounced in these books. The name "Fundamentalist" was popularized by this series of books, which were written by Bible-believing men for the purpose of expounding the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith, of the Bible. I have a copy of this material in my own library. The battle lines were clearly pronounced. ***Those men who rejected these booklets were known as "modernists" or "liberals."*** Sermons, booklets and full-scale books began to be written by both the fundamentalists and liberals. A warfare had now reached into many of the leading denominations which had become corrupted by this modernism. *By the 1920's liberals had captured many places of leadership in the old-line denominations such as Methodists, Presbyterians, Lutherans, Baptists, etc.* The word "fundamentalist" was first used in 1920 by Curtis Lee Laws, who was the Baptist editor of the Watchman-Examiner.

4. The Worlds Christian Fundamental's Associations (WCFA)

This was another leading contributor to the spread of early Fundamentalism. As the 1920's dawned upon America, this movement realized that the Bible institutes, Bible colleges and Bible conferences still did not do enough to curb the problem of Modernism within the ranks of the denominations. With the cooperation of Fundamentalists within the prophetic conferences, there emerged an interdenominational fundamental movement called "The World's Christian Fundamental's Association." This movement was decided at the Philadelphia Prophetic Conference in May 28-30, 1918 where there were speakers such as William Pettingill and B .B. Sutcliffe of Moody Bible Institute. This became the forerunner of the WCFA.

That following summer six or eight Fundamental leaders met in Rueben A. Torrey's summer home in Montrose Pennsylvania. They determined that the first WCFA meeting must involve the cardinal doctrines of the Bible and not just focus on prophecy (see Acts 20:27). This was because the denominational structures were becoming deeply rooted in Liberalism. The Methodists, Northern Baptists and Northern Presbyterians were taken over by the modernists. A plan of action was to meet and try and stop the massive inroads of modernism within the denominations. The first conference was held in the Philadelphia Music Hall, May 25-June 1, 1919. Some of the speakers and their subjects were James M. Gray of Moody Bible Institute who spoke on inspiration. Griffith Thomas spoke on "The Atonement by Blood". Lewis Sperry Chafer spoke on the topics of the Son of God and sanctification. William Pettingill spoke on the subject of the church. Other speakers such as I. M. Haldeman, A. B. Winchester, R. A. Torrey and L. W. Munhall all had important contributions to share on key Biblical subjects. There was a tremendous return to solid Biblical teaching and the foundational trues of the Bible.

2 Timothy 3:13-14

"But evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving, and being deceived. But continue thou in the things which thou hast learned and hast been assured of, knowing of whom thou hast learned *them*."

The interdenominational make-up of these early Bible conferences (Niagara and Prophetic Conferences) and now the World's Christian Fundamentals Association was due to the rise of modernism in the denominations and the desire for believers to learn and know the truth in view of the darkness of liberalism which was growing like cancer within the denominations. *This WCFA movement was even a stronger effort to weld together a vast interdenominational movement that would serve as a kind of damper to the spread of the modernistic tendencies within the denominations.* From these gatherings many leaders did go on to establish hundreds of local and regional conferences on Fundamentalism. A network was created whereby James M. Gray

would supervise the Bible School movement; Charles Blanchard would head up the college and seminary movement; Charles G. Trumbell would keep on guard against the religious magazines and periodicals; W. B. Riley would be in charge of the Bible conference movement and Orson R. Palmer would head up the Interdenominational Foreign Missionary Societies (IFMA) which was founded in 1917 to stop the spread of modernism into the mission field.

Throughout the years there were great fundamental warriors of the faith who spoke at the conferences such as T. T. Shields of Toronto Canada, Harry Rimmer, I. H. Linton, Robert Ketcham, W. H. Rodgers and Harry Ironside to name just a few. William Bell Riley (1861-1947), who was a Baptist, was the president of the WCFA. Riley wrote a book entitled, "The Menace of Modernism." He was second to none in his defense of creationism and the great fundamental truths of Scripture.

Colossians 1:16

"For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether *they be* thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him."

Riley would debate in many leading colleges on the subject of evolution. He excelled as a champion of public debate and preacher of the word. He wrote over 90 volumes of material and clearly separated the church from the kingdom. He said that the kingdom is a future thing and the church is a present thing (see Luke 1:32-33; Acts 15:13-15; Matthew 19:28). He was a strong preacher of the rapture of the church and the imminent return of Christ. He was Fundamentalism's most energetic organizer and leader.

There was to be annual reports at the meetings to keep abreast of Liberalism's inroads into the denominations. The WCFA paper ("**The Christian Fundamentalist**") was written from 1927-1932 and gave out much information concerning current literature, mission boards and schools that were still good and had not turned to modernism. One issue revealed that there were 51 safe Fundamentalist colleges and schools that people could safely attend. Their paper sounded the alarm against modernism and its devastating affects to America.

Another wealthy man who was vice president and general manager of the Lukens Steel Company in Coatsville Pennsylvania (Charles L. Huston) financially assisted the beginning of this movement. He also was a helpful leader and spoke on the subject of the Holy Spirit in one conference. His message title was "The Holy Spirit and the Layman." Once again we see how God uses ordinary people to get God's work done! God uses faithful layman in order to accomplish His goals and purposes. God uses ordinary people who are willingly to be faithful to God.

1 Corinthians 4:2 says:

“Moreover it is required in stewards, that a man be found faithful.”

*We must once again realize that Fundamentalism was essentially interdenominational in its beginning. This was possible because the denominations on a large scale stood by the historic truths of the Bible. They did not question the inspiration of the Scriptures, the substitutionary atonement of Jesus Christ, the Virgin Birth of Christ, the bodily resurrection of Christ and the Second Coming of Christ. **There was also a strong unity among the early groups about key doctrinal issues and the need for ecclesiastical (church) holiness. Holiness in doctrine and life were always the strong points in Fundamentalism.** Historically, fundamentalists have always striven for what they regard as Biblical purity or holiness. The Hebrew and Greek word for “holy” basically means to live separate. Their goal has always been to take a position that is consistent with purity or the doctrine of holiness. Their pursuit of Scriptural holiness has always been the hallmark of their movement and lives. This holiness was applied to both doctrinal truth and everyday living. The early Fundamentalists always fought for doctrine that was pure and living which was also pure. Holiness was the key issue among the Fundamentalists.*

2 Timothy 3:15 reminds us that the Scriptures themselves are holy:

“And that from a child thou hast known the holy scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus.”

Since the Scriptures are holy (separate and different), the Fundamentalists sought to uphold the unique holy character of the Scripture by defending truth and standing up for what the Bible really said and taught to mankind (Jude 3). There was to be no room for compromising the truth. This was because the Bible was holy. It was sanctified or separated by God and should be upheld at all costs.

The Fundamentalists also taught the need to live holy or separated lives from the world’s contamination. On one occasion Adoniram Judson Gordon (1836-1895) when coming to a Baptist church, immediately questioned their worldly and unspiritual music in the church sanctuary, their dead ritualism, worldly financing and other questionable amusements that they were involved with. This man, like other true Fundamentalists of the early era, were deeply concerned about holy living in the midst of a secular society.

1 Peter 1:15-16 says:

“But as he which hath called you is holy, so be ye holy in all manner of conversation; Because it is written, Be ye holy; for I am holy.”

1 Timothy 2:8

“I will therefore that men pray every where, lifting up holy hands, without wrath and doubting.”

The expression “lifting up holy hands” has to do with a holy way of living. Paul is not emphasizing a specific posture necessary for prayer, but a prerequisite for effective prayer (Ps. 66:18). Though this posture is described in the OT (1 Kin. 8:22; Pss. 28:2; 63:4; 134:2), so are many others. The Greek word for “holy” means “unpolluted” or “unstained by evil.” *“Hands” symbolize the activities of life; thus “holy hands” represent a holy life.* Hands are amoral in themselves. They are not holy or unholy. It simply depends how you use your hands. The basis of effective prayer is a righteous or holy life (James 5:16). God demands that we live in a holy manner or fashion within this world below. *This was the ringing call of Fundamentalism.*

Because of unholy doctrine and living, the giants within the denominations were stirred to stand against the rising tide of modernism as it began to trickle into their denominational structures. **Many realized that truth plus heresy can never amount to holiness.** What did these giants of the Faith do to counteract modernism? Initially their aim was to eradicate the modernism in their denominations. **This is why the real Fundamentalist and modernistic battles occurred within the framework of mainline denominationalism.** The strong defenders of the Faith stood by the truth as liberal enemies and philosophies made inroads into their ranks. **Nonconformist separation means that the strong believers attempted to remain in the denominational structures and refuse to conform to the gathering teachings and attitudes of modernism.** There were those who remained in their beloved denominations and who viscosly fought to maintain their purity of doctrine. They held on to the Scriptures to encourage their efforts in the days when modernism was creeping into their beloved churches.

Revelation 3:2

“Be watchful, and strengthen the things which remain, that are ready to die: for I have not found thy works perfect before God.”

Revelation 2:13

“I know thy works, and where thou dwellest, *even* where Satan’s seat *is*: and thou holdest fast my name, and hast not denied my faith, even in those days wherein Antipas was my faithful martyr, who was slain among you, where Satan dwelleth.”

Like the Puritans from England, the early American fundamentalists tried to purify or purge the denominations from within. These verses gave the nonconformists the mandate to try and uproot the modernistic weeds within their ranks. Satan’s seat was beginning to be common place within the denominations. The heretics needed to be hit head on and removed from the denominations. The problem was that not enough was done to uproot them. Mere preaching against their false doctrines would not have them pulled from the sanctuaries. *Many Fundamentalists simply wanted to try and preach the liberals out of their denominational structures and*

regain the leadership positions. It was like swatting at flies on a hot summer evening. The problem is this. When you swat at a fly, it will soon be back to bug you again! This is what happened in the denominations. The fundamentalists wanted to preach the false modernistic teachers out of their midst. However, this was a fanciful dream that would never happen. The churches and leading Fundamentalists needed to outright expose the modernists and throw them out of the churches. They needed to mark the defectors and enact discipline. They needed to expel the weeds from among the wheat.

Matthew 13:25 says:

“But while men slept, his enemy came and sowed tares among the wheat, and went his way.”

Liberalism invaded the denominations because many began to fall asleep and not take action against the inroads of the modernistic teachers. In short, the denominational structures on a large scale failed to remove the weeds. In order to get rid of the weeds, you need to mark them out as weeds and then yank them out of the soil. They will not just fall out. The liberals or modernists needed to be yanked out of the soil of fundamental churches or else they would succumb to the enemy. Some have used this section of Scripture to teach ecumenicalism, since the hired servants were told let the weeds grow together with the wheat. This is a false interpretation of the passage and goes against the grain of the rest of the Scripture. The idea that there would be mingling together of the true and false does not place God’s approval on the happening. The parable simply is teaching the fact that there will be the mingling together of truth and error throughout the present age. It is explaining the fact that it would happen throughout the course of the age and nobody would be able to stop the pollution from occurring.

Many of the fundamentalists were reluctant to stand up and name the modernists or the weeds that were springing up among the true crop of God’s people. There was not enough desire for militancy within the denominational Fundamentalists. Because of this, modernism continued to spread.

Romans 16:17-18

“Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them. For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple.”

When the saints were told to “mark them” (false teachers) in their crowds, which obviously involves identifying them by name. To “avoid” them means to no longer associate or fellowship with them in any way. The believers were no longer to identify with those who would reject the basic doctrine of Scripture. *This command to mark out*

specific men through name and avoid them through direct church discipline was not followed but on rare occasions. Therefore, the liberals were left go and remained within the American systems of education and the denominational structures far too long. If you put a man in a cage with a tiger, sooner or later the man will be in the belly of the tiger! So it was in the case with modernism in the church. The denominational churches were swallowed up by the tiger of modernism because they remained in the cage with these liberals far too long. This only enabled them to spread their damnable doctrines among the denominations. The Fundamentalists within the denominations needed to take swift disciplinary action. However, they failed to follow the Biblical mandates to mark out the apostates and avoid them through disciplinary expulsion. In doing this, they failed to get rid of the real problem, which were the liberals themselves!

Without immediate discipline, error will grow like a cancer and the church will become inundated with damnable heresies. Such is the story of modernism as it came into American denominationalism.

2 Peter 2:1-2 gives us the sad results of the failure of discipline:

“But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction. And many shall follow their pernicious ways; by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of.”

2 Timothy 3:8

“Just as Jannes and Jambres opposed Moses, so also these men oppose the truth--men of depraved minds, who, as far as the faith is concerned, are rejected.”

Whenever you fail to rebuke false teachers directly by name and their teaching, then you will suffer the consequences of false doctrine spreading throughout the church. This is why Titus was told to rebuke the false teachers in a very direct way by naming them and exposing them.

Titus 1:13 says:

“This witness is true. Wherefore rebuke them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith.”

Failure of exposure and censorship will lead to disastrous results. And this is what happened in both the institutional level and the denominational structure at the turn of the 20th century. *There was laxity and failure within the institutions and denominations to act quickly and exterminate the modernistic trends and teachers.* The nonconformist separatists did not win the battle within their beloved denominations. They wanted to stay within the denominations and fix them. *Their defeat occurred because they failed*

to get rid of the actual problem. This failure led to the corruption of Christendom and the demise of the fundamental truth in the mainline denominations.

The ideal situation would have been for the denominations to purge out the modernists on their own church level. Then, the denominations themselves should have ousted all those churches within their ranks that tolerated modernism. This would have kept purity on the denominational level. However, the fundamentalists failure to rock their ecclesiastical ship soon led to total corruption. When cancer is not removed, it will continue to spread and zap the life out of the body. The same principle applied to the denominations.

Even men like Griffith Thomas, who assisted Lewis Sperry Chafer in the founding of Dallas Seminary, and Charles Trumbull (fundamentalist editor of the Sunday School Times) visited the mission field of China. They reported widespread unbelief and the modernistic higher criticism of the Scriptures. However, they refused to provide the names of liberal missionaries on their return to America. This is one example of the failure of fundamentalists to name and expose the actual modernists. Even the great fighting fundamentalist T. T. Shields initially refused to oust all of the liberals out of Des Moines University when he tried to change the liberal school into the fundamentalist school. ***In other words, Shields tried to make a change without changing the players!*** And this was the major flaw of the fundamentalists within the denominations. They tried to change schools, churches and organizations without changing the players. They failed to name the liberals and challenge them head on and expel them from the congregations and schools. Little did they realize that you cannot have a different church unless you rid yourself of the old modernistic preachers and get new players or preachers who will stand for the truth.

The children of Israel failed to get rid of all the people that God had clearly forbid them to intermingle with. Because of this, the people became corrupted by the pagan ways of the very people they refused to separate from. What was true of the children of Israel long ago was once again relived by the Fundamentalists who were trying to hold to truth and make changes without getting rid of the real problems.

Judges 1:28

“And it came to pass, when Israel was strong, that they put the Canaanites to tribute, and did not utterly drive them out.”

The Fundamentalists failed to drive the enemy out of their denominations and as a result, corruption would overtake the denominations on a large scale. This is the inevitable result when God’s people fail to actually discipline those who are corrupt in doctrine and expel them from the congregations (see the repeated teaching – Judges 1:21,27,28,29,31,33). Because the fighting Fundamentalists failed to actually drive out the modernistic teachers within their denomination, corruption established itself in great

measure. The cancer of modernism spread where healthy truth once stood. ***The failure of most Fundamentalists to boldly denounce these menacing modernists and name them in front of the people resulted in the deterioration of denominationalism.***

T. T. Shields said it best concerning how modernism had seized the fundamental churches and institutions of the time:

“We remember our faults this day. We ourselves did not know that Modernism was so deeply rooted.”

- 1. Nonconformist Fundamentalism – remain in the denomination and fight but don’t conform to the modernism (1857-1930).**
- 2. Separatist Fundamentalism – separate from the denomination because of growing apostasy and corruption (1930-1950).**

As a result of the failure to rid the denominations of the modernists, a plan of action had to be taken. The action was to now separate from the corrupted institutions, churches and denominations that had become leavened or corrupted by modernism. *This has been called the “**mass exodus**” from the mainline denominations by Fundamental believers. Like the English Separatists (unlike the Puritans) many believers decided to come out from among the unbelief and apostasy of denominationalism and start afresh.*

*It’s interesting to realize that there is no passage of Scripture, which instructs believers to separate from churches. Scripture always instructs believers to separate unscriptural elements or people from their churches in order to keep them holy and preserve ecclesiastical purity. **Because the fundamentalist failed to act swiftly in purging the churches of modernists from their leadership, the churches soon had no New Testament model to follow.*** There was no pure church model to follow anymore. In other words, they could no longer look to the Scriptural passages that spoke of purging the evil from within the church because the evil cancer has spread to far. The light of mainline denominationalism was snuffed out!

Revelation 2:4-5 speaks to the situation at hand:

“Nevertheless I have *somewhat* against thee, because thou hast left thy first love. Remember therefore from whence thou art fallen, and repent, and do the first works; or else I will come unto thee quickly, and will remove thy candlestick (lampstand) out of his place, except thou repent.”

The lampstand or light of truth that once shone so brightly in the denominations went to a flicker and then died. When purity of doctrine is lost then the lampstand of truth and

testimony is lost. ***There was nothing else to do but look to the Scriptures once again and find another Biblical principle to follow in light of the tragic situation at hand.*** The need to separate from the apostasy and corruption was evident. Therefore, many believers obeyed the Scriptural instruction to now separate from unbelievers and their apostate gatherings.

2 Corinthians 6:14-17

“Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel? And what agreement hath the temple of God with idols? for ye are the temple of the living God; as God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in *them*; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean *thing*; and I will receive you.”

This verse speaks of disassociating with religious movements and their people who are not pure in doctrine or practice. Such was the case with the religious pagan festivals going on in Corinth. The Corinthians were told to separate from these religious services and those people, which promoted and practiced pagan idolatry. In a similar way, the fundamentalists within the denominations needed to separate from the religious modernism and modernists, which had now corrupted and paganized their denominations. People were accepting and tolerating religious liberal views everywhere. There was no other Biblical solution. Separation was the answer. There needed to be a Biblical separation from those who were promoting and accepting false doctrine.

Romans 16:17

“Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them.”

The only way that those fundamental believers in the denominations could “avoid” the modernistic teachers and the multitudes that were now going along with their false teachings was to separate from the denominational structures. With the apostasy firmly entrenched or rooted in the churches, there could no longer be any more purging. Therefore, the fundamentalists had to react in a Biblical fashion to the unbelief and apostasy by separating from the denominations or starting strong offshoots of the denominations. This is when fundamentalism became a real separatist movement. **When the decision was made to start the exodus from the denominations fundamentalism no longer was viewed as a nonconformist movement trying to change the structure within. Now it became a total separatist movement, which broke its old ties with modernistic denominations and branched away from the denominational corruption completely.** The heated battles throughout the 1920's gave way to this mass exodus from the denominations and the formation of many

independent movements within the Baptist church and movements altogether outside the liberal denominations.

Thomas Todhunter Shields (T.T. Shields) was a leading Baptist figure to initially separate and stand out from among the liberal denominations. *He represented a transition from nonconformist to separatist fundamentalism.* Many followed in his footsteps and began to form independent organizations away from denominational ties and associations. Separation from liberal mainline denominations began to mushroom. Independent Baptist, Presbyterian and Methodist movements were formed which would not associate with liberalism in any way or fashion. Others totally broke away from having any denominational ties or associations and formed nondenominational churches. Such movements as the I.F.C.A. were formed in 1930.

This movement was called the Independent Fundamental Churches of America, which began in February of 1930, when William Mcarrell, pastor of the Cicero Bible Church in Cicero, Illinois, met with 39 men. They were interested in uniting with the American Conference of Undenominational Churches and adopting a new name. This movement was led in the early years by men such as M.R. DeHaan, William Pettingill, John Walvoord and J.O. Buswell.

Multitudes of independent movements sprang up to stand against modernism. The GARBC was formed. This stands for the General Association of Regular Baptist Churches, which was organized in 1933. This tie of churches was the outgrowth of the Baptist Bible Union of Frank Norris (the Texas Tornado), T. T. Shields and W. B. Riley. It was formed because of the break away from the liberal Northern Baptist Convention. Its aim was to promote fundamental fellowship among Baptists. Robert T. Ketcham was the leading influence in this gathering and fellowship.

The American Council of Christian Churches (ACCC) was formed in 1941 under the leadership of Carl McIntire. It was a separatist organization, which was militantly pro-Gospel, anti-Modernist and Anti-Communism. It sought to promote separation among Fundamental believers who had separated from modernism.

Many religious radio programs also became popular and championed the cause of Fundamentalism. Here are some of them as we look back and see how they helped to spread fundamental truth against modernism. Such radio ministries as "The Old Fashioned Revival Hour" under Charles E. Fuller became widely known and the most popular religious broadcast in the country. Millions also heard Martin R. DeHaan's "Radio Bible Class" ministry. "The Bible Study Hour" under the teaching ministry of Donald Grey Barnhouse also stood for truth. Walter Maier, a Lutheran who preached the Gospel (Missouri Lutheran Synod) was also widely known in the 30's and 40's for his "Lutheran Hour." Although Maier was not considered a fundamentalist, he fearlessly preached the Gospel. There was other fundamental radio preachers on the

airwaves that helped the cause of Fundamentalism such as John R. Rice and Jack Wyrzten who was the founder of the Word of Life Camps in Schroon Lake New York. There were many sound and fervent radio ministries being promoted in these days across America.

Many writings also began to champion the cause of Fundamentalism. I will list some of them that helped greatly throughout the initial stages of separation from the liberal denominations.

- Our Hope – Arno C. Gaebelin (1894-1945)
- Scofield Reference Bible - January 12, 1909
- The Christian Fundamentalist – W. B. Riley’s paper written from 1927-1932. It was written and endorsed by the World Christian Fundamentalist Association
- Serving and Waiting – magazine edited by William Pettingill (Philadelphia School of the Bible)
- The Searchlight – (1917) paper of T.T. Shields – In 1927 it became called “The Fundamentalist”
- Sword of the Lord – began on September 28, 1934 under the ministry of John R. Rice
- “Christianity and Liberalism” – J. Gresham Machen (1923)
- “The menace of Modernism” – William Bell Riley
- “The Voice” Publication of the Independent Fundamental Churches of America
- Moody Monthly – periodicals published by this school in its fundamental days
- Radio Bible Class – Martin R. DeHaan – published many fundamental booklets and literature
- The King’s Business – published by the Biola Bible Institute of Los Angeles (BIOLA)
- The Pilot - published by Northwestern Fundamental Schools
- Moody Press – conservative publisher who printed fundamental literature
- Fleming H. Revell (D.L. Moody’s brother-in-law) – published fundamental books
- Loizeaux Brothers – published many Plymouth Brethren books such as the famous commentaries of Harry Ironside
- Kregel Publications – originated in 1909 when Louis started selling used theological books out of his basement in Grand Rapids Michigan.
- William B. Eerdman’s - began by selling ten cent specials to Dutch farmers in 1910 in order to pay his way through Calvin Theological Seminary.
- Zondervan’s – Pat and Bernie Zondervan (Eerdman’s nephews) began their own publishing company in 1931 and were known for their publishing of fundamental literature during the 1930’s and 1940’s.
- Baker Bookhouse – Herman Baker (Louis Kregel’s nephew) established a book business in 1939.

Note: Most of these publishing companies are no longer known for publishing fundamental literature. Like all things, time has eroded the firm fundamental stance. But through the 1930's and 1940's they played a significant role in providing fundamental literature for Fundamentalist circles. Of all the publishing companies, Kregel Publications is still publishing some notable works.

The Navigators was also started by Dawson Trotman in 1932. It was based upon the 2 Timothy 2:2 principle of discipleship. The Navigators provided Keith L. Brooks Study Books to thousands of World War 2 servicemen. They also provided salvation packets and promise packets from God's word. They were responsible for a topical memory system of 108 verses. The Navigators majored on discipleship training and geared all its literature upon this principle.

Fundamentalism also was working in the mission arena as well. China Inland Mission (CIM) was founded by Hudson Taylor and was backed by fundamental principles. This mission grew more in the 1930's than in any other decade of its history. It had 205 stations with 800 missionaries, claiming 125,000 Chinese had been won to Christ.

A strong point of Fundamentalism through the years has been its emphasis upon soul winning and evangelism. Missions has always been at the heart of Fundamentalism. Fundamentalism has always promoted the need to win people to Christ both here and overseas. The Fundamentalist movement has sought to obey the Great Commission, which Jesus gave to His disciples concerning winning people to Christ.

Mark 16:15

“And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature.”

The reason for this soul winning effort and desperate need for missions is because of the path of destruction that the unsaved are walking upon. Jesus revealed the sad condition of the lost and why people need the Lord.

Matthew 7:13-14

“Enter ye in at the strait gate: for wide *is* the gate, and broad *is* the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat: Because strait *is* the gate, and narrow *is* the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it.”

Fundamentalism with its radio programs, publications, mission agencies and leading figures was on the rise while the old denominational structures were suffering from some kind of *American liberal depression*. Liberal denominations had to do something to recapture the minds and hearts of people and regain some of their losses. The way that they did this was to introduce a new kind of liberalism on the table that would be more up to date with the times.

Neo-Liberalism

New Liberalism (realistic theology) was the movement that rose to prominence after World War One. The war shattered the classic or old forms of liberalism, which previously taught the utopian concept or that the world would be unified in peace. New Liberalism was no longer optimistic about building a utopia on earth. It wanted to face life realistically. This is why it was called realistic theology. **Harry Emerson Fosdick** was the founding father of this “New Liberalism” and began to teach a lower view of man and a higher view of God. The Bible was taken more seriously to some degree but still was not considered inspired. This movement with its men (like Walter Horton, John C. Bennett & C. H. Dodd) did not recognize original sin, the total depravity of man, or the total deity of Christ or His virgin birth. It did not emphasize the substitutionary atonement of Christ. Instead, the New Liberals taught that one could receive stimulating power through Christ’s death. It is safe to say that this movement was not orthodox in belief. It was merely a reshaping of the Classic Liberalism. At its core, New Liberalism retained the essence of the old liberalism. It merely tries to make liberalism more realistic and palatable to the changing culture and times.

This new twist on old liberal was the attempt to dress up some of the old liberal ideas without changing the core beliefs of liberalism or modernism. It reminds me of what the Scriptures say about deceit and trickery on the behalf of false teachers.

2 Timothy 3:13 says:

“But evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving, and being deceived.”

The deception of the last days was prophesied as becoming increasingly worse prior to the coming of Christ. This new liberalism concept was promoting continued widespread deception among people. It was designed to gain a greater following. However, the promoters of this new liberalism were the same old wolves in sheep’s clothing and their message was the same message of unbelief. *What was supposedly new was not new after all.*

Harry Ironside used to say:

“If it’s new it’s not true; and if it’s true, it’s not new.”

In the wake of this new-liberalism there arose another movement that was in one sense spawned from the inroads of the first movement. It was termed as Neo-Orthodoxy. Most Neo-liberals hold to the major tenets of Neo-Orthodoxy, as we are about to discuss. The fact of the matter is this. *Most modern day liberals teach a blend of Neo-Liberalism and Neo-Orthodoxy views.* In any event, it really is the same old liberalism with a new twist of ideas and understanding of terms.

Neo-orthodoxy

In 1919 modern theology took a new turn when Karl Barth, trained in liberal theology, rejected it but did not return completely to conservative theology. Neo-orthodoxy was born. The prefix “neo” suggests that this particular brand of orthodoxy was not the same as the old-line orthodoxy. It was new in the sense that it had different conclusions about doctrines than the original orthodox position. Neo-orthodoxy stressed an experiential encounter with God through a “leap of faith.” While neo-orthodox theologians differed widely in their views, none accepted an inspired Bible. Many rejected the historicity of Christ’s bodily resurrection: the Bible was to be considered *geschichte* (story) rather than history. Many varied forms of modern theology have evolved from liberal and neo-orthodox theology.

Dialectic theology is a synonym for Neo-Orthodoxy teaching. The teachers of Neo-Orthodoxy used this method of teaching by dialectic or logical argumentation. It was the same method used by the Greek world and Socrates where people would use questions and answers in order to gain insight and arrive at truth. Therefore, their teaching focused on dialectic (debating or logical argumentation) as it tried to emphasize the differences between opposing matters such as time and eternity or finite and infinite and God’s righteous anger and mercy.

After World War One, modern modernism or new liberalism continued to be reshaped in this movement called Neo-Orthodoxy. This new modernism was eventually labeled as New Orthodoxy. This was because the dream for world peace or this utopian idea of a perfect world was shattered by the war. The new liberals criticized the old liberalism for not having an appropriate concept of God and being overtaken by intellectualism.

Robert Lightner has said:

“The collapse of old liberalism or classical liberalism created a theological vacuum. Into that vacuum came what is known as noe-orthodoxy.”

The new liberalism or New Orthodoxy called for help and assistance from a God that was different than man. *This movement also stressed the transcendence of God or the teaching that God was different than the creation and actively involved with this creation as well.* It was now said that God can help the world instead of ignoring the world. *However, their view of God was not as the Creator of time but as being part of time.* It equates God with forces and laws of the universe and becomes pantheistic in its design. This was called the “theology of hope” which now regarded God as being part of the laws and forces of the universe. It is simply another version of pantheism. The Bible teaches that God is a personal Being which has created everything in the universe (Rev. 4:11) and He is the God who is absolutely independent of His creation

(Genesis 1:1; Exodus 3:14). It also teaches that the real theology of hope is the believer's hope of eternal life (Titus 1:2).

The "God is Dead" movement actually sprang forth in the early and mid 1960's from this type of philosophical thinking. After all, if God was not a personal being or is only part of the universe of time and space, then the God of the Bible must be dead. When people take away the Bible as being true and the only lasting source of authority, then you will sooner or later take away the God of the Bible and kill Him. Thus the Biblical image of God is changed to laws and the terminology of God becomes different.

Thomas J. J. Altizer, associate professor of Religion at Emory, University, Atlanta Georgia boldly said:

"Christian theology must boldly proclaim the death of God...God has disappeared from history...He is truly dead...We must recognize that the death of God is a historical event; God has died in our time, our history, in our existence."

The Episcopal Bishop, John A.T. Robinson called for an outlawing of the name God for at least a generation. He went on to say these words in his book entitled "Honest to God":

"In the space age men can no longer credit the existence of God as a supernatural person."

Well, as the modernists counted their losses, they could see that their denominations began to lose large numbers of congregations, which were defecting from apostasy into Fundamentalism. They realized that they had moved too far to the left. *If they were to stop the trend and recapture some of their losses, they were going to have to restructure their program and present themselves in more orthodox clothing.* This reaction away from liberalism, which constitutes a failure to return to the historic Christian faith, emphasizes a subjective authority of the Bible and uses evangelical terminology, but all the while embraces the destructively critical conclusions of modernism in reference to the Bible.

New-Orthodoxy was a system of theology that was born in Europe and popularized in the United States after World War One. It was associated particularly with its founder **Karl Barth** (Swiss theologian -1896-1968), who wrote a commentary on Romans in 1919. He had been trained under liberal theologians in Germany. The birth of Neo-Orthodoxy owes something to the writings of the Danish philosopher Soren Keirkegaard who was the founder of existentialism. However, its real beginnings are normally linked to the writings of Barth's commentary on Romans. Barth has been called by one writer, "a religious springtime after the long, cold winter of Liberalism." This was not the case. Barth was still in the deep freeze and dead of winter when it

came to accepting truth as it should be accepted and wholeheartedly believing on the Bible.

Karl Barth became especially interested in Schleiermacher's theology of experience. With World War One underway, Barth realized that the old liberal theology which he was taught concerning the immanent God who was uninterested in the affairs of mankind and who was like man could not meet the needs of people in their time of adversity. Therefore, he began to search the Scriptures and study the writings of the Reformers, including Calvin's Institutes. He published his book on Romans in 1919 and made God, not man, the focal point. Barth deprived man of all self-righteousness and self-reliance and exalted the grace of God in Christ. Barth sought to make his theology God-centered instead of man-centered as the traditional liberal viewpoint always did. The liberals quickly rejected Barth's commentary.

Although Barth returned to a study of the Bible, he did not equate the Bible with the Word of God. Barth rejected the notion of an infallible written word. He taught that the writers of Scripture simply related their experiences concerning the revelation of God. In reading the Bible people today can also experience the revelation of God at the moment the Word of God becomes revelation to them. *In other words, it can be termed revelation only if it is recognized and experienced as revelation by an individual.* This is a dangerous teaching. There are those who still emphasize this teaching today. But the Bible declares that all Scripture is inspired in spite of a person's experience or recognition of its authenticity (2 Timothy 3:16). You may not feel or experience that the Bible is inspired for your life, but that does not change the fact that the Bible is inspired in every detail and every word down to the jot and tittle (Matt. 5:18).

Barth did not believe that truths could be stated in doctrinal statements or creeds because not every person has experienced the same truth. Yet the Bible talks about "the faith which was once delivered unto the saints" (Jude 3). This is a body of revealed objective truth and not some kind of blind leap of faith into truth by subjective experience as New-Orthodoxy taught.

Barth also rejected general revelation as proof for the existence of God. He stated that general revelation is unable to reveal God's existence to man. Of course, this is false.

Psalm 19:1

"The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament sheweth his handywork."

The creation of all the heavens sends forth a silent symphony of praise to the Creator God. All of creation speaks of a divine Creator who is infinite and wise and above all.

Romans 1:18-20 says:

“For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold the truth in unrighteousness; Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath shewed *it* unto them. For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, *even* his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse.”

God has revealed Himself to every human that is born into this world. God has placed an intuitive knowledge of His own existence in the conscience of every person so that man is without excuse in his understanding of God’s existence and creation.

The theology of Barth, based upon the existentialist philosophy of Kierkegaard was then followed by the more negative and destructive theology of Rudolf Bultmann (1884-1976) who was also associated with Neo-Orthodoxy. Rudolph Bultman was a radical German existentialist and was also linked to Neo-Orthodoxy. Bultmann denied the reliability of the Bible and taught that the early church had gathered together stories about God and Christ and not factual statements. Therefore, the events of Scripture are seen to be like a storybook and not historically accurate accounts. He called this “**demythologization**” which means that we must regard many of the Bible stories as myths passed down from the early church. Demythologizing is that method of interpretation of the Bible, which seek to identify the ancient or outdated symbols or myths that are found in the Bible such as heaven, hell, miracles, demons and replace them with modern terms and ideas. In short, it seeks to determine what should be myths in the Bible and replaces them with more modified and up to date ideas and explanations.

Bultman said:

“I do indeed think that we can now know almost nothing concerning the life and personality of Jesus, since the early Christian sources show no interest in either, are moreover fragmentary and legendary; and other sources about Jesus do not exist.”

The Bible warns about those who would begin to teach the Bible as myths and passed down legends instead of taking the Bible as being the absolute Word of God.

2 Timothy 4:2-4

“Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine. For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; And they shall turn away *their* ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables (“myths”).”

Other key figures of this movement include Emil Brunner (1889-1966) who was a Swiss Theologian. Brunner also denied the verbal, plenary inspiration of the Scriptures. However, He recognized the validity of general revelation. Like Barth, Brunner

emphasized experience, as a focal point of knowing God instead of finding out what God was like through the Bible and statements of theology. However, we can be sure that we must depend upon the Bible or the specific revelation of God's being or person in order to discover what God is like. The Bible teaches us that God is loving (John 3:16), God is holy (1 Peter 1:15; Heb. 12:29), God is just (Rev. 15:3), God is merciful (Lamentations 3:22-23) God is spirit (John 4:24) and God is full of wrath against sin (Romans 2:5). You cannot find out what God is like without getting into the Word and discovering who He really is and what He is like. Only then can God's life become meaningful to you in your everyday walk in life. Without the accurate statements of Scripture, we cannot truly know who God is and experience the wonder of His person in our life. To know God means to know what He is like and then meditate upon His greatness and glory.

Psalm 63:6

"When I remember thee upon my bed, *and* meditate on thee in the *night* watches."

Psalm 77:12

"I will meditate also of all thy work, and talk of thy doings."

Brunner also denied the virgin birth and a literal hell. He also declared that man is a sinner not because of an inherited sin nature, but because he chooses to sin. This runs contrary to Scripture (Romans 5:12). Brunner's definition of sin was simply self-centeredness instead of the breaking of God's holy law.

1 John 3:4 says:

"Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law: for sin is the transgression of the law."

Brunner also said that the only way one could overcome sin was to have a personal encounter with Christ. This was something other than belief or faith in Christ for salvation. Brunner was a prolific writer and a popular theologian and speaker in Great Britain, America and Japan.

Reinhold Niebuhr (1892-1971) was a Lutheran professor at Union Theological Seminary and became another leading pioneer in Neo-Orthodoxy. His main emphasis was that doctrines were only important or significant as they relate to man's social conditions and needs. Niebuhr abandoned the "moral utopianism" of the old liberalism and replaced it with "Christian Realism" which was the attempt to bring about change to that which was realistically possible. He said that sin was more social than spiritual and that evangelistic appeal should be with the view of converting the social problems of society, not individuals. Of course, this is simply an old rehashing of liberal ideas. Richard Niebuhr was the brother of Reinhold. He followed closely in the footsteps of his brother.

Paul Tillich (1886-1965) was the professor in four liberal colleges and the American interpreter of Karl Barth. He was called the “theologian of the theologian.” His writings are not easy reading in any sense of the word. *He also attached new meanings to biblical words.* Tillich approached God on a philosophical level rather than a theological level. He was more of a philosopher than theologian. He did not view God as a personal being but as “being itself.” He denied the account of creation and the fall of man. In the fall man became simply estranged from himself. The idea of sin to Tillich was the disruption of man’s essential unity with God. Tillich did not express salvation in the traditional understanding of terms. His teaching was that salvation was to find oneself again or his “essential being.” Man is to look in hope to Christ to rescue him from this loss of being. Salvation would come to man not through Christ’s death on the cross but through *concern* for Christ. To Tillich, Christ was not a historical person but only “a symbol of the New Being” that people are trying to dissolve their unity back into through the course of time. Tillich rejected the person, incarnation and the resurrection of Christ.

The Episcopal liberal A.T. Robinson (born in 1919) was also a pioneer in Neo-Orthodoxy. He did not believe in the traditional theological language about God. He rejected the traditional arguments for God’s existence and the idea that God is Sovereign. He did not believe that God was a self-existent God and suggested that the term God could be used interchangeably with the term universe. He rejected God’s personal being, transcendence and self-existence. He thus adopted a pantheistic view of God or that God’s being is everything in the universe. His concept of salvation was that man needed to be brought into one with the “Ground of his being.” Once again, many old terms were used with different meanings. These so-called theologians wanted to stress a new awareness of God but explained God in different ways and as a non-rational being.

Dietrich Bonhoeffer (1906-1945) was also indebted to Karl Barth for his teaching. Bonhoeffer was a Lutheran pastor and German theologian who resisted Nazi evils during World War II. He was eventually executed at the age of 39 as a war criminal in a German concentration camp. He stressed personal encounter with Christ and discipleship. He coined the phrase “cheap grace” which is used today in circles that promote salvation by grace alone. In classic New-Orthodoxy fashion, there was a new stress on experiencing God in some way instead of having no help from God. Bonhoeffer spoke of Jesus as “being there for others.” And yet, strangely enough, Bonhoeffer emphasized man’s independence of God and man’s own quest to deal with himself “without any recourse in the working hypothesis called God.” This suggests that Bonhoeffer may have rejected God as a real person and did not see Christ as related to God. Christ was man’s great helper but He was not God. His theology formed the basis for the “God is dead” movement which would later come to fruition in the sixties.

Bonhoeffer also stressed the need for secular help in society and did not separate the secular from the sacred. He always saw the secular or social concerns as part of man's sacred duty. He called this "Religionless Christianity." Christianity was not to focus on religious issues but the issues of helping man. And this help was a form of what Jesus pointed out as true discipleship. Many today within the church are quoting Bonhoeffer and other philosophers such as Soren Kierkegaard. They are getting comfortable with the writers of Neo-Orthodoxy concepts. We must beware of such a trend as this. One can go into the average Christian bookstore today and find books by these men, which will contain their subtle errors. The church is treading on dangerous ground when they start reading the philosophical and New-Orthodoxy claims of writers.

Dietrich Bonhoeffer said:

"God confronts people not in the old process of repentance, faith, conversion, regeneration and sanctification, but in new exciting ways."

What we need to do is get back to the Scriptures and what Christ has said. We need to have a new love for the bare Word of God. Paul during his imprisonment asked Timothy to bring the Scriptures so that he could read them. He emphasized the Scriptures over the books and this is what we need to do today.

2 Timothy 4:13

"The cloke that I left at Troas with Carpus, when thou comest, bring *with thee*, and the books, *but* especially the parchments."

This so-called New-Orthodoxy claimed to return to more of a modified form of orthodox doctrines instead of the old liberal abandonment or rejection of doctrines. In the minds of others, it was new (the prefix "neo") in the sense that new philosophical principles were to be used to help attain an accurate view of Scripture. The fact of the matter is this. ***New-Orthodoxy was neither new nor orthodox in its teachings. It simply used sophisticated and philosophical terms to restate old liberal beliefs.*** It still rejected many of the literal facts of the Bible, the trinity and deity of Christ and the inspiration of the Bible.

We must be careful about those movements and men who try to use the same terms but different definitions of those terms in order to teach the same old error. The fact that Neo-Orthodoxy uses Bible terminology has deceived many. *They fail to see that while the neo-orthodox theologian will sometimes use the fundamentalist's terminology, he uses the modernist's dictionary.* In other words, they may have the same terms but use a different dictionary. Some liberal theologians today will even use the words "inspired" and "infallible" when talking about the Bible but assign altogether different meanings to these terms instead of the fundamental meanings from Scripture. The

flowery speech and new terminology still produced the same old modernism. New-Orthodoxy teachers were like those false teachers mentioned in the Bible.

Romans 16:18 says:

“For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple.”

The word “fair” means that their speaking is highly polished and full of elegance. They attract many by their fancy words and rhetoric. So it was with Neo-Orthodox teachers. Their sophisticated words and philosophical teaching was designed to catch the attention of evangelicals and win them over into the camp of modernism. Fancy speaking has always been a way for the devil to deceive people. Many fall for sophisticated words and find a type of fascination in listening to new terms and ideas. This was the case with Paul the apostle when he came to Athens.

Acts 17:20-21

“For thou bringest certain strange things to our ears: we would know therefore what these things mean. (For all the Athenians and strangers which were there spent their time in nothing else, but either to tell, or to hear some new thing.)”

This movement of New-Orthodoxy emphasized experience or **existentialism** over truth (crisis theology). This underlying existentialistic thought taught that present day experience was all-important and more meaningful than doctrine or Biblical teaching. This teaching was a spin off from the existential teaching of the Danish philosopher Soren Kierkegaard who actually invented this theory of existentialism. He denounced the old orthodox way of expressing truth in creeds. He taught that life is not believing doctrines but experiencing God. It was more important to take what he called a “leap of faith” to discover God because God was transcendent and could not be known objectively. He must be known through an experience of some kind, which alone could give meaning to life. This is exactly what Karl Barth taught about knowing God.

Existentialism simply says that man is an autonomous or free being (human freedom) so that he can do as he pleases. In this system of thought, God Himself is what you make Him out to be. *Experience is all-important and not creeds, doctrines or Biblical facts.* All existence is in an experience and experience is what is important in life. Experience gives meaning to life and becomes truth to you and for you. And experience is how you get to know God.

This philosophy is outlandishly untrue as we investigate the Bible. The Bible clearly says that experience is not the most important matter in life. It is our **relationship** with the Lord and our service to Him that is most important.

Philippians 1:21 says:

“For to me to live *is* Christ, and to die *is* gain.”

The most important thing in life for the born again believer is Christ. We are to love Christ, live for Christ and worship Christ. Our life is not to revolve around some kind of experience that seems pleasing to the flesh but around the person of Christ. We are not to strive to get out of life what we want but what Christ wants. Jesus taught that our life is to be one of sacrifice and surrender to whatever pleases Him.

Luke 14:26-27

“If any *man* come to me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple. And whosoever doth not bear his cross, and come after me, cannot be my disciple.”

It is not a crisis experience but the cross that is most important in life! It is surrender and sacrifice to Christ that is most important in life and not your own personal experiences that bring meaning and satisfaction to your life. Solomon observed that all of the worldly experiences of life that he went through were nothing more than vanity!

Ecclesiastes 1:2

“Vanity of vanities, saith the Preacher, vanity of vanities; all *is* vanity.”

Ecclesiastes 2:11 goes on to say:

“Then I looked on all the works that my hands had wrought, and on the labour that I had laboured to do: and, behold, all *was* vanity and vexation of spirit, and *there was* no profit under the sun.”

This type of existentialistic or experiential thinking leads to **pragmatism** which basically says, “If it works, do it. What experience pleases you is right for you.” Pragmatism concludes that the things that are of value are the things that work or satisfy me. *A thing becomes true if it brings results or works. Man and his situations are the basis of his values, ethics and even morals. Truth is relative.* This is the inevitable result of this type of teaching. New-Orthodoxy tried to make God more personable to people but in doing so it advocated a god of personal crisis and experience instead of a god who advocates holiness and clear written moral codes and commands (Exodus 20:1-17).

There were those New Orthodoxy theologians such as Barth and Brunner who went back to teaching the importance of a *transcendent God* or a God who was different and separate from mankind. This counteracted the old liberal teaching that downplayed God’s person. Old Liberalism taught the *immanence of God* or that God is similar to human beings in every way. The old liberal idea was that God was merely a human

extension of themselves. With the new teaching of New-Orthodoxy, God was once again seen to be infinite and man finite. Barth spoke of God as the “Wholly Other” but refused to believe that God was another being and that Jesus Christ was God Himself. New-Orthodoxy rejected all of the Trinitarian and Christological creeds about God. New-Orthodoxy taught that God is “wholly other” than man and that God cared about people and wanted to be involved with the social affairs of mankind.

New Orthodoxy rejected Adam’s fall and the creation account and stressed the liberal teaching of the social welfare of people instead of their salvation from hell. ***New Orthodoxy tried to be a theological position halfway between orthodoxy and Liberalism.*** Nonetheless, this movement is simply the old liberalism in a new disguise with confusing terminology. It attempted to keep the message of the Bible while denying the facts and inspiration of the Bible. ***This position is nothing more than a theological hoax. It is neither “new” nor “orthodox.”***

Whereas the old modernism blatantly denied the Bible as the Word of God, neo-orthodoxy professed to believe in inspiration, but gave that biblical term an unbiblical meaning by suggesting that inspiration did not refer to the Scriptures per se but to the subjective experience (inspiration) one received as the Bible was read, even as one would be inspired by reading the writings of Milton or Shakespeare. *In other words, the Bible can become inspired to us only as we are inspired by it.*

Karl Barth said:

“The Bible is God’s Word so far as He lets it be His Word.”

As we have said already, the central teaching of various New-Orthodoxy writers is upon the transcendence of God, which basically means that God is different than mankind and is actively working in every detail of the world and human history. However, the Neo-Orthodoxy catch is that God works and speaks in all the events of the world and not just in the Bible. *Therefore, since God is present in all that happens, there can be no distinction between the natural and supernatural or between science or revelation as seen in the Bible. In fact, the distinctions between what is sin and what is not sin are blurred.* The idea of New-Orthodoxy is that God’s divine presence can be seen in every work and happening. Therefore, you cannot deny the evolutionary science and other rational thinking. You cannot deny the laws of nature, which God has established. Likewise, since God is involved in the natural process of all things, there can be no miracles. In addition, since God is working in all of human history, He is working in all religions. There is a universal religious tie with every religion in the entire world because God is transcendent or working in connection with all things.

The Bible teaches that God is sovereign, but it does not teach that He is the direct cause of all religions. It does not teach that He approves of all religions and ideas because He is involved in the events of the world and history. *In other words, God is*

not the instigator of human reasoning and world religions simply because He reigns as the sovereign God. The Bible teaches that man goes his own way and departs from God with his own vain imaginations and reasoning.

Romans 1:21

“Because that, when they knew God, they glorified *him* not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened.”

Romans 1:24-25

“Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness through the lusts of their own hearts, to dishonour their own bodies between themselves: Who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed for ever. Amen.”

The Bible clearly reveals that human reasoning is not the result of God. God placed the right reasoning in the mind of humanity but they willfully rejected this intuitive reasoning and invented their own ideas such as evolutionary thought and unnatural sexual relations. *The reasoning of man cannot be blamed on the immanence of God or God's involvement in society.* Man creates his own world views and ideas based upon his rejection of God's views as seen in the Bible and placed upon his heart. God in His sovereignty makes things happen but He also allows things to happen.

The basic summary of teachings in the movement would be as follows:

1. The Bible is not to be considered the word of God through direct revelation. It only *becomes* the Word of God as it fits into your experience of life and inspires your own life. The Bible simply *becomes* the Word of God as it fits into your experience in life.
2. The events of Scripture, such as the resurrection and creation accounts, are passed down stories by the early church. They are myths or sagas that cannot be taken literally.

The system of Neo-Orthodoxy downplays the historical events of the Bible and the Biblical events of Scripture. Their zeal for subjective experiences with Christ cause them to ignore the truths based upon historical accuracy. ***But Christianity is based on historical facts!***

1 Corinthians 15:3-4 says:

“For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; And that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures.”

This is an historical fact verified by Biblical truth and accuracy. To deny this is to deny the Bible and the whole basis of Christianity. Because of these accurate historical facts, our faith does not need to be some dark leap into the unknown, but a trust or reliance in the person and work of Christ.

3. The most important thing in life is a crisis experience with Jesus Christ. This is the only way that man can know God. A sharp distinction exists between man and God. This experience to know God is like a "leap of faith" whereby a person can come to know God through some kind of crisis in their life (crisis theology). This is also known as the "theology of despair" because in one's despair of life they could have a leap of faith and encounter the person of God who will help them in life. The *subjective experience* of God was stressed instead of the objective proof of His existence.

The Bible says that we do not come to know God in some kind of crisis experience. The Scriptures teach that we come to know God only when we pass through the instantaneous event called the new birth. I am reminded of what Jesus said to Nicodemus.

John 3:3-7

Jesus answered and said unto him, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God. Nicodemus saith unto him, How can a man be born when he is old? can he enter the second time into his mother's womb, and be born? Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. ⁷Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again.

Man does not need an experience with God. He needs a new birth from God! He needs to have his inner spirit regenerated so he can fellowship with God. Man does not fellowship with God through some kind of crisis experience; he fellowships with God through the new birth. Man needs a recreation. He needs to be brought back to God through the new birth in order to meet with God and fellowship with Him as Adam did in his original state of innocence in the Garden.

1. Faith is not believing in a set of doctrines or believing on Christ. This is unimportant. Faith is a commitment of ones life to God through experiencing His presence. *Salvation is a "leap of faith" in the dark unknown, hoping God will be there in your time of crisis* .Man strives to become a Christian through his subjective experience with God but never becomes a Christian through objective truth of faith in Christ for salvation. But what does the Bible say?

Acts 16:31

“...Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved...”

The Bible also teaches that God will always meet His children in the time of crisis and need. It is not a matter of hoping that God will meet us in the days of darkness. He will meet us! He will be there.

Psalms 46:1

“God *is* our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble.”

New-Orthodoxy was viewed as a middle of the road position between modernism and evangelicalism. The problem is that this stance did not satisfy either the old-line liberals or conservatives. It was not appealing to either side. Nonetheless, it seemed to be somewhat appealing to the middle of the road New Evangelicals that were about to ignite their own movement. *Today Neo-Orthodoxy existentialism and their skepticism toward the inspiration of Scriptures are hidden behind the mask of New Evangelicalism.* The emergence of New-Orthodoxy and continual affects of Neo-Orthodoxy cannot be overlooked in the battle, which Fundamentalists fought with this new liberalism or modernism in disguise.

(Neo) New-Evangelicalism

It was at this point that there came yet another division within the church - that of New-Evangelicalism. This movement was much more subtle and dangerous than Neo-Orthodoxy. It was once again a move away from traditional or old evangelicalism or old orthodoxy, which called for separation from all apostasy and worldly practices. *The name “New Evangelical” implies dissatisfaction with the traditional and historical concept of evangelical Christianity.* There was that younger group of believers who wanted to ride the fence and be middle-of-the road Christians. They wanted to remain in the denominations and try to recapture them even after the apostasy had totally devastated them. There were also those younger evangelicals among the fundamentalists who were also tired of the unkind and ungracious actions that some fundamentalists had against one another. Fundamentalists must admit that some of the antics of fundamentalists were embarrassing. This set the stage for a softer and broader position among the evangelical Christians. However, we must remember to never reject a scriptural position just because some people holding the position have proven to be an embarrassment to the cause. One does not stop eating steak just because you purchase one tough or bad steak.

In addition to this, the scholarly men of Fundamentalism were not being recognized by the scholarly world as a whole. Therefore, the schoolmen and scholars began to enroll in liberal schools so that they could gain more popularity, recognition and acceptance. They wanted to have their articles and books published by more respectable

companies so they could be seen to be authentic scholars. This was a matter of pride with these younger fundamentalists who wanted to become preachers. Paul warns about young men becoming inflated with pride.

1 Timothy 3:6

“Not a novice, lest being lifted up with pride he fall into the condemnation of the devil.”

The fundamentalists were also constantly being harassed by the liberal crowd for being too negative and not positive. Dogmatism was becoming a hated concept. Also, the liberals kept pounding away at the fundamentalists lack of love for social reform and for the poor and the needy of the country. There was also their denominational pension programs which they would lose if they left the fold of denominationalism. This was too great a price for some to pay. Then too, there was the added respect one was pressured to maintain by staying in the denomination. There was a sense of loyalty to the denomination and their position. *But respect, loyalty and position in the eyes of the apostates and the world means absolutely nothing to God.* Since when is God concerned about your accepted position within society? God is concerned about your faithfulness and your walk with Him. God is not concerned about your status or acceptance in a society that is bent and warped in their knowledge and thinking about God. We must remember the life of Enoch at this point. Enoch walked with God without the approval of the surrounding world.

Genesis 5:22

“And Enoch walked with God after he begat Methuselah three hundred years, and begat sons and daughters.”

Genesis 5:24

“And Enoch walked with God: and he was not; for God took him.”

Noah also walked with God in spite of those who would think he was strange or square for building an ark on an earth where it had not previously rained. Noah walked with God in that He obeyed God wholeheartedly even when the opposition was against him. It always pays to walk with God by doing what is right. The fundamentalists should have continued to walk with God by following the truth about separation, but instead they chose to give in to the pressures of a godless society and desired social acceptance with them. They were too embarrassed to carry the cross of sacrifice and persecution!

Jesus said in Luke 14:27:

“And whosoever doth not bear his cross, and come after me, cannot be my disciple.” People carrying crosses today are not popular. A cross means persecution and alienation. A cross means that you will stand alone at times even as Christ was alone. Those who want to identify with the liberals and repudiate the doctrine of separation do

not want to carry the cross of persecution for standing up for the truth and they surely do not want to be persecuted for being different or for being a fundamentalist. But what did Jesus say about the world's reactions to our lifestyle and stand for absolute holiness and truth?

John 15:18-19

“If the world hate you, ye know that *it hated* me before it hated you. If ye were of the world, the world would love his own: but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you.”

The fundamentalists who stayed in the denominations did not want to be called “Bible thumpers,” Bible bashers,” and “red-necked bigots.” They wanted the denominations with their scholarly liberals to accept them. They wanted to make the fundamentalist church more modern, up-to-date and relevant to society or culture without forsaking the time-honored doctrines of the Bible. The problem is this. *You cannot up-date Christianity without up-dating truth because truth and Christian living go hand in hand.* Biblical truth such as separation effects the way that we live and the decisions we make in life. In order to try and up-date Fundamentalist Christianity the New Evangelicals had to dress up the Christian faith by compromising truth instead of suffering the harassment and persecution for Christ and truth. But Hebrews 11:37 talks about those believers who took a stand against the opposition in spite of the repercussions that they faced from them.

“They were stoned, they were sawn asunder, were tempted, were slain with the sword: they wandered about in sheepskins and goatskins; being destitute, afflicted, tormented;.”

It's a terrible thing to try and shape the absolute truth of the Bible into a system that will be viewed by the ungodly world as acceptable and respectable. This is a terrible twist on the Scriptures and only shows how cowardly Christians can be. The Bible says that we will be the savour of death to the unsaved and not a positive light to them in their rejection of Christ and eternal truth.

2 Corinthians 2:15-16 says:

“For we are unto God a sweet savour of Christ, in them that are saved, and in them that perish: To the one *we are* the savour of death unto death; and to the other the savour of life unto life. And who *is* sufficient for these things?”

John the Baptist was a “voice crying in the wilderness” when it came to introducing Jesus to the nation of Israel which had become spiritually corrupted over the years.

John 1:23

“He said, I *am* the voice of one crying in the wilderness, Make straight the way of the Lord, as said the prophet Esaias.”

Sometimes believers, who try to maintain a true doctrinal position, will feel like they are alone in the wilderness of rejection. They will not feel accepted by the vast majority. One young New Evangelical said to me, “Do you realize the odds that you are against?” It is true that the vast number in the church have moved to the New Evangelical position. But that does not mean we should move in their direction. We must remain out in the wilderness of scorn and New Evangelical rejection if this is what it takes. We must stand in the vast desert alone knowing that God will reward us for our faithful stand against error and those who promote it.

D.M. Panton said:

“To identify oneself with the truth is to place one’s self in the heart of a storm from which there is no escape for your life.”

New Evangelicals have become like the children of Ephraim. They have given up the fight. They have surrendered to the enemy.

Psalm 78:9 says:

“The children of Ephraim, *being* armed, *and* carrying bows, turned back in the day of battle.”

We must remember that the church is “the pillar and ground of the truth” (1 Timothy 3:15). Because of this, we must be ready to “war a good warfare” (1 Timothy 1:18) and fight the “good fight of faith” (2 Timothy 4:7). We must always be ready to “fight with beasts” (1 Corinthians 15:32). We must be a good soldier (2 Timothy 2:3). ***The bugle sound is not one of retreat but charge!*** New Evangelicalism is sounding forth a different bugle call that is taking Christians out of the battle for truth and error.

1 Corinthians 14:8 says:

“For if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?”

The trumpet sound of New Evangelicalism is giving an uncertain sound. It is not the sound of battle that is being heard today in the New Evangelical ranks. It is the sound of retreat. It was a sad day when these once fundamentalist Christians began to worry about their social acceptance in society and whether or not they were looked upon as scholars among the liberal world of the day. *We must remember that it does not matter what man thinks about us. In the final analysis, it only matters what God thinks about us for we are accountable to Him.* Whether or not man accepts us is not the issue. The issue is this. Is God pleased with my life and my testimony for him? Have I been living a holy and acceptable life before God by demonstrating an uncompromising stand on truth and in my manner of living?

For all of these stated reasons above, the once fundamentalist Christians began to develop this new mood of infiltration and cooperation with the enemy. This led to the deterioration of their strong doctrinal stance. In short, their doctrinal positions became weak and flexible. Today they are talking about “revisionist theology” instead of “confessional theology” or the old historical theology of the church. The new wave of Evangelicals that started stressed friendliness with liberalism instead of separation from all apostasy. The name “new” also has a new warm and flexible sound attached to it. And that is what the New Evangelical wants. The name is nonoffensive.

It would be safe to say that the New Evangelical Christians did not want to feel left out of society and be looked upon as someone who was less than scholarly and not concerned about humanitarian efforts. They wanted society to see them as a different type of breed of Christian than the previous generation of fundamentalists. Therefore, they began to make adjustments to gain acceptance and credibility with society and the liberal denominations by repudiating the doctrine of Biblical separation.

The founding father of New Evangelicalism, Harold Ockenga, has said:
“The New Evangelical has changed his strategy from one of separation to one of infiltration.”

Where did Harold Ockenga and the other New Evangelicals get the authority to do such a thing? They did not get it from the clear-cut teaching of the Word of God.

Ephesians 5:11 says:
“And have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove *them*.”

2 Corinthians 6:14-17 says:
“Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel? And what agreement hath the temple of God with idols? for ye are the temple of the living God; as God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in *them*; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean *thing*; and I will receive you.”

The New Evangelical says, “Go in” but God says, “Come out.” Who will you believe? You will have to choose which authority to accept.

The New Evangelical Christians decided to sign a peace pact with the devil and stop fighting for the truth. In their opinion, the New-Evangelical believers wanted to achieve respectability for evangelicalism or orthodoxy. Instead of evangelicalism having a Fundamentalist and militant attitude about doctrine and separation from

apostasy, New-Evangelicalism wanted to stress cooperation and dialogue with liberals and increase their intellectual pursuits along with liberals. ***In many ways, New-Evangelicalism was born as a reactionary movement to Fundamentalism.*** They considered Fundamentalism as having a critical attitude that was not God honoring. So in the later 1940's and 50's we see a group of believers banding together to form this Neo or New-Evangelical community. They did not want to be called liberal or a Fundamentalist. They wanted to be called a New Evangelical or someone who took a middle-of-the-road position. This position blurred the historic battle lines between Fundamentalism and Liberalism and confused the real issues of separation and purity in doctrine. The New-Evangelicals would be middle-of-the road believers who would not take the bold and courageous stand against liberalism. They wanted to find a happy medium between the two groups. They wanted to remain fundamental in what they called key doctrines without being so harsh and separated from the liberal enemies. In reality, they wanted to be divided in their opinions and stance. They should have been reminded about Elijah's question, which dealt with making up your mind and taking a stand.

1 Kings 18:21 says:

“And Elijah came unto all the people, and said, **How long halt ye between two opinions?** if the **LORD** be God, follow him: but if Baal, *then* follow him. And the people answered him not a word.”

W. B. Riley was the fundamentalist leader and long time pastor of the First Baptist Church of Minneapolis. He was speaking about Israel's enemies such as the Jubsites, Hivites and the Amakelites (Exodus 3:8). He then sorted out other dangerous “ites” mentioned in the Scripture. Then he proceeded to say that the most dangerous “ites” are the “in-betweenites.” These are the folks who straddle every issue and try to remain in between. This is a good way to view New-Evangelicals. They like to straddle the issues and go in-between on many issues. Are you an “in-between” ite?

Dr. Bob Jones Sr. has likened the New Evangelical man to a soldier in the civil War who tried to save his neck by wearing a Confederate jacket and Union pants at the same time. The Yankees fired at his jacket and the Rebels shot at his legs. It does not pay to compromise.

The liberals were watching what began to take shape within fundamentalism. And in their own liberal writings they spoke about the new mood within the ranks of fundamentalists and began to talk about the new younger attitudes of the new generation of fundamentalists who had not engaged in the battles of the past. The liberal magazine called “The Christian Century” said:

“A new generation of earnest intellectuals is appearing within the ranks of avowedly fundamentalist groups and educational institutions. These thinkers do not personally

bear the battle scars which marked the leaders who engaged in the earlier and futile fight to halt modernism...They are able to view other kinds of theology objectively and appreciatively that their predecessors did... A new flexibility is developing in their (fundamentalists) restatement of Protestant orthodoxy and with it a capacity to make their case in terms more *sensitive* to the integrity of the modern mind.”

How sad it really is when the enemy starts to see that the opposition is beginning to put away their guns and ammunition so as to talk about peace. The modernistic enemies knew when the fundamentalists were beginning to weaken. They could see that some of the fundamentalists would no longer would cup the water in their hands to drink it but would bend over to drink the water without much concern about the enemies' presence.

Judges 7:5-7 says:

“So he brought down the people unto the water: and the LORD said unto Gideon, Every one that lappeth of the water with his tongue, as a dog lappeth, him shalt thou set by himself; likewise every one that boweth down upon his knees to drink. And the number of them that lapped, *putting* their hand to their mouth, were three hundred men: but all the rest of the people bowed down upon their knees to drink water. And the LORD said unto Gideon, By the three hundred men that lapped will I save you, and deliver the Midianites into thine hand: and let all the *other* people go every man unto his place.

God said to the great warrior Gideon that He would choose only those men that cupped the water in their hand when they drank. Some writers have suggested that a “non-kneeler” scooped the water up in one hand (holding his weapon in the other) from which he lapped the water with his tongue. This act demonstrated their alertness to the enemies presence and their readiness for war. The others who bent down to drink the water like a dog were not careful and alert, as they should be. In a similar fashion, the modernists looked within the fundamentalist camps and began to see fundamentalists lapping up the water like the dogs. They began to see carelessness on their part and that they were not as alarmed about the presence of the liberals as they used to be. This left the door wide open for the enemy to make his move. What an analogy this is to the day in which we live. The modern evangelical church is seen to be crouched down by the water carelessly drinking in the water without keeping an eye on what the enemy is really doing within the ranks of evangelicalism. The New Evangelical believers are notorious for drinking water without any alarm about the enemy. They have put down their sword and have been steadily drinking without any sense of awareness of the enemy in their ranks.

It is important to understand that the original New Evangelical believers that stayed in the denominations wanted to remain sound in their doctrines but did not agree with the principle of Biblical separation. However, they forgot that separation is a doctrine or teaching of Scripture as well. Up to the time of 1950 the term "evangelical" generally

referred to those who preached the necessity of the new birth through faith in the Blood of Jesus Christ and who stood firmly for the pure doctrine of the Scriptures. *In other words, the term “evangelical” always referred to obedient, Bible-believing separated and holy Christianity. In 1948 there arose a group Christians who claimed the title “evangelical” but who refused to obey some of the teachings of Scripture, especially the doctrine of separation.* These people began to be called "new-evangelical." ***They are “new” in the sense that they want to be different than the old orthodox, evangelical and fighting fundamentalists. They wanted to update the old Evangelical doctrine and practice of separation.***

Sadly, evangelicalism is no longer a term which can be used for the strong and fundamental defense of the New Testament faith. *A generation of evangelicals has arisen that is not willing to stand on truth or the Biblical tenets of separation and who blindly are following their leaders of compromise.* The term “evangelical” can no longer be worn by fundamentalists. It is used today in a very broad sense so that just about any person can be called an evangelical. The term has become *flexible* to accommodate many people and allow them to fit under the umbrella of this word “evangelical.”

Car F. Henry said:

“An evangelical is one who believes in the evangel and whose life is governed by the scriptural revelation of God and His purposes.”

This is a very broad definition of evangelicalism, which could include those people who do not believe in the inspiration or inerrancy of Scripture or hold to the great doctrines of the Bible. The term has been reworked or formulated with this thought in mind. Modern or young (green grass) evangelicals of this generation have removed the doctrinal landmarks and knocked down the theological fences, which were carefully set up by those evangelicals who previously fought the battles against liberalism. ***The newer evangelicals have now redefined this term “evangelical” so the true separated fundamentalists can no longer claim the title and associate with the modern evangelical movement.*** *The term evangelical is now always associated with the New Evangelicals and their movement of infiltration with apostasy and their promotion of a Christian freedom that is contrary to the doctrine of holy separation.*

Even Ockenga stated:

“Neo or New Evangelical has been abbreviated to Evangelical.”

This means that the term evangelical now sails under the disguise of New Evangelicalism. The word “evangelical” actually comes from the Greek word, which means gospel or “good news.” Historically, the term describes those who hold that man is a lost sinner and is in need of the Gospel of salvation. However, generically the term has grown to mean all those religious groups, who claim to accept orthodox doctrines

of Scripture, emphasize the authority of Scripture and hold to the Gospel message. The emphasis upon the word evangelical has grown to mean those who hold to orthodox doctrines. Evangelical was a term used historically to denote those who accept Biblical authority as over against those who reject or question it.

We must also understand that during Fundamentalism's history and before 1950, the term's evangelical and fundamentalist were used interchangeably. The fundamentalist were all those who were evangelical in their doctrine and who held to both the high standard of holiness in both doctrine and living. The term evangelical always referred to those who upheld doctrinal purity and personal purity and holiness of living. The two (doctrine and practice) were not disassociated. Today, this is no longer the case.

It is true that all fundamentalists are evangelical or conservative in their doctrine, but not all evangelicals can be considered fundamentalists or separatists any longer, due to their compromise with movements that embrace unholy doctrine and practices.

The term "New-Evangelicalism" was coined in the 1940s to define a new type of evangelicalism and to distinguish it from those who had heretofore born that label. The author of the term was either Harold Ockenga (1905-1985) or John Alexander MacKay (1889-1983). Ockenga, who claimed to have first used the term in 1948, had a phenomenal influence upon today's evangelicalism. He was the founder of the National Association of Evangelicals, co-founder and one-time president of Fuller Theological Seminary, first president of the World Evangelical Fellowship, a director of the Billy Graham Evangelistic Association, and chairman of the board and one-time editor of Christianity Today. In the foreword to Dr. Harold Lindsell's book, *The Battle for the Bible*, Ockenga stated the position of new-evangelicalism:

"Neo-Evangelicalism was born in 1948 in connection with a convocation address, which I gave in the Civic Auditorium in Pasadena. While reaffirming the theological view of fundamentalism, this address repudiated its ecclesiology and its social theory. The ringing call for a repudiation of separatism and the summons to social involvement received a hearty response from many evangelicals ... It differed from fundamentalism in its repudiation of separatism and its determination to engage itself in the theological dialogue of the day. It had a new emphasis upon the application of the gospel to the sociological, political, and economic areas of life."

Baptist fundamentalist leader Monroe Parker claims that the term was used earlier than this, in 1945:

"...in 1945, I was doing summer school work at Princeton Theological Seminary. The late Dr. John MacKay, then president of the seminary, returned from Amsterdam where he had helped to lay the foundation for the World Council of Churches. He gathered

the faculty and students of the seminary on the campus. Dr. MacKay stood on the steps of Miller Hall and spoke on the ecumenical movement. He said that several great denominations were coming together, that the Roman Catholics would be observing, that the Greek Catholics would join, and that the Pentecostals would likely join. 'But,' he said, 'we are going to need the evangelicals.' He also said, 'There must be a neo-evangelicalism.' He then delineated what the characteristics of the so-called 'neo-evangelicalism' must be. Dr. Ockenga in that convocation speech at Fuller Theological Seminary three years later also delineated what this neo-evangelicalism must be. They were almost identical to the things Dr. MacKay had delineated and that other liberals were saying at that time."

Regardless of exactly by whom and when the term was coined, it is clear that a new generation of evangelicals arose which was determined to abandon a militant Bible stance. They wanted to be middle-of-the-roaders between liberalism and fundamentalist actions against liberals. *This is why this movement of New Evangelicalism is greatest enemy of Fundamentalism that has ever emerged.* It is a movement that tries to straddle the line and have one foot in both the evangelical and liberal camps. It reminds me of a man in a circus who was walking across a tightrope trying to balance himself on the middle of the rope while swaying from side to side. God hates middle of the road Christian living. He wants us to choose sides and make a stand for right or wrong.

Joshua 23:14-15

"And, behold, this day I *am* going the way of all the earth: and ye know in all your hearts and in all your souls, that not one thing hath failed of all the good things which the LORD your God spake concerning you; all are come to pass unto you, *and* not one thing hath failed thereof. Therefore it shall come to pass, *that* as all good things are come upon you, which the LORD your God promised you; so shall the LORD bring upon you all evil things, until he have destroyed you from off this good land which the LORD your God hath given you."

God wants us to hate the evil of false doctrinal teaching and not promote it any way or fashion by our fellowships and religious interests with the enemy.

Amos 5:15 says:

"Hate the evil, and love the good, and establish judgment in the gate: it may be that the LORD God of hosts will be gracious unto the remnant of Joseph."

For some people, this New Evangelical movement was not originally seen to be a threat to Fundamentalism. Much thought that Fundamentalism was simply going to take on a new label as it began to raise young intellectuals for the cause of Fundamentalism. Many did not see this movement as a threat to historic Fundamentalism. It was not seen to be a serious defection from Fundamentalism.

They merely saw it as an upgrading and a refinement with more scholarly support and interest. ***Little did they realize that a movement was being born that would change the face of the church forever and its militant stand against error, apostasy and unholy practices.***

The breeding ground for this movement was Fuller Theological Seminary in Pasadena California. Many figured that Fuller Seminary could never produce a movement contrary to Fundamentalism since it bore the name of one man who was a strong Fundamentalist. Charles Fuller was known by everyone as a strong Fundamentalist with his widely acclaimed radio program, "The Old Fashioned Revival Hour" which remained true to Gospel preaching and Bible teaching since 1925. The faculty of Fuller Seminary was known for its academic credentials and scholarly men such as Wilber Smith, Carl F. Henry and Charles Woodbridge. Its first president was Harold Ockenga. It began in 1947 as a school supporting Fundamentalism. Fuller produced warmhearted evangelists and pastors. All looked promising for this Seminary and Fundamentalists saw the seminary as a boost for their cause.

Nonetheless, the tide turned. Harold Ockenga, began to voice new ideas of tolerance, cooperation and humanitarian efforts with other denominations. Some on the faculty, such as Carl F. Henry, bought into this package of compromise that Ockenga had suggested. By 1957 the ideas of this movement were firmly entrenched in Fuller. Charles Woodbridge left the seminary and became a strong voice against Ockenga and his New Evangelical ideas. When Edward Carnell became the president of Fuller in 1955, Charles Woodbridge left in protest as he saw the direction that the Seminary was going. Even Charles Fuller embraced the ideas of the Seminary and became a supporter of New Evangelical ideas before his death in 1968. His son took over the Old Fashioned Revival Hour and renamed it "The joyful Sound." There would be no more talk of "Old Fashioned" Fundamentalism. This was an outdated movement. *The poison had begun to spread in the 1950's until churches, schools and radio stations which once took a Fundamentalist stand against all error, liberal compromise and worldly practices were beginning to allow this New Evangelical thought to permeate their institutions.* The leaven was spreading (1 Cor. 5:6).

William Pettingill saw it spreading in the churches and warned the Bible Schools of the coming wave of compromise: "The Bible Schools have for the most part fought a good fight of faith and kept the faith. They are next in line for Satan's onslaughts and they will be attacked without mercy and without quarter. Keep an eye on the Bible Schools and as you love the truth pray mightily for them that they may be kept true in these days of peril."

Many of the schools or Bible Institutes began to be susceptible to the New Evangelical cancer. They did not continue in the things that they stood for and what they were originally founded upon. They did not obey the principle Paul told Timothy.

2 Timothy 3:13-14

“But evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving, and being deceived. But continue thou in the things which thou hast learned and hast been assured of, knowing of whom thou hast learned *them*.”

If Pettingill were here today he would be saddened and shocked to see his own school, now called Philadelphia College of the Bible, and multitudes of other schools who were once separated and Fundamental schools, departing down the river of New Evangelicalism. The schools did not obey the principle that Paul spoke to Timothy about.

2 Timothy 3:14

“But continue thou in the things which thou hast learned and hast been assured of, knowing of whom thou hast learned *them*.”

The schools did not continue in the teachings of separation that they originally stood for and were founded upon. Instead, they gave in to the current of compromise and began to do away with the teachings against liberalism and association with apostasy.

The New Evangelical movement of compromise has virtually overtaken every area and mainstream of Christianity and has had a devastating effect on separatist Fundamentalism that once reigned as the predominant voice among Christians.

What has happened? What really happened to the church? Why is the church the way it is today? *The answer is that cooperation and contamination took place within the ranks of the church.* The church began to compromise with liberalism and became soft toward unseparated practices throughout the past 50 years. Along with this came the tearing down of the walls of separation and the building of bridges with denominations that are totally apostate themselves and represent liberal trends within their denominational ranks. The poison of compromise began to ignite in the late forties and mushroomed in the 1950's and spread like a prairie fire to this very day and time. ***When looking at the modern church today and the state of Christianity, one can readily see only the charred remains of once Fundamental churches and schools, which used to stand for truth, separation and holiness. The church on a large scale has fully embraced this movement and mood of New Evangelicalism.***

Dr. Horatius Bonar of Scotland, who pulled out of the established church and joined the Free Church in 1843 in an act of obedient separation once said:

“There is some danger in falling into a soft and effeminate Christianity under the plea of a lofty and ethereal (weak, airy, shallow) theology.”

2 Peter 3:17

“Ye therefore, beloved, seeing ye know *these things* before, beware lest ye also, being led away with the error of the wicked, fall from your own stedfastness.”

We can see that a large portion of the church has fallen from their steadfast stand on doctrinal issues and has become as Bonar says, “soft and effeminate.” This is because of the weak doctrine, ecumenical evangelism, cooperation, and worldly practices that have totally inundated the church through New Evangelicalism. Practices such as Christian rock music, the acceptance of charismatic confusion (tongues, visions, baptism of Holy Spirit), psychology and other shoddy theology is widely accepted among the churches today as something which should not be questioned. The acceptance of the Roman Catholicism in the ranks of the true church is yet another result and evidence of the spread of this New Evangelical mood of compromise. The pragmatic philosophy of the “ends justifies the means” is promoted. The attempt to win people with the practices of the world system has been totally swallowed by the mainstream church as they look to giant New Evangelical leaders who set the patterns for all the churches. New Evangelical TV church ministries have become a measuring stick for all the churches. Their influence cannot be underestimated.

Sadly, a generation of believers has arisen which knows nothing of the past and the battles that have been fought to remain separated and pure from apostasy and worldly practices. *The church now has raised a generation of believers who know nothing about Fundamentalism and its stand other than it is some kind of antiquated movement that is legalistic in its approach to Christianity.* We live in a day of great brainwashing! A new younger generation of New Evangelicals has been raised that have taken the teachings of their fathers of New Evangelicalism to their logical conclusions.

Many of the newer or younger Evangelicals have drifted even farther into the compromise with liberalism and the acceptance of error. With the passing of years, the older right wing evangelicals have actually been alarmed at the drifting of the newer left wing evangelicals toward liberalism and a wide acceptance of their theology. This should be no surprise to the older evangelicals since they began to promote the alliance between the two and should have realized where compromise takes a movement over the course of years.

James Hunter has said:

“An unsettled quality pervades the Evangelical world.”

Clark Pinnock said:

“Evangelicals are experiencing the dizzy ferment of theological change they thought only happens to liberals.”

This is the cry of many evangelicals today. One New Evangelical pastor has told me, "We must be open to new ideas." In other words, we must be more innovative in our theological approaches and start to think more like the liberal. The move of the modern or newer evangelicals is leftward toward more liberal theology. ***This is the tragedy of compromise!*** *The present generation strays farther from the truth than the previous generation and the next generation goes even farther until all will be eventually leavened.* We must remember that apostasy always creeps into the church. It does not run into the church and blow its horn on the first day. Jude reminds of the sneaky character of apostasy.

Jude 4

"For there are certain men crept in unawares, who were before of old ordained to this condemnation, ungodly men, turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ.

2 Peter 2:1

"But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily (secretly or craftily) shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction."

Yes, New Evangelicalism is changing. But is change for the better? The Newer Evangelicals are becoming increasingly liberal and tolerant in their theology. This is not a change for the better.

Francis Schaeffer in his book "The Great Evangelical Disaster" has made an interesting observation:

"Within the evangelical circles things are moving rapidly in the direction of what happened fifty years ago in the denominations. Here again we see the great evangelical disaster – the failure of evangelical leadership to take a stand really on anything that would stand decisively over against the relativistic side of our culture."

What one group does the next must imitate or accept in order to "get into the swing of things." This is why the evangelical community keeps sliding farther and farther away from truth and holiness.

Dr. Ernest Pickering has wisely said:

"True, solid, and scriptural theology is not characterized by movement but by stability."

Of course, our stability is the Word of God.

Psalm 119:89 says:

"For ever, O LORD, thy word is settled in heaven."

2 Timothy 1:13 says:

“Hold fast the form of sound words, which thou hast heard of me, in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus.”

Colossians 1:23 reminds us:

“If ye continue in the faith grounded and settled, and *be* not moved away from the hope of the gospel, which ye have heard, *and* which was preached to every creature which is under heaven; whereof I Paul am made a minister.”

We are not to try and change “the faith” which was once and for all delivered unto the saints we are told to defend the faith (Jude 3). We are not to *redevelop* the faith and make it fit into our times and to our culture. We are told to defend that which God has forever settled in heaven (Psalm 119:89). The truth and historic doctrines of the Bible do not need changing! How sad it is when apostasy moves us away from the truth. ***We must also remember that change does not necessarily mean progress!***

One of the founders of this movement, Carl F. Henry, has said:

“The evangelical campuses that surveyed, as a group, do reflect disconcerting theological deterioration...Even on some of the best evangelical campuses, some professors have taught their students that Jesus Christ is not the sole ground of human acceptance by God and the entire human race need not have descended from Adam.”

This is a real concern from one of the founders of the movement. Another founder, Harold Lindsell, who was once a giant figure in the New Evangelical world, said this: “I must regretfully conclude that the term evangelical has become so debased that it has lost its usefulness.”

This is an amazing statement from of the New Evangelical founders. Some of these men realize what has happened since they set the ball rolling downhill. It has been speeding toward total apostasy for the last several generations of New Evangelicals.

The story of New Evangelicalism is a sad one indeed. The younger New Evangelicals who have been raised in the teaching and philosophy of the older New evangelicals have only been taught the philosophy of acceptance and infiltration. They have always practiced unscriptural compromise with error and held to the open acceptance of worldly amusements, which are now considered the norm for Christian living. It is only natural that the original compromise of the Old Evangelicals would eventually produce a terrifying harvest of second and third generation New Evangelicals which are more radical and departing from the truth. I am reminded of what the book of Judges says at a very sad point in the history of Israel. It reminds of the sad days in which we live today within this particular era of the church.

Judges 2:10 says:

“And also all that generation were gathered unto their fathers: and there arose another generation after them, which knew not the LORD, nor yet the works which he had done for Israel.”

One generation strays farther from the truth than the previous generation. I think that there is another generation that has come about within the ranks of God’s people. Some are ignorant out of innocence but many others are willingly ignorant and choose to remain neutral in regards to truth and error. The great masses of the modern church have been the victims of a devilish and strategic plot that has effectively taken the church off of the battle lines. Instead of being properly taught and understanding true Biblical separation, the modern church has swallowed the New Evangelical lie that Fundamentalism is nothing more than unloving Pharisee legalism. This is the siren of New Evangelicalism.

We must remember that legalism and separation are two different animals. To tie the two together is simply a gross misunderstanding of terms and shows negligence and ignorance about New Testament Christianity that is Biblically separated. A legalist is a person who tries to follow laws in order to be saved or accepted by God (see Acts 15:1). Laws themselves do not represent legalism. If we are not going to be conformed to the world (Romans 12:2), then we must make standards and rules, which will keep us from conforming to the world. But the presence of rules and standards within the church or your life is not legalism. **Legalism is not the presence of rules but the wrong attitude toward rules.** Must I obey certain rules in order for God to save me? Absolutely not! Are there rules and standards that I must follow in order to live holy and separate from the world system? The answer to this question is yes.

If I am going to participate in a different manner of living than the world (holiness), then I will most definitely need to have a different set of rules than the world. You cannot get around this fact. To ignore rules is like trying to ignore a tiger that is standing in front of you, which is licking its chops. Everybody needs to establish rules so that they will not be molded to the world system. The rules themselves will not make you spiritual unless you guide your life by another rule, which says we are “to walk in the Spirit” (Galatians 5:25) or “be filled with the Spirit” (Ephesians 5:18). These are commands or rules that God has given us to follow in order that we can establish other rules or standards, which will keep us from the world system. The Spirit of God will help us to formulate rules or standards to live by so that we are not overtaken by the system and become unseparated in our walk as Christians.

We must also remember that God is not pleased with those Christians who try to ride the fence on doctrine and the issues dealing with Biblical separation. New-Evangelicalism wants to walk down the centerline of the religious market place. William Ashbrook has called this movement “**The New Neutralism**” because it sought the

middle ground through compromising theology and Biblical separation principles with the liberalism of the day. It asked for a re-examination of certain doctrines such as revelation, inspiration or inerrancy and wanted to return to theological dialogue with the liberals of the day. It was not willing to separate from modernistic trends. *The New-Evangelicals were committed to the philosophy of infiltration. They felt that a mood of tolerance and understanding with the liberals would inevitably change them and bring them over to more orthodox beliefs.* The New-Evangelicals wanted to try and win the denominations in spite of the miserable failure that had already been seen in the historic battles of Fundamentalism within the denominations. *In one sense, the New-Evangelical Christians wanted to relive the failure of infiltration, which took place in the twenties.* This is why the movement has been properly dubbed as “The New Neutralism.” They wanted to associate with the liberals and apostate practices and still try and maintain orthodox truth. *They wanted to be neutral in their reactions, attitudes and fellowship with the enemy of liberalism.* They wanted to sit down and talk about things with the liberal and try and show love, respect and understanding for the liberals and their viewpoints.

Revelation 2:13-15 says this about the church of Pergamos:

“I know thy works, and where thou dwellest, *even* where Satan's seat *is*: and thou holdest fast my name, and hast not denied my faith, even in those days wherein Antipas was my faithful martyr, who was slain among you, where Satan dwelleth. But I have a few things against thee, because thou hast there them that hold the doctrine of Balaam, who taught Balac to cast a stumblingblock before the children of Israel, to eat things sacrificed unto idols, and to commit fornication. So hast thou also them that hold the doctrine of the Nicolaitanes, **which thing I hate.**”

The church of Pergamos was much like the New-Evangelical church and movement, which is in the world today. It clearly is identified with the same mindset and spirit of New-Evangelicalism. The Christians at Pergamum had been true to God under severe testing (vs. 13) but had compromised their testimony in other ways, as seen in verses 14-15. They stood for the name of Christ, which may refer to holding the line on the deity of Christ (“thou holdest fast my name”). Likewise, these Christians did not deny the great fundamentals of the faith (“And hast not denied my faith”). This may refer to the body of true doctrine, which is believed by Christians.

New Evangelicalism is much like this today. They talk about holding to the fundamental doctrines but at the same time they are willing to be part of questionable practices that do not promote the doctrine of separation and holiness. They are tolerant toward sin and error and therefore compromise their testimony. This is what Jesus spoke to this church about. There were those in their midst who held to the doctrine or teaching of Balaam. You will remember that Balaam taught Balac the way to corrupt Israel by intermarriage with the Moabite women. This introduced into the nation of Israel both idolatry and spiritual fornication (worldliness).

The church also had those within their ranks who were promoting the doctrine of the Nicolaitanes. The word actually means “to conquer the people.” This was the teaching that there should be a system of priestly order over the people whereby men could lead the people into whatever practices they decided to promote. This was the seed philosophy of Romanism. It was believed that this was actually a Gnostic teaching that involved license to sin since believers were said to be under grace.

In any case, these believers allowed this pagan society to get into their church. Christ says that He *hates* it! You see, Christ hates as well as loves. ***The New-Evangelical Christian many times is not willing to talk about God hating something! He wants to always stress the love of God without touching upon the hatred of God against certain evils and atrocities.*** We had better be careful that we are not indulging in the things that He hates. Compromise with worldly morality and pagan doctrine was prevalent in the church. So compromise with pagan morality would eventually erode true doctrine or teaching and corrupted the church.

The New-Evangelical believers of the late 40’s and 50’s wanted to remain in the liberal denominations or at least be supportive of the liberals. They wanted to be less fundamental and outspoken on the issues of separation. ***New-Evangelicalism was a major defection from Fundamentalism.***

As stated already, one reason New-Evangelicalism began was because of the distasteful attitudes and antics of some Fundamentalist leaders. *But instead of reprimanding the distasteful attitudes of Fundamentalists they through out the baby with the bathwater.* The New-Evangelical Christians began to compromise Biblical truth and clear Bible principles dealing with separation. They began to become accommodating to liberalism and entered into fellowship and dialogue with the liberals.

Another reason why New-Evangelicalism formed was because the leaders of this movement were warped by the liberal mentality that Fundamentalism was unloving, ignorant and intolerant. All of these descriptions from the liberals concerning Fundamentalism caused this new movement to rise up. The leaders within New-Evangelicalism proposed to correct the bad image of Fundamentalism and regroup those who were turning to liberalism. *They sought to do this by changing the Fundamentalist approach about uncompromising doctrines and their stubborn attitudes about separation. **Instead of earnestly contending for the faith the New-Evangelicals wanted to have dialogue with liberals about the faith (Jude 3).*** They wanted to associate with the liberals by trying to build a bridge across the sea of fundamental doctrines that had been vigorously fought for through the previous years. ***The aim was not to abandon the true doctrines but to try and have friendlier relations with the liberals in their own territory and promote the spirit of friendliness and cooperation with those who were not considered evangelical in doctrinal positions.*** We must remember that God is not interested in building bridges

that cross over into denominational lines where liberals reign or are at least are represented in the denominations. God is not a builder of bridges nor does he promote building bridges with those who are teaching wrong doctrines.

Romans 16:17

“Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them.”

2 Timothy 3:5

“Having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away.”

Where are the bridges in these verses?

2 Corinthians 6:17 says:

“Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean *thing*; and I will receive you.”

Where is the bridge in this verse? Where is the bridge that leads over to the island of liberalism and those who promote error? *God wants us to tear down the bridges that lead to modernistic trends, teachers and their teachings.* The New Evangelical claims that there are certain areas of truth that one can set aside in order to further the cause of Christ. They feel that they can give up a little of the truth to get a lot for God. However, the New Evangelical ignores these very clear instructions of God on separation from unbelief. He reasons that if liberals are invited to participate in evangelism, they will bring their constituents with them and they might get saved. Their motive may be good but their method is wrong.

We must now understand that there has been a whole new crop of evangelical Christians that has been taught this philosophy of infiltration. They have taken even broader steps over the years. The present generation has implemented the compromising teaching of the original New Evangelicals and they are now carrying this philosophy to its utmost goal. The point is that once you begin to compromise and teach compromising principles, then you will sooner or later reap a harvest that is far worse than you ever expected. Even Carl F. Henry in his old age spoke at a leading New Evangelical college and made this statement to the graduation class, “We have gone too far.” I would not believe this statement unless someone was there to verify it. But it is true. There are those within the New Evangelical ranks which realized what happens when you associate with apostasy too long. When the roller coaster begins coasting down hill there is no stopping it.

Someone has stated:

“God has put the church in the world. The devil has come along through New-Evangelicalism and put the world in the church.”

The cry of the New Evangelicals was “ecumenicalism” with the enemy while maintaining the truth. Their favorite ecumenical verse was John 17:11: “And now I am no more in the world, but these are in the world, and I come to thee. Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one, as we *are*.”

The New Evangelicals have always sought their unscriptural unity on the basis of this high priestly prayer of Jesus. The fact of the matter is this. The prayer of Jesus for unity has already been answered. Jesus did not make this prayer looking ahead to Promise Keepers or the New Evangelical movement of compromise. He made this prayer in light of His ascension (vs. 1) and the coming of Pentecost, which would begin the baptizing of the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit would unite the church together into a spiritual unity, which would be called the body of Christ or New Testament Church (see vs. 23). *This verse does not deal with organizational unity but with spiritual unity the body of Christ* (see vs. 20-21). The Bible teaches that we are already one in the body of Christ (Eph. 2:22). The unity Jesus spoke about was not experiential unity, but the unity of common eternal life which every believer in Christ shares and which results in the formation of one body of Christ (the church) all sharing His life. The prayer of Jesus has already been answered! The prayers of Jesus are always answered.

The cure for unity is not an institutional union. Jesus was not praying for the unity of a single, worldwide, ecumenical church in which doctrinal heresy would be maintained along with orthodoxy. Instead, He was praying for a spiritual unity to be formed by the birth of the church whereby Christians would begin to witness of God’s saving plan and the creation of this new unified community called the church. This newly formed spiritual unity of believers (the church) was intended to have an impact upon a world without Christ so that they too would believe on Christ for their salvation (“that the world may believe that thou hast sent me” – vs. 21).

History shows that the New Evangelical strategy was infiltration rather than separation; positive proclamations of truth instead of negative attacks upon error; withdrawing repudiation of the liberal social gospel and combining it with the personal Gospel. *In short, New Evangelicalism was a complete repudiation of the historic fundamentalism’s position while still trying to claim historic fundamental doctrine.* Their motto cry has always been, “We are to preach positive messages.” This kind of mentality has ignited the New Evangelical positive thinking of our day with the Norman Vincent Peales and the Robert Schullers. This **principle of positivism**, which suggests that we are to accentuate the positive and eliminate the negative, is the theme song of New Evangelicalism. We must put everything in a positive light whether it is right or wrong. In 1963 Billy Graham spoke about, “Our great religious faiths Catholicism,

Protestantism and Judaism.” He claimed that it is a sign “that God blesses the churches that are working together.” This mentality is thoroughly unscriptural. **A large part of the Bible is given to the attack upon religious error.** If you listen to New Evangelicalism, one would come to the conclusion that there is no apostasy in the church. Just who does Billy Graham think are the apostates that the Bible talks about? If they can’t be from Catholicism, Protestantism or Judaism, then where are they? While New Evangelicals think that it is the job of the believer to be positive and please everyone he forgets that Christ and Paul and the early Christians did not please the religious leaders of their day. They wanted to stone the believers who stood for truth.

Jesus said in Luke 6:26:

“Woe unto you, when all men shall speak well of you! for so did their fathers to the false prophets.”

This positive spin on everything is seen in preaching, literature and evangelism. Consider the widely used Campus Crusade tract called, “Four Spiritual Laws.” You may have used them for years. Are you aware that this tract was written in the spirit of New Evangelicalism? The tract starts on a positive note, “God loves you and has a plan for your life.” Instead of hitting the nail right on the head that man is a sinner and away from God, the tract is designed to soften the load. It is designed to be positive instead of instantly negative about man’s sin and dreadful position against God.

Franky, the son of Francis Schaeffer said:

“Everybody wants to be a nice guy; no one wants to be a bad guy.” Bad guys are disruptive to cozy fellowships, are theological and ecclesiastical whistle blowers – and few want to hear the whistle. As a result of well-meaning efforts on the part of many to be nice, the cutting edge of Christianity is being dulled.”

We see that this is all too true today. Many men will claim that they are not a charismatic but refuse to speak out against their errors and defend the truth. They will refuse to expose their false teachers who are leading people astray. Certainly they will not name names for this is unloving and negative. There is a spirit of acceptance and broadness in the church today. The attitude of New Evangelicalism today is, “Let’s not offend anyone.” **Few people want to be known as a person who is a “controversialist.” They would rather want to be known as a “reasonable” person who is not dogmatic.** Why has there been such a change in the attitude of Evangelicalism over the years? The change and problem is simple to diagnose. The New Evangelicals want to appear more intellectually acceptable to others and have come to fear being negative, controversial or non-accepted with the rest of the crowd. They want the recognition of others and of the world, even apostates. This has caused a gradual weakening of convictions.

The apostles never tried to accommodate their message so it would be socially acceptable and less negative. They did not try to make their message “fit” the times. They simply stood on the truth of the Word of God and spoke out against all those things that were wrong. They did not try to walk on eggshells for fear that someone might disagree with them and chide them from being too negative. They did not try to smooth over the truthfulness of the Word of God. Paul simply spoke forth the Word of God boldly so that there could be no misunderstanding about what was right.

2 Corinthians 3:12

“Seeing then that we have such hope, we use great plainness of speech.”

Acts 4:13 also states:

“Now when they saw the boldness of Peter and John, and perceived that they were unlearned and ignorant men, they marvelled; and they took knowledge of them, that they had been with Jesus.”

Acts 4:29

“And now, Lord, behold their threatenings: and grant unto thy servants, that with all boldness they may speak thy word.”

Acts 4:31

“And when they had prayed, the place was shaken where they were assembled together; and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and they spake the word of God with boldness.”

Whatever happened to the days of boldness? When Christians would stand up and say what was right without the fear of being too negative or too unloving. The mentality of the New Evangelical spirit has tamed the church from being bold and outspoken. Sadly, it has allowed the church to become compromising and drift into all kinds of worldliness. And consequently, it will continue to soften the church in regards to truth and take them down the road to continual apostasy.

2 Corinthians 4:1-2 reminds us about Paul’s ministry of the Word:

“Therefore seeing we have this ministry, as we have received mercy, we faint not (do not lose heart); But have renounced the hidden things of dishonesty, not walking in craftiness (no hocus pocus, clever tricks, no dishonesty or manipulation), nor handling the word of God deceitfully (by distorting it when mixing law with grace - trying to get away from the real thing); but by manifestation of the truth commending ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God.”

Of course, there is much to discourage and depress the separated Christian in their service, but the Lord gives mercy and grace to help in every time of need. *Thus, no matter what the discouragements may be, the encouragements are always greater.*

But in sharing the Word of God, we are not to use hocus-pocus, or clever tricks and above all else, never try to no manipulate the Word of God. We are to speak the plain truth without worrying about how the message is being accepted by others (“by manifestation of the truth”). Someone has said: “God pity the preacher who has grown cross-eyed by watching certain faces in the congregation to observe whether the message is acceptable or not.”

Dr. Ernest Pickering has said:

“God did not set his sails to the winds of this world.”

Paul was not worried about making favorable impressions upon man. He simply wanted to declare the absolute truth. I say again. *New Evangelicalism has a positive spin on everything.* It is aimed to never be negative. Yet the Bible is negative. And there is power in negative preaching which contains the denunciation of man in his sins and the separation from heretics. *The heart of New Evangelicalism is its repudiation of the negative aspects of Biblical Christianity.* If you stand strictly on the Word of God you will be “too negative” for the New Evangelical. New Evangelical preachers simply refuse to preach what is right because they do not want to become negative. They want to remain popular. Therefore, they do not plainly preach against sin and expose those who are preaching blatant error. They do not expose false teachers. In short, they do not practice Biblical separation. They practice a false ecumenical unity that is nothing more than a sea of theological confusion concerning the truth of Scripture. The parable of the wheat and the tares illustrates what will progress throughout this age in wheat we live. There will be a vast ecumenical growth or tie of the true with the false.

Matthew 13:24-30

“Another parable put he forth unto them, saying, The kingdom of heaven is likened unto a man which sowed good seed in his field: But while men slept, his enemy came and sowed tares among the wheat, and went his way. But when the blade was sprung up, and brought forth fruit, then appeared the tares also. So the servants of the householder came and said unto him, Sir, didst not thou sow good seed in thy field? from whence then hath it tares? He said unto them, An enemy hath done this. The servants said unto him, Wilt thou then that we go and gather them up? But he said, Nay; lest while ye gather up the tares, ye root up also the wheat with them. Let both grow together until the harvest: and in the time of harvest I will say to the reapers, Gather ye together first the tares, and bind them in bundles to burn them: but gather the wheat into my barn.”

This parable is not promoting ecumenicalism or the unscriptural unity with unbelieving apostasy. He is simply discussing the course of this age and what will happen in this time period called the “mysteries of the kingdom.” There will be the false by the side of the true so much so that the false will not be able to be readily identified. The next parable amplifies this present parable.

Matthew 13:31-32 reminds of this ecumenical procedure throughout the course of this age in what is called the “mysteries of the kingdom of heaven(s)” of heavens rule over this earth in an intervening time prior to Christ’s rejection by Israel and His return to earth. “Another parable put he forth unto them, saying, The kingdom of heaven is like to a grain of mustard seed, which a man took, and sowed in his field: Which indeed is the least of all seeds: but when it is grown, it is the greatest among herbs, and becometh a tree, so that the birds of the air come and lodge in the branches thereof.”

The birds have already been interpreted as Satan and his workings. Therefore, the parable is speaking about the unnatural and ecumenical growth of the church where Satan is seen to be lodging in its ecclesiastical branches promoting his false teachers and doctrinal heresies. The tree speaks of “Christendom” or the entire religious system of both good and evil combined together. Within this giant religious tree there is the promotion of Satan’s works and doings. Thus, we have liberal Protestantism and Romanism and all religious bodies as part of this tree.

Today Satan has landed in the church and is accomplishing His plan of corruption through ecumenical gatherings with apostates and the acceptance of unholy doctrines and the promotion of unholy living. The bird is in the church! And unless preachers warn their people about this end-time ecumenical trend and the acceptance of apostasy in the realm of the church, there can be no hope for young believers. Earnest Christians are being swept into this movement without any warning. It’s no wonder they are being led astray. It’s because there is no warning from the pulpits any longer. There is no trumpet sounding.

Acts 20:31

“Therefore watch, and remember, that by the space of three years I ceased not to warn every one night and day with tears.”

Philippians 3:2

“Beware of dogs, beware of evil workers, beware of the concision (those who cut).”

Paul was not afraid to warn the believers of heretical groups that were threatening to the life and purity of the church.

Romans 16:17 once again says:

“Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them.”

In order to “mark” someone you must expose false teachers for what they truly are! Let us not forget what one writer said, **“You cannot shoot a wolf by aiming in the general direction.”** You must name false teachers so that they can be clearly

identified and be separated from by those believers who practice Biblical separation. *We must also note by this verse that it is not the fighting fundamentalist who is causing the divisions in the church today.* They are simply seeking to hold the ground that historic Christianity and separated evangelicalism, which the church has originally held. It is the apostates who have been successfully sneaking in the back door of the church wherever they can to cause division. They want unity so they can bring corruption. And the New Evangelicals are playing in their ecumenical trap to unite the false church with the true church and demote doctrine to a very low and insignificant plain.

The divisions are caused by the doctrinal departure of apostate denominations and their apostate leaders. ***Division in the church is because of the error of the apostates and not because of the continued stand of the fundamentalists.*** Those who stand on the truth today and who will not budge in their association with liberals and speak out against apostasy are called “contentious trouble makers.” But the real troublemakers are the liberals of our own day and time. Let’s not place the blame on the wrong person. This is what happened in Elijah’s day. Elijah was a great outspoken separatist in his day. He refused to have fellowship with wicked apostate Ahab and his wife Jezebel who promoted Baal worship. When Ahab finally saw Elijah he blamed Elijah for troubling Israel by preaching God’s disfavor against Baal and all idolatry.

1 Kings 18:17 says:

“And it came to pass, when Ahab saw Elijah, that Ahab said unto him, *Art thou he that troubleth Israel?*”

Like Ahab, the New Evangelical has got it all wrong. It was not Elijah who was the troublemaker or the fundamentalists who are the troublemakers. It is the wicked apostates who have rejected the truth even as Ahab rejected the truth in his day (1 Kings 16:33). Today fundamentalists are viewed as hyper-fundamentalists, troublemakers, insensitive and uncooperative. I’m sure that Elijah heard all of these same things. Times have not really changed.

Amos 5:15 is also worth repeating at his point in time:

“Hate the evil, and love the good, and establish judgment in the gate: it may be that the LORD God of hosts will be gracious unto the remnant of Joseph.”

Dr. Arnold of Rugby used to say that he never could be sure of a boy who only loved the good. Until that boy also began to hate evil he never felt that he was safe. There comes a time when we must be negative and expose the error so that the truth is not covered up. *To cover up the truth in silence for fear of the evil or certain repercussions is to love the evil over the truth and not fear the Lord. If you fear the evil and the repercussions that come from standing against the evil, then you cannot fear God the way you should. .*

Proverbs 8:13 says:

“The fear of the LORD *is* to hate evil: pride, and arrogancy, and the evil way, and the froward mouth, do I hate.”

When we fail to speak out about error, wickedness and apostates, then we are covering up the truth and actually fearing the evil instead of the holy Lord. *Evil always wins when we fail to stand up for truth.* When you are neutral then the evil always wins and the truth loses out. Furthermore, evil also spreads if we fail to hate it and expose it for what it really is. A disease will spread if it is not exposed and if certain measures are not taken against the disease. This is why we cannot be cowards in these last days. We must face the cancer and not be afraid to cut it out from our churches. We need to be courageous believers who are willing to stand up against the battles that are before us and hold the ground that we still have left! Many churches are nothing more than the charred smoking remains of their lost battle with New Evangelicalism and the compromises of the present day. Whatever happened to courageous men who are willing to sound the trumpet?

Abraham Lincoln once said:

“To sin in silence when they should speak in protest, makes cowards of men.”

1 Corinthians 16:13 says:

“Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, quit (to act manly, show oneself brave) you like men, be strong.”

But Billy Graham said in 1978:

“I am far more *tolerant* of other kinds of Christians than I once was. My contact with Catholic, Lutheran and other leaders – people far removed from my own Southern Baptist Convention – has helped me, hopefully, to move in the right direction.”

By this statement we see Billy Grahams unwillingness to stand for truth and Christ against heretics and boldly denounce the evil and apostasy. And we can be sure that he is not moving in the right direction. He is unwilling to pronounce men as heretics who have clearly apostatized from the truth of Scripture.

Here is one question that was asked before Billy Graham:

“Do you think that churches such as The United Churches of Canada and the great liberal churches of the United States that are active in the ecumenical movement ... are apostate?”

Billy Grahams answer was appalling but New Evangelical:

“I could not possibly pass this type of judgment on individual churches and clergyman within the United States or Canada. Our Evangelistic Association is not concerned to pass judgment - favorable or adverse - on any particular denomination.”

New Evangelicals have a way of warring about false teaching in a general sense but never are willing to identify the false teachers. All of the popular New Evangelical leaders tend to operate this way. We need to at times *speak in generalities* about false teachers but then go along with them to Promise Keepers or some other place to show that we are all one. How utterly ludicrous this is! We can speak about false teachers but not identify who they are. We can warn people about them but then promote an ecumenical rally with them! This is the height of spiritual insanity! How silly!

Stephen Olford said about exposure of liberal heretics:

“That’s the wrong spirit – avoid the liberal! I love to be with the liberals, especially if they are willing to be taught, much more than with hardboiled Fundamentalists who have all the answers. Evangelicals should seek to build bridges.”

Charles Swindoll wrote a book entitled, “The Grace Awakening” and came to the conclusion that a grace awakening is when one can become tolerant of error and when one can emphasize the positive in every situation. “More than ever we need grace-awakening ministers who free rather than bind: Life beyond the letter of Scripture ... absence of dogmatic Bible-bashing. When there is a grace-awakening ministry there is an absence of dogmatism and the Bible bashing ... There is a spirit of openness.”

We must remember something today. Christians can have wrong opinions! Wrong thinking and opinions can be held by born-again people. Men on the radio are not God. Men who have large audiences does not mean that God approves of all that they promote and say. This kind of positive Pepto-Bismol is not taught in the Bible. ***The early Christians did not specialize in making everyone feel comfortable.*** In the Pastoral Epistles Paul identifies false teachers and worldly compromises by name (see 1 Tim. 1:20; 2 Tim. 1:15; 2:17; 3:8; 4:10,14). ***The apostles were not positive New Evangelicals.*** New Evangelicals say, “Let’s not be confronters, let’s be builders. Let’s see how we can mesh together with the liberal and New Orthodoxy theologians.” But is this what the apostles did, who were the founders and leaders of the early church? Regarding false teachers, the apostles taught that believer’s are to:

1. Mark them out and avoid them (Rom. 16:17-18)
2. Come out from among them (2 Cor. 6:14-18)
3. Have no fellowship with their demonic blindness
(1 Cor. 10:20; 1 Timothy 4:1)
4. Have no fellowship with their unfruitful works of darkness
(Eph. 5:11)
4. Reprove or correct them (Eph. 5:11)

5. Shun their babblings (2 Tim.2:16-17)
6. Turn away from them (2 Tim. 3:5)
7. Reject them (Titus 3:10)
8. Do not receive them (2 John 10-11).

Stephen would not have made a good New Evangelical today. He did not try to create a moderate approach to the religiously lost people of his nation when he said in Acts 7:51: “Ye stiffnecked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost: as your fathers *did*, so *do ye*.”

New Evangelicalism would not talk like this today because they would stress that it is not loving to do so. But God approved of Stephens’ boldness. Was Stephen worried about his negative spirit in this conversation? Was he worried about his acceptance among the scholarly? Was he trying to take the moderate and soft approach to those he was dialoguing with? Of course he was not. In fact, after he spoke the Bible says that this was the response of his listeners.

Acts 7:54

“When they heard these things, they were cut to the heart, and they gnashed on him with *their* teeth.”

Paul said in Galatians 1:9:

“As we said before, so say I now again, If any *man* preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed (damned to hell).”

Galatians 5:12

“I would they were even cut off which trouble you.”

Paul was speaking on the terms of death or castration when he remarked about these false teachers. There are certainly no positive overtones in these inspired statements of Scripture. Paul was not worried about whether his letters would be viewed as too negative or unacceptable to the New Evangelical crowd. He simply told it the way it was and did not mix words. ***We must remember that a Biblical position cannot be maintained without militancy and negativism. To be militant does not mean that you must be nasty and mean-spirited.*** No person was more loving than the apostle Paul but at the same time he was willing to be militant and speak negatively about false teaching and the need to judge apostates. He was very bold. Negativism is not to be a synonym for being nasty. New Evangelicalism has simply tried to view negativism as being nasty so as to help their own cause.

I once heard a New Evangelical comment on this verse of Scripture. He said that Paul stepped out on a limb, and spoke, before he thought his words through. What a low

view of inspiration! Paul meant what he said and said what he meant under the guidance of the Holy Spirit.

The preaching described in the Bible is authoritative preaching. There was strongly held convictions by those preaching which were not swayed by the opinions and mindset of others. Take the Lord Jesus for example.

Jesus said in Matthew 7:29:

“For he taught them as *one* having authority, and not as the scribes.”

The scribes were like the New Evangelicals of their day because they often would quote one another and would be indefinite to what the Scripture really teaches. But Jesus was very definite, clear, and settled in what the truth was. There was no questioning what the truth was all about. The authority which Christ had was in himself, but the authority that we have is found in the Scriptures which He has given to us.

Preaching today has become too soft and cozy for people. We need preachers today who are willing to boldly speak out against heresy and false teaching instead of promoting it by silence or by the claims that it is unloving to do so. We must ask ourselves the question, “Who are we trying to please in life?”

Galatians 1:10

“For do I now persuade (convince) men, or God? or do I seek to please men? for if I yet pleased men, I should not be the servant of Christ.”

2 Timothy 4:2

“Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove (convict), rebuke (reprove, forbid), exhort (encourage) with all longsuffering and doctrine.”

Preaching the word involves rebuke against false teaching, which will inevitably bring rebuke against those who are teaching the error. Preaching the word demands authoritative preaching that will cause some chickens to fly the coop. *New Evangelicals don't want to be against anything today!* Their spirit of compromise has taken them away from authoritative preaching which demands that heresy and all false doctrine is exposed. Christians today don't want to be told what not to do. But the servant of the Lord must be bold and denounce sin and false teaching which leads his people away from eternal truth.

Matthew 23:13

“But woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye shut up the kingdom of heaven against men: for ye neither go in *yourselves*, neither suffer ye them that are entering to go in.”

Here is bold and negative preaching. Here is preaching from the Lord that is bent on exposing hypocrisy and error. And yet it came from the most loving person that ever lived. His name was Jesus Christ. Christ was quick to denounce sin and sinners that are leading people astray.

Isaiah 1:4

“Ah sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity, a seed of evildoers, children that are corrupters: they have forsaken the LORD, they have provoked the Holy One of Israel unto anger, they are gone away backward.”

How would this go over in a New Evangelical service today? I’m sure that it would be much too negative. It would not promote a positive spirit. *The church needs pastors today who are willing to be against some things.* The church needs more preachers who are willing to speak out against error and preach the rebuke of the Word as well as the comfort and help of the Word. We need balanced preaching today. New Evangelical preaching is one sided and leaves out rebuke for fear of reprisal from the people and others in their movement.

Another cry or theme song of New Evangelicals is “God has called me to win souls, not to criticize others.” The fact of the matter is this. ***God did not call us to be popular, nor did he commission us to get along with everyone else.*** God did not call us to get on the bandwagon with everyone else.

Psalm 119:63 says:

“I *am* a companion of all *them* that fear thee, and of them that keep thy precepts (those who are doctrinally sound).”

The point is this. God has called every believer to win souls and Fundamentalism has always had a heartthrob for evangelism (1 Thessalonians 1:7-8). But God has also called the believer to contend for the faith (Jude 3-4). He has called the believer to expose error and reprove or correct that which is wrong (Ephesians 5:11). He has called the believer to stand the ground and fight in the battle of truth and error which will at times call for the exposing of men, ministries and movements which are untrue to the Word of God (1 Timothy 1:20; Titus 3:10; Revelation 2:6).

The hidden cry behind the New Evangelical believers has always been “peace without purity.” Too many of Gods people today value “peace above purity.” They are tolerant of false teachers and want to associate with them in large ecumenical gatherings. They want to compromise truth with error by accepting the presence of those within religious settings who do not accept the truth. The Bible teaches that when we do this we become guilty of compromising truth by our association with those who are promoting false teaching and apostate practices (1 Corinthians 10:20). We are guilty by

association. Many Christians today also want to associate with worldly methods and organizations, which tear down this principle of purity in worship and evangelism.

Romans 12:18 says:

“If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men.”

As we work and live among lost humanity we are encouraged to live harmoniously with mankind by adopting Christian attitudes and Christlike natures. Some Christians are simply a poor testimony for Christ. However, the point needs to be made which says, “if it be possible, as much as lieth in you.” *This suggests that we cannot and will not always be able to live peacefully among the lost.* There will be times that peace must be broken for the sake of Christ and truth. We cannot call for peace above purity. We must break the peace with the lost and all apostasy when it comes to witnessing for Christ and our refusal to compromise the truth. Jesus said that the world will hate you and not accept you as you live the pure Christian life and stand up for what is right (John 15:17-19).

The New Evangelical Christians also suggest that all Fundamentalists are unloving toward other Christians who are promoting different views on theology and even to the unsaved. This has always been the cry of the New Evangelicals. In some cases their argument may be true. There have been certain figures in Fundamentalism who have been more obnoxious than contending for the faith. However, to assess a whole movement on several figures is unwarranted and unfair, as any honest person will agree. So this cry of New Evangelicalism which says that all Christians are unloving when they oppose error and those people who promote error is certainly a poor argument. Just because a believer stands for purity in doctrine and practice by not associating himself with certain people or movements does not say that he hates the people. ***True Fundamentalism loves people but they hate the unholy system that people are part of and the humanistic and liberal trends of the time that these people associate themselves with.*** We must remember that we cannot call for love above the truth. The Bible tells us that there can be no true love and unity apart from the truth. The two are inseparably bound together (2 John 3). True love always maintains a strong emphasis upon truth, even the truth about holiness and separation in all matters of doctrine and practice. We must espouse the truth in whatever we do. Truth must be maintained and not compromised.

1 Corinthians 13:6 says this about love:

“Rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth.”

This means that the husband of the wife will always lead her in the truth and the right way for her life. It means that a truly loving person will always espouse the truth no matter what. True love maintains the truth and never compromises.

Dr. Bob Jones, Sr. once said:

“God uses the thermometer of obedience to test the temperature of love.”

Psalm 97:10

“Ye that love the LORD, hate evil...”

But the New-Evangelicals have always criticized the Fundamentalists for their lack of love because the Fundamentalists wanted to criticize those who were liberal and heading in a wrong direction. *The New Evangelical perceives love as the ability to compromise and be open-minded. In other words, one is more loving if he is broader and more lenient.* Of course, as we've seen this is a perverted and distorted view of love since love always rejoices in what is right. Since the fundamentalists stood firm on the truth about separation and fearlessly exposed men who did not stand for truth, the fundamentalist were looked upon as unloving and uncaring. This has always been the cry of New-Evangelicalism even to this day.

Dr. Edward Carnell, president of Fuller Seminary, said in the early going:

“Our stated purpose is to produce a great evangelism by combining great learning with a love ... to produce a new evangelicalism.

The fact of the matter is this. You cannot have true and sincere love unless you are willing to stand up for the truth. The old saying concludes that to withhold fellowship with unbelievers in a religious service or setting is a lack of love. Their claim is that love must be the final ground for fellowship. They usually quote John 13:35 to prove their point:

John 13:35

“By this shall all *men* know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another.”

However, they fail to quote another verse that is intertwined with the subject of love as well.

What did Jesus say in John 14:23?

“Jesus answered and said unto him, If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him.”

2 John 1:6

“And this is love, that we walk after his commandments...”

A love demonstrated to the Lord is when we are willing to obey all of His commandments, even the commands for separation from unbelieving liberals. ***In the final analysis, it is not love, which is the final test of genuineness, as the modern evangelical says; it's rather obedience to His words.*** This is because obedience is

true love in action. You can't love God, as you should, when you are not willing to follow all of His Word. ***In fact, let me say that it's not an act of love toward God, when you disregard, or break the commandments of God, even to win souls.*** This so-called love seems to be the mandate for the believer to associate with apostasy and those who are holding doctrinally incorrect views on the Scripture. Actually, this is a type of hypocritical love that God is not pleased with at all. Love and truth are always bound together.

2 John 3

"Grace be with you, mercy, *and* peace, from God the Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the Father, in truth and love."

If you separate truth from love then you have lost true love. The Bible says that Love rejoices in the truth (1 Corinthians 13:6).

Martin Luther said:

"Cursed be that love and unity for whose sake the Word of God must be put at stake."

We must remember that John was the "apostle of love" but he also identified by name in his epistle the proud Diotrophes and condemned his actions (3 John 9). The New Evangelical writer Warren Wiersbe was asked by David Cloud why he never speaks out against Romanism and liberals. He wrote a letter and said this: "Quite frankly, my Brother, I wish some of the brethren would take off their boxing gloves and pick up a towel. Perhaps if people began to wash one another's feet, there might be more love an unity."

Of course we must remove our boxing gloves when we are plain down carnal in our living and are just full of a quarreling spirit over every insignificant detail in life. But we are never told to take off our boxing gloves when it comes to contending for the faith and standing up for truth. *If there was ever a day that we need to keep our boxing gloves on it is today.* You see, there is this spirit of positivism and so-called love that is willing to compromise truth by not exposing the error that has invaded Christianity. *Instead of doing battle with the enemy and upholding truth, as the church is called to do, now we are told to surrender and put our arms around the enemy.* We are told to serve their efforts while they are shooting their own artillery of error and damnable doctrines at us. The concept of New Evangelical love is that love is when we develop a soft tolerance toward error, even gross error, and a gentle spirit of acceptance toward all who call themselves evangelical. It is this very attitude has allowed Charismatic error to slip into the ranks of evangelicalism. In the manner of love, all false teaching is condoned or at least overlooked. *But we have forgotten that overlooking false teaching is condoning false teaching! **The idea that doctrine divides is absolutely correct. Doctrine does divide and so let it do its dividing so truth and error can be separated and not condoned!*** Let doctrine do its dividing so that God's people can express a newfound reverence for truth. After all, you cannot love somebody if you do

not love them enough to tell them the truth. You cannot express true love if you are not willing to uphold the truth at any cost.

We must remember that we do not hate the false teachers; we hate their false teaching. ***Loving people has nothing to do with the issue of exposing error.*** I can expose the pope and still love the pope as a person wanting him to be saved. I can expose my enemy who is preaching false doctrine and still pray for his salvation and deliverance from such error as Jesus suggests (Matt. 5:44). I can spank my children and reprimand them and still love them as a father. It is simply a New Evangelical mentality that says we cannot love people if we expose that they are wrong in some area. Furthermore, loving others does not mean that I must agree with them on everything and promote ecumenical rallies with them. In a very practical way, we show love to others by sacrificing our lives for them (Galatians 6:10) and not by promoting false religious ties with them.

Dr. Jack Van Impe has recanted his position on ecclesiastical separation in view of so-called loving all the saints, even the Roman Catholic saints as he terms them. What a tremendous delusion! His book, which his new position, was called, "Heart Disease In Christ's Body" (A New Position of Love). His claim in the book was that fundamentals have lost their heart of love for people because they are too nitpicky on minor doctrinal areas and should love everyone in the denominations by cooperating with them in ecumenical evangelism in an attempt to get the Gospel out. He says that we should love everybody in the denominations. Who ever said that fundamentalists don't love people in the denominations? I love those who are in the denominations. I love those who are teaching error. But I despise their false teaching and their promotion of error as God says I should.

Titus 1:9 once again says:

"Holding fast the faithful word as he hath been taught, that he may be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers (those disputing the truth)."

Van Impe's definition of love like other New Evangelicals teach is to blindly dismiss trivial doctrines and come together in the spirit of cooperation and love. Strangely, he mixes love with error, especially the error of the Roman Catholic Church. He praises the pope as the greatest Christian leader of the century. He fails to admit as he once did as a fundamentalist that the pope is a terrible apostate who is deceiving and damning millions of souls to an eternal hell fire. He no longer wants to talk about how the pope claims to be Christ's replacement on earth and receive worship and claims to forgive sin. How compromising can someone become? There is a heart disease in Christ's body today. And Jack Van Impe has the disease. It is called New Evangelicalism. It is the disease to blindly follow heretics and false teaching and condone their errors in doctrine which God says we are to expose (Romans 16:17). I tell you, God

will have the final say on all of this compromise going on today when believers stand before the Judgment Seat of Christ.

Another quest of New Evangelicals is to be culturally up-to-date with people. We must identify with culture in order to understand people and be able to witness to them effectively. New Evangelicalism has become culturally crazed over the years. They have developed another syndrome, which we can add to the list – the cultural syndrome. We are hearing in Christian circles today that the new is always better than the old. What they really mean by this statement is that the culture is more pleasing and palatable to my lifestyle than what the Bible says about truth and godliness and what is right. *It is an open season on all traditional or old church standards. Nobody wants to be shackled to what they call the fossilized standards of the past.* What is the real problem? The problem is this. ***While modern evangelicals seek to understand and penetrate culture, the culture is penetrating evangelicalism.*** This is why the church is updating all of its music and traditionally accepted hymns. *It would be safe to say that the one thing that shows a slide toward New Evangelicalism in any church is their acceptance of the so-called contemporary Christian music.* This inevitably leads toward a gradual slide in other areas of the church as well. Soon, the church is promoting all kinds of New Evangelical programs and ideas that were once alien to the church. Many are saying today that we cannot attract the masses of the world with outdated music. We must make them comfortable when bringing them into the church by giving them their own style of music.

The church is also updating its style of preaching and singing. It's updating the Bible and cutting out expository preaching. We have modern music, modern preaching, modern psychology, modern Christian celebrities, modern dramas, modern Christian dance bands and rap artists and just about everything that is modern in the world must also become modern in the church. Why is this? It's because the church wants to identify with the culture of this world system. And they try to interpret the Bible and evangelize by accommodating to the culture of our days and time instead of the old settled faith of the Bible and Christianity.

The New Evangelical Clark Pinnock said:

“... we are making peace with the culture of modernity. Influenced by modern culture, we are experiencing reality as something dynamic and historical and are consequently seeing things in the Bible we never saw before... diversity in biblical doctrine means that changes in orientation are always going to be possible, enabling us to communicate in fresh tones to our contemporary hearers.”

What is this we are hearing today? Many are agreeing with the philosophy of Pinnock. He is saying that our study of the Bible and finding out what Scripture says must not only come from our investigation of Biblical truth but also from the cultural society around us. The world of lost mankind and its culture is now helping us to interpret the

Bible so we can discover new things that we never have noticed before in the Bible. *We must interpret the Bible through the lenses of culture.* What is happening? Cannot we see how far the church has gone and is going today?

The Bible teaches that we are not to conform to the cultural standards of this world system (Romans 12:2). It teaches that we are not to become a friend to the culture of the world (James 4:4). When man start bending to culture for understanding and direction, then look out! We do not need the philosophies of men in this world who are blind and have no spiritual understanding (Eph. 4:18) to tell us how to evangelize. We should never expect someone who is totally blinded in their minds and twisted in their spiritual perceptions to instruct us on how to live the Christian life or accomplish our witnessing program. How utterly foolish this New Evangelical talk is today. We do not develop theology by listening to our culture. ***The Bible passes the final judgment on the world and not the world on the Bible.*** The Bible teaches that we are to overcome the cultural standards of this world and not allow the standards to overcome us (1 John 5:4). All of this *cultural relevancy* talk today is simply the desire of the church to become more like the world system and minimize the teaching about God's holiness. Everybody wants to be like everybody else. Unfortunately, the church wants to be like the world!

The church today is more concerned about *marketing techniques* than they are about heralding the truth. They want to use the cultural standards of the system to try and seduce people into their sanctuaries so that they can be saved. They call these types of churches "user friendly churches." However, there is no scriptural support for trying to use the unsanitary or unholy cultural standards of this world in order to win people to Christ. Most New Evangelicals try to use several passages to support their pathetic disobedience such as 1 Corinthians 9:19-23 and 10:33.

In this context Paul was talking about his privilege to eat meat with Gentiles or not eat meat with his unsaved Jewish friends because of their unwillingness to eat meat that had been sacrificed to idols (10:23-28). Paul never changed his message but he did vary his methods in regards to the *non-sinful areas* between Jewish and Gentile culture and religious practices. But the New Evangelical rises up and says that this is a proof text and Bible mandate for all kinds of cultural conformity. It is a proof text for square dancing in the church and for new music that is stolen from the world system. It is proof that we can win people to Christ by using all kinds of marketing techniques such as plays, dramas, movies about hell, Christian rock concerts and various other kinds of secularized methods. What a gross exaggeration of what Paul was saying here! *Paul was not endorsing the practice of giving people what they want or marketing people in order to win them for Christ. In actuality, he was talking about giving up his rights in order to win them to Christ.* The main emphasis is giving up (not giving in) your rights in order to see others come to Christ. Paul was not endorsing the practice of seducing secular society to come to church by giving them culturally accepted or exciting things

to them, which please their flesh. He never introduced a worldly salad bar type of sanctuary where people could choose what they want in the church in order that they might listen to the message of the Gospel. *Paul was simply giving up his own privileges. He was not promoting the world's cultural lifestyles, which were sinful and degrading to God and His house of worship.* New Evangelical Christians seem to think that Paul is giving a mandate for using almost every cultural practice in the world. This is nothing more than unholy compromise with the world.

Paul was not endorsing the philosophy that we must identify with every cultural background of a person in order to win them to Christ. He was not trying to make the Gospel acceptable to people by compromising with cultural standards that are paganistic and sinful. It has gotten so bad that megachurches are actually surveying what unsaved people want in a church so that they will attend their services. Bill Hybels is responsible for starting much of this type of marketing technique. Many are catching on to their new idea and are starting to do outlandish things in their churches in order to gain the attention of the lost. ***Where in the entire Bible do we see Paul surveying the godless pagan society in order to find out what their interests are and what they would like if they come to church to listen to the Gospel?*** This is nothing more than pragmatic evangelism. *Dear friend, the unsaved church does not need a church that makes them feel good in their sins; they need a church that makes them feel the heavy guilt and weight of their sin.* A sinner who comes to church and finds his own sins there will see no need to repent of the sins that he has in order to be saved.

Romans 1:30-31 speaks of the unsaved crowd:

“Backbiters, haters of God, spiteful (one who insults others), proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, **Without understanding**, covenantbreakers, without natural affection (unliving and hard hearted toward people), implacable (someone who breaks their word), unmerciful.”

How can these unsaved people critique a church? How can someone who hates God or who is “without understanding” (spiritual understanding) critique what needs to be in a church or what should be in a church? How unholy and horrendous is this whole philosophy! The idea that we must give the unsaved unholy cultural practices so that they can become a Christian is so outlandish that I fail to see the need to comment on it any farther. We need to keep reverence in the church today (Psalm 89:7) and remember that the God has told us to go out into the world to win the lost (Mark 16:15) and not begin market programs in order to bring them into the church. *We must stop reducing God as something that we must sell to people.* We are told today that one of the secrets to having a successful church is to have something for everybody. The megachurches have become like megamalls. We need to have something for everybody. My question is this. What is the one thing that everybody needs? It is the Word of God!

Luke 10:39 reminds us of Martha and Mary:

“And she had a sister called Mary, which also sat at Jesus' feet, and heard his word.”

Then Jesus said in Luke 10:42 this about Mary's actions:

“But one thing is needful (sitting at the feet of Jesus and listening to His word): and Mary hath chosen that good part, which shall not be taken away from her.”

Paul told Timothy to “preach the word” (2 Timothy 4:2) when the saints would come together. He did not tell Timothy to have a drama presentation or rock concert to attract the pagan people of the world. He did not tell Timothy to have a marketing committee that could think up some new inventive ways to get the crowds into the church. But today preaching against sin and expository preaching which unveils the great doctrines of the Bible has fallen on hard times. ***We live in an age of sharing and interaction.*** We should talk about the Bible and not dogmatically preach the Bible any longer. People don't want to be told what to do by using those words “should,” “ought,” “must,” but they would rather hear positive messages that will entertain them about issues and the government. People want sermonettes for Christianettes by preacherettes!

The early church ministries were marked by expository preaching (Acts 20:29), praying (Acts 12:5), singing (Eph. 5:19; 1 Cor. 14:15), giving (1 Cor. 16:2), baptizing (1 Cor. 1:14-16), observing the Lord's Table (1 Cor. 11:20-34), and encouraging one another (Acts 14:22; Hebrews 10:25). Acts 2:42 tells us of the basics of the church ministry. This is what God has ordained for the early church and the church today. *God's plans for the church have not changed.* To divert from these key things into marketing techniques is the downfall of the modern church. The church is turning into a religious sports club and drama club. It is becoming an ecclesiastical night club. God has not promised to bless the church, which departs from God's plan and design for local church ministry. And many things that are happening which are called God's blessings today are simply man's assessment of God's blessings. Such is the case with the so-called revivals in the Vineyard Movement and Charismatic Circles. They are simply revivals of feeling and experience and not bonifide revivals concerning sin and wrong doing in life.

Furthermore, we must also understand that churches are not growing because masses of people are getting saved. For the most part churches are growing by rearranging the saints who want to move around to more exciting ministries. Or they are growing because they are simply entertaining the masses in their glass cathedral auditoriums. The glorification of success and efforts of Christians to influence the culture have created religious megachurches that are booming in their cultural relevancy and compromise. But we must remember what Joshua said about success. The church has forgotten what true spiritual success is.

Joshua 1:8

“This book of the law shall not depart out of thy mouth; but thou shalt meditate therein day and night, that thou mayest observe to do according to all that is written therein: for then thou shalt make thy way prosperous, and then thou shalt have good success (enjoying God’s victory, blessing and peace).”

True success is to enjoy God’s victory and blessing in life as we meditate in the truth of God’s Word. Success is never viewed in Scripture as big numbers, big buildings or big amounts of money. It is viewed from the standpoint of meditation upon God’s Word with the results of possessing personal victory, joy and peace in life. *True success is living in obedience with God’s Word and therefore in a close relationship with God so that we can encounter His blessing of victory, peace and joy in our own Promised Land or inheritance in Christ.*

Today the Evangelical church is seeking for fame, fortune and status in society. I am reminded of what Jeremiah said:

Jeremiah 45:5

“And seekest thou great things for thyself? seek *them* not: for, behold, I will bring evil upon all flesh, saith the LORD: but thy life will I give unto thee for a prey in all places whither thou goest.”

Everybody is looking for great things today. They want to be successful in their ministry in the eyes of man. They want big numbers and big programs and big productions. The success syndrome is certainly haunting the church today. We want to bigger, better and greater than we are now. *We must remember that the nature of the flesh is to want bigger and better (see Mark 10:37; Matthew 18:1). **But We must remember that big is not always better!*** John the Baptizer had a large ministry in the beginning but his ministry dwindled down and his enemies eventually took his life. And yet God calls him “my messenger” and declared that there had been no human prophet greater than John the Baptist (Matthew 11:10-11). Paul the apostle at one point said these lonely words:

2 Timothy 4:11

“Only Luke is with me...”

Today the average fundamental church is not large; that is to say, it is not large by New Evangelical standards. *But we must remember that we are called as faithful pastors to do His will and leave the results with Him.* We must remember that God has not despised “the day of small things” (see Zechariah 4:10). We may be considered the backwaters of church life but in God’s eyes we are doing His will and will be rewarded accordingly. In God’s eyes there are no big preachers and there are no big churches. Doing God’s will for our life is what is important. God’s will is the big thing in life!

The responsibility of the church is to preach the pure and unadulterated Holy Scriptures. The Bible is what penetrates the lives of people and gives them what they need in life (Hebrews 4:12). People need the bare Word of God and not entertainment. My friend, we were never told to make the Gospel acceptable to the world so that they will come into the church. ***The world will not accept the Gospel. And to try and make it acceptable is a crime against Almighty God and the Bible.***

1 Corinthians 1:18 says:

“For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness; but unto us which are saved it is the power of God.”

1 Corinthians 1:23

“But we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumblingblock, and unto the Greeks foolishness.”

I might also say something about all of the books being written today on marketing skills and church management. Beware, lest we forget the work of the Holy Spirit in the church! Is our reliance on church growth techniques and slick sales or on the power of the Holy Spirit? Paul recognized that the message of the word was powerful. He did not rely on church management skills nor read the latest book on how to get your church to grow or your people to give.

1 Thessalonians 1:5 says:

“For our gospel came not unto you in word only, but also in power, and in the Holy Ghost, and in much assurance; as ye know what manner of men we were among you for your sake.”

1 Corinthians 2:4

“And my speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power.”

Acts 2:47

“...And the Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved.”

We must remember that there may be many people sitting in the church seats but we must ask ourselves if they have understood the message of sin, grace and salvation. Have they been confronted with the issues of discipleship.

The modern New Evangelical ministries who compromise God's holy standards by accommodating culture to their ministries will have to answer to God someday, specifically those leaders who are promoting such cultural corruption. The question

every pastor will have to face in the future is this: “Have I built a ministry that is honoring to God and according to the pattern set forth in Scripture?”

1 Corinthians 3:5-15

“Who then is Paul, and who *is* Apollos, but ministers by whom ye believed, even as the Lord gave to every man? I have planted, Apollos watered; but God gave the increase. So then neither is he that planteth any thing, neither he that watereth; but God that giveth the increase. Now he that planteth and he that watereth are one: and every man shall receive his own reward according to his own labour. For we are labourers together with God: ye are God's husbandry, *ye are* God's building. According to the grace of God which is given unto me, as a wise masterbuilder, I have laid the foundation, and another buildeth thereon. But let every man take heed how he buildeth thereupon. For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ. Now if any man build upon this foundation gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble; Every man's work shall be made manifest: for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire; and the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is. If any man's work abide which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward. If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved; yet so as by fire.”

The context reveals that Paul is referring specifically about ministers who have participated in building the ministries of God. They will be held accountable for how they have built those ministries. There is a right way to build a church and a wrong way to build a church. In that coming great day of accountability before Christ, the Bema Seat, ministers will give account of how they built their ministries. In that day it will not be the quantity of the work that God will look at, but the quality of the work (“of what sort it is”). There will be those who will have to hang their head in shame at the ways they have compromised in their ministries. Furthermore, they will not receive reward for any of their compromises. They will not pass the final examine (James 3:1).

There used to be a man who came on the Christian radio and asked, “Is everybody happy?” This seems to be the goal of New Evangelicalism. They want to make everybody happy of their tolerant stance. And they somehow believe that their sincerity and sentimentality about seeing people saved and loving everybody to the extent of compromising with them will somehow allow God to overlook their disobedience and condolences of error. *Let us remember that sentimentality will not satisfy God. God is looking for obedience! It is better to obey than to sacrifice (1 Samuel 15:22). God honors obedience (Deut. 11:26-28).* Furthermore, all these attitudes of positivism, the absence of negativism and the fact of peace and love without purity, which the New Evangelicals promote, can be summed up in what J.C. Ryle said:

“From the liberality which says that everybody is right; from the charity which forbids to say that anybody is wrong; from the peace which is brought at the expense of truth; may the good Lord deliver us.”

David wells, who is a New Evangelical and professor of Gordon- Conwell Theological Seminary wrote a book entitled “No Place For Truth Or Whatever Happened to Evangelical Theology?” This book was a confession of the departure of New Evangelicalism from traditional doctrines and was a call to return to doctrinal purity. The problem is this. You cannot return to doctrinal purity unless you get the impure out of your ranks. *How silly to call for purity in doctrine when you are promoting, supporting and rubbing shoulders with those who are preaching impure doctrine.*

Harold Lindsell, former vice president of Fuller Theological Seminary, another New Evangelical, also wrote a book entitled, “The Battle for the Bible.” This book came out in 1976 and exposed the danger of modern evangelicals corrupting the complete inspiration of Scriptures because this in return would do away with the matter of inerrancy or a Bible without error. Lindsell wrote of the errors of the founding school of New Evangelical – Fuller Seminary. In 1979 he came out with a sequel book called “The Bible in Balance.” There are those within the New Evangelical camp who have seen first hand what compromise does. In short, it attacks the Bible. And this is what Satan wants to do today. He wants man to question God’s word. Satan puts a question mark where God puts a period. “Yea, hath God said?”

In 1984 Francis Schaeffer published his exposure of what he called “The Great Evangelical Disaster.” He argued that “latitudinarianism” has been adopted by the Evangelical world at large. This refers to the prevailing attitude that Christians must be broadminded, must not be dogmatic or judgmental but must allow for a wide range of theology. Schaeffer noted, “When doctrinal latitudinarianism sets in, we can be sure both from history and personal observation that in one or two generations those who are taught by the churches that hold this mentality will lose still more, and the line between evangelical and liberal will be lost.”

Webster defines “latitudinarianism” as “one who is not restrained by precise limits. *But the Bible teaches that the believer should be bound by the very precise limits of the Word of God.*

The words of the Lord given to Joshua are important to remember:

Joshua 1:7

“Only be thou strong and very courageous, that thou mayest observe to do according to all the law, which Moses my servant commanded thee: turn not from it *to the right hand or to the left*, that thou mayest prosper whithersoever thou goest.”

God is looking for courageous men today and not compromising men. God is looking for Christians to stand in the gap and be counted as separated believers who will not associate with unholy practices or organizations that promote false teaching.

“Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, quit (to act manly, show oneself brave) you like men, be strong” (1 Cor. 16:13).

My friend, there is an evangelical crisis going on in the church today. It began when New Evangelicalism was formed in the later 1940's and started the philosophy that there was a need for infiltration and dialogue with skepticism and unbelief. The crisis has now spread to mammoth proportions. In a 1994 publication of “Christianity today,” the leading magazine promoting New Evangelicalism, says that the majority of pastors surveyed listed “relational skills,” “management skills” and “communication skills” as the top priority in their jobs. This is erroneous. God exalts sound doctrine above all of these matters. And doctrine is all important in the church life and ministry of the preacher – not relational skills (2 Timothy 3:16).

There is an astounding degree of theological illiteracy among evangelicals today so that there is an acceptance of more liberal theology or “revisionist theology” as they call it today. Call it what you may, revisionist theology or theological pluralism. I call it the same old modernism or liberalism. *Dear friend, it is absolutely impossible to maintain truth without practicing Biblical separation and discipline.* The history of New Evangelicalism has proved this to be true. If you give one pew to New Evangelical thought, this movement will take ten pews. **One compromise always leads to another compromise. A little heresy invariably leads to a lot of heresy.** Error is like any other seed. It tends to grow and multiply. “A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump” (1 Cor. 5:6). If you leave apostasy and worldly unseparated ways go long enough, it will only grow until everything is leavened or permeated within the church. This is what happens to churches on the local level and it is what has happened to the New Evangelical churches as I write. When acceptance with error, apostasy and worldly methods begins there is no end to where it will go. God says “to obey is better than sacrifice” (1 Samuel 15:22). **God is really saying that that to obey is better than anything!**

New Evangelicalism is that movement (1940's - present) which professes to adhere to the Fundamentals of the faith but advocates a spirit of re-examination of the basic doctrines dealing with the Holy Spirit (Charismatic teachings), eschatology, and has re-opened the question of inspiration. It has shifted away from traditional dispensationalism and has also increased its emphasis on scholarship. It has a friendlier attitude toward science and the liberals. It also has stressed new forms of worship, questionable methods for living and ecumenical practices of compromise. **This movement was born because of the dissatisfaction with Fundamentalism and Fundamentalism's bold stand against error, ecumenicalism, apostates and unholy practices.** It is a

movement that tries to be neutral and tolerant in its preaching, stand and living. This is the main movement, which has swept the church into a compromising position with liberals and with unholy and worldly practices. It promotes an attitude of tolerance toward the liberals and enters into "dialogue" with them. ***This movement emphasizes God's love and mercy and not God's holiness and righteousness.*** Cooperation and contamination are two words to describe this movement and mood, which controls evangelical Christians.

In his book *The New Evangelicalism*, Dr. Woodbridge identifies the following five downward steps of compromise: "The New Evangelicalism advocates **TOLERATION** of error. It is following the downward path of **ACCOMMODATION** to error, **COOPERATION** with error, **CONTAMINATION** by error, and ultimate **CAPITULATION** (surrender) to error!"

A New-Evangelical is a person who claims to adhere to the Fundamentals of the Bible but has an open mind and attitude of tolerance toward Liberals and a spirit of compromise toward unholy practices and even certain doctrines. *They are a person who is willing to compromise in certain areas of doctrine, associational separation and holy living in order to remain tolerant and accepted by the mainstream of other Christians.* The main figures in this New Evangelical movement are Carl Henry, Harold Ockenga, Bernard Ramm, J. Carnell and Billy Graham who can be considered as a major impetus to the spread of New-Evangelicalism.

Ockenga, the founding father of New Evangelicalism, contended that evangelicals should practice infiltration rather than separation, meaning they should stay in the apostate denominations and organizations and try to change them from within rather than separate from them and serve God in pure churches and organizations. He contended that evangelicals should practice dialogue rather than exhortation, that they should not be negative in their message by rebuking and warning false teachers publicly, but should attempt to change the false teachers through dialogue. He taught that evangelicals should reexamine their idea of worldliness and not be as strict about separating from worldly evils as Bible-believing Christians had been in earlier days.

Ockenga decided that evangelicals should consider the possibility that modern science was right in some areas where it disagreed with the Bible. The prime example of this was in the origin of the world. Ockenga did not think Christians should so easily ignore the teaching of evolution, as separatists were accustomed to do. He taught that there could be a synthesis between modern science and the Bible, and it is this new-evangelical principle that led to such strange ideas as theistic evolution.

Ockenga also believed that Christians should aim to meet modernists and the men of the world on their own scholastic level and therefore contended that Christian leaders should be as well educated in the social sciences and liberal arts as unregenerate

scholars and as well-versed in Bible criticism as the modernists. The idea was that the Christian leader should seek to influence men through human wisdom and scholarship rather than purely through the power of the Holy Spirit and the preaching of the Word of God as we see in the ministries of the Apostles. This of course has always been the trend of New-Evangelicalism.

Paul told young Timothy in 2 Timothy 4:2:

“Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine.”

The authority of the Bible is what will penetrate through liberal beliefs and ideas. **Scholarship is not the answer! Christians who are sound in the faith and standing on truth is the answer!** Furthermore, the idea that we must get to the level of liberals intellectually is an absurdity. The Bible itself is the level we must rise to and **“what saith the Scripture?”** as seen in Romans 4:3.

In 1956 an article appeared in “Christian Life magazine” which emphasized the new movement with its trends. The article was entitled, “Is Evangelical Theology changing?” There were eight trends used to identify this movement.

1. A friendlier attitude toward science.

The Bible says that we should not be friends with the science when science contradicts the Bible. I want to repeat something, which I shared with you earlier. **We are to measure science by the Bible and not the Bible by science.** Man’s speculative scientific knowledge is full of ignorance and delusion.

1Timothy 6:20-21 says:

“O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane *and* vain babblings, and oppositions of science (knowledge) falsely so called: Which some professing have erred concerning the faith. Grace *be* with thee. Amen.”

Dr. Edward Carnell, president of Fuller Seminary (1955-59), was a leading spokesman for New-Evangelicalism. Carnell said: “Orthodoxy does not deny that nature is progressively changing and what is this but evolution? Orthodoxy has given up the literal day theory out of respect for geology, it would certainly forfeit no principle if it gave up the immediate creation theory out of respect for paleontology.”

This statement shows how New-Evangelicals were influenced by the false findings science and how theistic evolution was taught as a possibility in certain New-Evangelical schools such as Fuller Theological Seminary.

Professor Millard Erickson, a member of the Wheaton College faculty, has said: “The term progressive creationism is a good one. It is progressive in that it denies an instantaneous creation and fixity of the species allowing for a moderate amount of development. It is creationism, however, in that it denies the evolution has been total.”

Once again, this is double talk that tries to highlight the secular notion of evolution with the Bible.

Harold J. Ockenga has said:

“I contend that it makes no difference whether God used a literal or anthropomorphic handful of dust or whether He used some creature already in existence when He formed man of the dust of the ground.”

The attempt to support the evolutionary myths of science is another indication that New Evangelicals want to have intellectual respectability with man at the expense of the Scriptures. The glorification of other science related topics such as anthropology or the study of man are also highly emphasized. This would include such areas as **psychiatry** and **psychology**. The church has become fascinated with psychology today. We can readily see the results of New Evangelicalism by looking at the bookstores and the so-called flood of books dealing with human potential. Christian Psychologists such as James Dobson, Gary Collins, Lawrence Crabb, Paul Meier, Frank Minirith and multitudes of others have swallowed the New Evangelical lie to compromise with science in order to find the answers to man’s problems. These men with their psychological approach to Christian living are the direct result of the New Evangelical movement, which had always wanted to compromise with science. And these men today are teaching the old humanistic philosophies of “**self-esteem**” that butter up man and make him feel good about himself. *They are trying to press the issue of self-acceptance and self-love as a necessary ingredient for successful Christian living and service instead of only deep humility and dissociation with one’s self.* Jesus said that we are to hate ourselves in one respect in order to be His disciple.

Luke 14:26

“If any *man* come to me, and **hate** not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life (his sins, failure to serve God and His own goals and ambitions in life) also, he cannot be my disciple.”

The human sciences of psychology say that we are to love ourselves but Jesus says that we are to hate our sin and selfishness and not look upon ourselves as some kind of tremendous gift of human potential. We are to not to think of ourselves as someone great and noble (Romans 12:3) nor are we to consider ourselves as God’s special gift in the human race.

Job 25:6 asks:

“How much less man, *that is* a worm? and the son of man, *which is* a worm?”

We must view ourselves as worthless worms that have been saved and given new life as God’s children. We must see ourselves as people who have been saved only because of God’s love and grace. ***The glory is in God and not in man or human potential!*** Man’s human potential was not in God’s mind when he reached out to man. It was God’s love alone that motivated Him. There can be absolutely no room for human pride and potential in God’s saving and serving program. We need Christ-esteem today and not self-esteem, (Philippians 1:21).

Messages today are geared around trying to probe and satisfy the psychological and emotional needs of people. Psychological wholeness is more important than doctrinal correctness.

Robert Schuller said:

“For decades now we have watched the church in Western Europe and in America decline in power, membership, and influence. I believe that this decline is the result of our placing theocentric (God centered) communications above the meeting of deeper emotional and spiritual needs of humanity.”

Many New Evangelicals are adopting preaching today that is anthropocentric instead of theocentric or God centered. They are trying to entertain man instead of exalting God and what He says in His Word. Instead of expository preaching which exalts both God and sound doctrinal, many are turning to more of a man-centered type of preaching that is geared around man’s apparent psychological needs and human potential. Every preacher has heard the old saying, “Pastor, you are not meeting my needs.” This is actually a confession of selfishness where someone’s focus is on themselves other than Christ. When a preacher gives in to the “felt needs” of people he will start preaching messages that are geared to satisfy peoples psychological needs. He will begin to make the Bible a textbook of psychology, personality change, psychotherapy, and therapeutic change. *People today are more interested in having their feelings explored and diagnosed than they are to hear the truth of God’s word, which exposes their wrong feelings and warns them about their failures in their Christian lives.* Little do they realize in their deluded state that only God and the truth can meet their true needs. But many ministers are giving in to this false need preaching so people can analyze themselves instead of repent of sin and get right with God. Is this not a fulfillment of what was said to take place in the last days?

2 Timothy 4:3

“For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine (healthy teaching); but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears.”

People no longer want healthy teaching but teaching that is man centered and fits their lifestyle. They want teaching that is geared for their selfish needs and their psychological interest. *Today people would rather want to “feel” something than “learn” something.*

Dr. Ernest Pickering has said:

“The great preachers of the past have not gone to the Scriptures with the primary aim of meeting human need but of finding and declaring the mind and purposes of God. In doing so, they have met human needs. The Bible was not written merely to satisfy man’s needs and to give him answers to life’s problems. It was written to show forth the majesty of God and to trace God’s purposes for the created universe, angels, earth, Israel, and the church.”

Dear friend, science or psychology cannot help us win the battle of the Christian life. It is not science it is the Scripture! It takes the Scriptures and the Holy Spirit to bring us guidance and victory for the Christian life. God has given us the new nature and the promises of His word to enable us live godly and different in this present world. We have divine power, divine promises and a divine nature to get us through the battle.

2 Peter 1:2-4 says:

“Grace and peace be multiplied unto you through the knowledge of God, and of Jesus our Lord, According as his divine power hath given unto us all things that *pertain* unto life and godliness, through the knowledge of him (not ourselves – psychology) that hath called us to glory and virtue: Whereby are given unto us exceeding great and precious promises: that by these ye might be partakers of the divine nature, having escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust.”

We are to live our life on divine power and divine promises and the divine nature. Everything we need to live the Christian life comes from God! We are not to try and live our lives by the discoveries of anthropological science. Your left brain and right brain has nothing to do with living the Christian life. Man cannot solve man’s problems! When will we realize this? Only God and His word can bring lasting solutions and help into our lives.

2. A willingness to re-examine beliefs concerning the Holy Spirit.

This plays right in the hands of the Charismatic teachings on the Holy Spirit and their supposed Spirit-led experiences or visions, which are false and should never be considered. Today there is a heavy reliance upon visions, dreams and emotional experiences as added sources of authority other than the Bible. This is an extremely dangerous trend. We must remember that the Bible is our only and final source of authority (Jude 1:3; Rev. 22:18,19). *God has told us to “preach the word” and not*

dreams and visions. The Scriptures are the final authority. If the Scriptures are not the final and only Word of God, we are left to endless confusion and conflicting testimony. Bernard Ramm, another New Evangelical said:

“We must steer a wise course *between* subjectivism and authoritarianism”

In other words, Ramm is suggesting that we must allow for subjective experiences and reasoning and walk the middle of the road between subjective encounters (mystical experiences) and Biblical authority. Subjectivism deals with experiences and not necessarily factual statements from God’s Word. Experience is fast becoming the uniting force among New Evangelicals. This is the trend of New Evangelicals today. It is the trend to accept pragmatic experiences over theological truth. Many in the New Evangelical movement have fallen into the pot of mystical experiences. Evangelicalism today has been totally swallowed by the modern day Charismatic whale. When you allow the whale to open its mouth, then the whale will sooner or later swallow you. When you open up your mind to error, then error will sooner or later eat away at the truth and override the clear truth.

2 Timothy 2:16-18 warns us:

“But shun profane *and* vain babblings (empty or fruitless discussion): for they will increase unto more ungodliness. And their word (not God’s Word) will eat as doth a canker (infect the truth like gangrene infects the body): of whom is Hymenaeus and Philetus; Who concerning the truth have erred, saying that the resurrection is past already; and overthrow the faith of some.”

The medical image is striking in these verses. Participating with those who engage in false teaching will only give their words a feeding place that will attack the truth even as gangrene attacks the tissues of the body. This is always the case. We have a gangrene affect going on in the body of Christ today as the church continues to compromise with error. New-Evangelical believers are giving ground to the false teachings concerning the Holy Spirit and other areas, which in return is attacking the very truth concerning these vital doctrines. This is having a gangrene affect upon the truth today. It is beginning to kill the truth. The truth is becoming decomposed and putrefying because of this gangrene affect.

Chuck Swindoll has said:

“I don’t feel it is my calling to shoot great volleys of theological artillery at my charismatic brothers and sisters.”

We must remember that the question is not whether certain charismatics are brothers or sisters. The question is this; are they abiding by truth? The issue is not the salvation of people but the preservation of truth! In spite of what Chuck Swindoll says, we must

remember that we are instructed to oppose those believers who are in error and seek to correct them from their unsound doctrine.

2 Timothy 2:25

“In meekness instructing those that oppose themselves; if God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth.”

Titus 1:13 also says:

“This witness is true. Wherefore rebuke them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith.”

It is not a mark of Christian love or grace awakening to remain silent in the face of error and fail to seek to correct the erring one. Quiet the opposite. It is a mark of cowardliness and a way to remain neutral and pleasing to everyone without standing up for sound doctrine and what is right.

3. A more tolerant attitude on views of eschatology.

This is certainly the trend today. A toleration of eschatological views is the hallmark of New Evangelicalism. Today, it's *not scholarly* to take a bold stand on the pretribulational rapture of the church or on the future state of Israel. One New-Evangelical pastor told me that I must be open to new things and new views on eschatology. This is the classic example of how this New-Evangelical virus has affected the church today. There are New-Evangelicals who are reconsidering the theory of the reconstruction of society through humanitarian efforts. This is called **dominion theology** and **reconstructionism**. All that they really are saying is what the liberals have been preaching all along. The kingdom will be brought in by the efforts of man instead of Christ. Many today are not willing to say dogmatically that they are right in their view of eschatology. They want to be open to other views and not downgrade any other view even if it does not square with Scripture. We live in a day of softness and acceptance of false theories about Christ's coming and His prophetic program. We live in a day of eschatological confusion. The prophetic Scriptures are being studied as only views instead of God's absolute standard of truth and error. There is also a resurgence of the allegorization method of interpreting prophecy. Millard Erickson is a leading New Evangelical spokesman who says:

“ For new evangelicals eschatology is less literal and more spiritual.”

In other words, Erickson is saying that New Evangelicals have the tendency to decrease the literal approach to the study of Scriptures when dealing with the prophetic Word. The prophetic Scriptures are outlined so that we do not have to guess about Christ's coming and what is going to happen in the future. A blessing is promised to

those of us who study prophecy in a futuristic literal approach and who are anxiously waiting for the imminent return of Christ (Revelation 1:3).

We might also add at this point that New Evangelicals also water down other doctrines of the Bible such as the subject of hell. They tend to spiritualize those things, which are to be taken literally. One example would be Billy Graham who once taught the truth about a physical hell of burning fire but now teaches that hell may be used in a figurative sense for the burning thirst that lost men have for God.

Erickson sums it up well:

“There has been a shift in Graham’s thinking toward a less exclusively literal interpretation of Scripture. In his early preaching, Graham gave evidence of a belief in a hell, which burned with a physical, not a figurative fire...Later, he came to believe that hell’s fire may be the burning thirst for God of those who had been banished from His presence...”

Dear friend, this is what happens when you hang around with liberals too long and read the intellectual authors who reject the plain meanings of Scripture. You will find yourself surrendering to human reasoning instead of God’s infallible Word. People say that Bible Graham has not changed his message. This is simply not true. By the way, Luke 16 could hardly refer to the view that Billy Graham now espouses on hell. Likewise, lost souls in hell do not thirst for God as he claims. The rich man did not want to be taken out of this awful place of judgment but called for his son (Luke 16:27-28). When mankind is judged they do not thirst for God. They blaspheme God (Revelation 16:8-11).

4. A shift away from dispensationalism.

The original New Evangelicals disliked Dispensationalism because it taught that there would be a growing apostasy in the church age (2 Thess. 2:3) for which there could be no remedy but separation. The New Evangelicals disliked this teaching in view of their non-separated attitudes with the liberals. They did not want to view the church as some kind of refuge in a ruined world. Rather, they wanted to promote the work of the church as having a positive building role within society so the world could be improved.

We see this happening today. New-Evangelicalism wants to shift away from the historic dispensational teaching of the Bible. Dispensationalism is a hobbyhorse that many of them like to ride and try to refute. They want to revert back to an eschatology that is reformed in its design. This is why we have the teaching of “progressive dispensationalism” being promoted today. This is a teaching that tries to accommodate covenant theology with dispensational theology by insisting that the Old Covenant promise to David is being fulfilled in the church today by Jesus Christ, who is sitting upon the throne in Heaven. This kind of reasoning tries to accommodate Reformed

Theology, which teaches that the Old Testament promises given to Israel concerning the kingdom are actually spiritually fulfilled in the present day people of God called the New Testament church. It begins to blur distinctions between the church and Israel (1 Cor. 10:32) and weakens the literal and future fulfillment of God's covenant promises to Israel (Romans 9). It is false and unwarranted because the kingdom is future and Christ's reign is in the future (see Luke 1:32-33).

5. An increased emphasis on scholarship.

Dr. Ockenga said:

"He (the New Evangelical) wishes to win a new respectability for orthodoxy in the academic circles by producing scholars who can defend the faith on intellectual ground."

My friend, this statement speaks for itself. New-Evangelicalism has always wanted to dialogue with the liberals by making scholarly men who could supposedly be on the same intellectual level with the liberals. This is what happened at the beginning. The scholarly men of Fundamentalism were not being recognized by the scholarly world as a whole. Therefore, they enrolled in liberal schools so that they could gain more popularity and acceptance. Thus, there was and is today an increased emphasis on scholarship within New-Evangelical circles. People seem to create icons out of men who are known for their Greek and Hebrew studies and their rhetoric. Many have developed a dependency on the interpretations of celebrity figures and scholars instead of the Holy Spirit (see 1 Corinthians 2:9-12). There are *evangelical icons* (MacArthurites, Swindollites) today that are held in such high esteem that they can never say anything wrong or considered to be in error.

Ernest Pickering has said:

"Evangelicals are bitten with academic prestige bug."

Today there are those teachers who make great claims to knowledge of the original languages and seek to impress the people with dependency upon them in order properly understand the Bible. There is a certain thrust on scholarship today that has in one sense introduced a new popery and priesthood over the average Bible student. Laymen are encouraged to accept scholarly teachers as the infallible interpreters of the Word and are discouraged to think they can understand the Bible by the instruction of the Holy Spirit. We must beware of such an emphasis as this today. Believers must never surrender the privilege of being taught directly by the Holy Spirit as they read and study the Word of God (1 John 2:20,27). These verses are not saying that it is wrong to listen to good Bible teachers or go to church. Rather, they are saying that we do not need to solely depend upon man in order to understand the Bible. We can depend upon the Holy Spirit for help and assistance as we study the Scriptures so that we do not have to take every man's word as truth. The Holy Spirit will enlighten us to

truth. All we need is the bare Word of God and the Holy Spirit to teach us. We should never believe that highly learned scholars are the only means by which people in a certain generation can learn truth.

We must also remember that we are not to be “highminded” (Romans 11:20; 1 Timothy 6:17) about our position in life. Scholarly advancements and man’s own higher learning has become a foundation to rest upon in these New Evangelical days. The Bible says that we are to possess a humble mind knowing that we are not the only answer in getting God’s work done on earth (Philippians 2:5-8).

Furthermore, we must remember that Paul did not attempt to explain God’s Word in some kind of scholarly fashion to appeal to a society whose minds are darkened by Satan (Ephesians 4:18). What did Paul say:

1 Corinthians 2:4 says:

“And my speech and my preaching was not with enticing (persuasive) words of man’s wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power.”

New Evangelicalism has practically destroyed the glorious days of the Bible Institutes that were dotted across America. The New Evangelical thrust is so caught up in higher scholarly learning other than the Bible that they talk about the “the Bible Institute mentality” and use this expression as some kind of mockery or secondary learning center. The New Evangelicals are strong on the liberal arts and higher academics. They place a heavy emphasis on these subjects and lessen the Bible intake. Of course, not every accredited college is New Evangelical. However, in the original spreading of the movement they began to criticize the Bible Institutes as being outdated. One New Evangelical writer said:

“The Old-fashioned Bible Institute is outmoded as high button shoes. It ought to be retired to the conservative religious museum. It is geared to training workers to perpetuate the myth of a Nicolaitan and legalistic local church structure unrecognized in the Word of God.”

Of course, this writer was talking about how the Bible Institutes warn against apostasy and teach Biblical separation. He was against the way the Bible Institutes warned against the inroads of modernism. This is why many of the New Evangelicals wanted to see the institutes become an antique piece of the past. In our day we have seen the tremendous decline of the Bible Institute because of the strong New Evangelical thrust for scholarly degrees and secular education. Saints are more concerned about being scholarly than they are about becoming a Bible discerning believer. The idea has been implanted by New Evangelicalism that you cannot get very far without degrees behind your name. Biblical discerning believers who just study the Word of God are frowned upon in today’s sea of New Evangelical scholarly confusion.

This idea that we must continually be engaged in the pursuit of intellectual knowledge so that we can be on the same level as modernistic Bible rejecters is erroneous. New Evangelical writers like to say that we need to be involved with “framework of modern reasoning.” This simply means that we must study sources outside the Bible in order to gain a full knowledge of what is true and what is not true. From the very beginning the devil tried to get Eve to believe that there was some hidden knowledge or agenda outside the Bible (Genesis 3:5).

Long ago Martin Luther said:

“When we first meet the devil in the Bible he is camped under the tree of knowledge and he has been there ever since.”

6. A more definite recognition of social responsibility.

New-Evangelicalism stated that the Fundamentalist did not have any concern for social reform. This was the big cry against the Fundamentalists in the 40’s. Carl Henry wrote a book entitled, “The Uneasy Conscience of Modern Fundamentalism” and claimed that the conscience of the Fundamentalist group was uneasy because of their lack of concern, interest and responsibility in the social welfare of humanity. The New Evangelicals didn’t like to use the term “social gospel” as the liberals did. Rather, they have substituted other words such as “social involvement” and “social concern.” The lines between the Bible’s Gospel and the social gospel of liberalism are being blurred.

Billy Graham said to the national Council of Churches:

“There’s a great section of the church that feels that the two (evangelism and social concern) should go hand in hand and I am one of them.”

Leighton Ford, Billy Graham’s brother-in-law, said:

“The Second Coming is a motivation force of social transformation.”

He uses such terms as “revolutionary evangelism” to teach the old concept of a social gospel. However, the Bible never teaches that the church should reform the world in light of the rapture. It teaches us to purify ourselves in light of His coming (1 John 3:2-3). This is something that many within the New Evangelical crowd do not like to hear. They would rather purify the earth through social reforms than take a long look at their own need for purity from apostasy and unclean living. The Bible teaches that the world is doomed for destruction and no believer is going to transform society (2 Peter 3:10). Christ will bring in His own kingdom without the efforts of man (Revelation 19:11-16) and then following the Millenium destroy planet earth to form a new earth (Revelation 21:1). The social reform will be done by Christ.

A careful study of the New Testament reveals that that the church never received any commission by the Lord to invest their time in “cultural transformation.” The Great Commission of our Lord contains no such command (Matt. 28:19-20; Mark 16:15; Luke 24:46-48). We cannot reform society or legislate society because the prince of this world (Satan) has much of the political and religious system of this world in his own darkness (John 16:11; 2 Cor. 4:4). The Holy Spirit is moving among the nations of people today to “take out of them a people for his name” (Acts 15:14). This is God’s purpose for this age. He is not attempting to Christianize the entire world. The New Evangelical church has placed too much emphasis on social transformation as the mandate of the church.

Many are saying today that there can be no true evangelism without accompanying social reform. This is simply false. As we have seen already, the church is not called to change the world from a social or political level. We are to seek to do good unto all men as much as possible (Galatians 6:10). However, the main thrust and mission of the church is to spread the Gospel or call out a people for the name of Christ. In short, we are to endeavor to see souls saved (Acts 15:14). New Evangelicalism is simply trying to shift back in the direction of liberalism and the social gospel so that there can be less of a division between the two systems. There is no place in the New Testament where you see the church gathering funds together to feed the unsaved. Rather, you see the church helping the saved (Acts 4:32-37; James 2:15; 1 John 3:17). There is nothing wrong with feeding the needy, but the New Evangelicals have gone too far in the espousal of social reform and programs.

New Evangelicalism with its huge thrust on feeding campaigns and social responsibility has simply tried to make the Gospel more attractive to the modern man. It has tried to make orthodoxy more respectable to humanity. Without knowing it, their heavy emphasis on social responsibility as part of the Gospel message is one way to try and remove the “offence of the cross.” The true Gospel that says Christ died and rose again for people who are dreadful sinners in God’s presence and are going to hell is offensive to the world. Therefore, we must incorporate other phases of what God wants to be included in His Gospel program and begin to emphasize them, such as social concern. This strategy lessens the offence of the cross.

Galatians 5:11 reminds us:

“And I, brethren, if I yet preach circumcision, why do I yet suffer persecution? then is the offence of the cross ceased.”

The Gospel of salvation and the cross is an offense to man. It offends him and causes him to stumble because it tells him that there is nothing he can do to earn salvation. It gives no place to the flesh and its efforts. It spells an end to human works. It tells him that he is an absolute good for nothing sinner in God’s eyes who can only be saved by God’s grace. If Paul were to introduce works by preaching circumcision, then he would

be setting aside the whole meaning of the cross. To preach the Gospel and include man's involvement through circumcision would cause the Gospel to become much less offensive to the lost world. The same could be said concerning social involvement. To preach the Gospel and include man's involvement through social involvement would cause the Gospel to become much less offensive to the lost world. *If you change the message, then the cross becomes less appalling!* This tells us that it is a very dangerous move to mix the cross with man made events such as circumcision or social involvement as New Evangelicalism emphasizes today. ***Man's actions and other manmade criteria have absolutely nothing to do with the cross and God's way of salvation.***

We might also add at this point that another New Evangelical practice is also to make the Gospel very unclear at times. They may talk about the grace of God and the love of God and forgiveness but in the final analysis the invitation to be saved comes out something like this: "Surrender your life to God" or "Love God" or "Give your heart to Jesus." I would like to show me on the basis of Scripture where a man's sins are forgiven on the basis of these things. The Bible says that a man is saved when he repents of his sins (Acts 17:30) and believes the Gospel of 1 Corinthians 15:3-4. Repentance is a change of mind about your sinful condition before God and belief means to express faith in Christ for salvation from hell. ***Weak Gospel invitations lead to false conversions.*** There are times when New Evangelicals do not want to explain the Gospel clearly and man's awful plight before God. They become hazy in their Gospel presentation or in their invitation for men to respond to the Gospel. There is only one salvation and it is to have faith in the finished work of Christ upon the cross.

The present day push in the New Evangelical mainstream on cultural relevancy and understanding cultural diversity is also the outcome of the old emphasis on the social gospel. There is a growing teaching among evangelicals that is saying that we must socialize with any culture and learn to adjust to its ways and ideas. This in return will give us unity and bring transformation and newness into the body of Christ. This sounds like something you would hear on the Christian radio today. *Behind all of this talk is nothing more than an emphasis on the social culture instead of the cross of Christ.* We must remember that we are to counteract culture and not be so concerned about fitting into every culture. The overemphasis to line up with other cultures is an easy way to promote false ecumenical unity and override important Biblical issues of doctrine. Of course, this is exactly what New Evangelicals want to do. They want to jettison certain doctrines that they feel are not important so that ecumenical unity can be maintained and cultural barriers can be broken down. Imagine this. We can now determine what doctrines are important? God, I will tell you what is important and what is not important. How utterly foolish!

7. A reopening of the subject of Biblical inspiration and inerrancy.

The New Evangelical Bloesch has said:

“Fundamentalism has placed too much emphasis upon words of Scripture to the neglect of meaning, truth and power.”

This is another mark of the New Evangelical crowd. They do not believe in the verbal inspiration of the Bible, which teaches that every word is inspired. *But they have forgotten that you cannot have the right meaning without the right words.* There are those who promote the idea that the Bible is not necessarily inspired in certain areas of history and science. This is a direct attack upon what the Bible says concerning its internal structure. The Bible declares absolute inspiration. We believe in the verbal and plenary inspiration of Scriptures (every word is inspired and all of Scripture is equally inspired).

2 Timothy 3:16

“All scripture *is* given by inspiration of God, and *is* profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness.”

As far back as 1956, Wilbur Smith has said:

“I believe that most conservative theologians today agree that the whole subject of Biblical inspiration needs reinvestigation.”

This is a statement that came from a man who was deceived by the modern scholarship of New Evangelicalism. Wilbur Smith should have known better. There is nothing to reinvestigate when it comes the matter of inspiration of the Bible. They talk about “inscripturated inspiration” today which sounds very intellectual but maintains that there are errors in the Bible.

Millard Erickson says:

“The new evangelicals hold that the Bible is entirely the Word of God.”

Then Erickson goes on to say:

“Some Bible statements appear to be in contradiction to what we know from science.”

Then he goes on to quote Carnell to verify what he really believes:

“The mere presence of a statement in Scripture does not guarantee its truth.”

New Evangelicals always water down the meaning of inspiration and engage in what I call theological double talk.

Paul Rees said:

“We say (New Evangelicals) this phrase (inerrancy) refers only to the original manuscripts of the writers, but no such manuscripts exist today. So you can’t apply this meaning (inerrancy) to any existing part of the Bible.”

Dear friend, if a man wants to entrust his soul to a high degree of probability that is up to him. But probability is not good enough for me. I will rest my soul upon the promises of Scripture. The Bible teaches that it is the inspired Word of God to every word, passage and minute detail.

The New Evangelicals have their own brand of inspiration. The original ones have departed from this truth but the newer ones have gone even farther in their skepticism and unbelief. The old concepts of infallibility and inerrancy are being reinterpreted because of the weak views of inspiration. There are those now saying that the teaching of Scripture rather than the text itself is without error. This is another kind of double talk being instigated by these New Evangelicals today. ***What kind of teaching can you have without the right words? If the words of Scripture are in error so must the thoughts also be!***

George Ladd of Fuller Seminary said this concerning the content of the Bible:

“The evangelical must often be satisfied with hypothesis, probabilities, possibilities, rather than in dogmatic certainties.”

Ladd goes on to say:

“It clearly cannot include the preservation of an infallible text.”

It is no wonder why New Evangelicalism also teaches that the Bible is no longer **inerrant** (without error). This is another word that New Evangelicals do not want to clarify. In fact, Ronald Nash commenting on inerrancy says, “For one thing no one word ever means the same thing to two people.” This is an absolutely ludicrous claim of a man who is trying to do away with the inerrancy of Scripture. The Bible is without error of any kind. The point is this. ***New Evangelicals have restated what the doctrine of inspiration means so that they can do away with an inerrant Bible or a Bible that does not have any errors. If you lose inspiration, then you lose the whole ship. God says in Psalm 11:3, “If the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?”***

Clark Pinnock is a limited inerrantist when he says:

“The Bible contains errors but teaches none.”

Many today want to discard the term inerrancy altogether and keep the term infallibility. Their reasoning is that the Bible is not inerrant (without error) for it contains errors in geography, history and numerology, but it is still infallible (incapable of error) and

reliable only in the sense when it comes to the important issues of doctrine which it teaches.

Today Billy Graham does not want to say that inerrancy is true concerning the Bible because he has been hanging around the liberals far too long and their liberal views about the Bible have made an impression upon him. What does Billy Graham think about the subject of inerrancy or a Bible without error?

“I do not believe that the ground of fellowship is to be the inerrancy of Scripture, but, rather, the ground of our fellowship should be the deity of Christ.”

Billy Graham has apparently forgotten that the only reliable testimony we have to Christ's deity is in an inerrant and infallible Bible in every part, which has no errors! ***The Bible is fully inspired to every word and fully inerrant and fully infallible.*** Let's stop all of this liberal double talk today.

This kind of thinking on the Bible is prominent today. It's also a familiar New Evangelical saying to claim inspiration “only in the original manuscripts or autographs.” Even fundamentalists do this without realizing that they leave the door wide open for the New Evangelicals to discuss limited inerrancy since we do not have the copies of the originals today.

Ernest Pickering has left the door wide open for the New Evangelicals when he said: “The inspiration, therefore, extends not merely to the thoughts, general concepts, or doctrinal truths, but to the very words in which the Scriptures were written.”

This is absolutely true. No fundamentalist could have said it any clearer. To this I say “Amen.” But what Pickering says next is shocking to me. He goes on to say in the next breath: “Every word in the original manuscripts as authored by the divinely-chosen authors was the very word God wanted employed.”

This kind of talk of God only preserving His word in only the original manuscripts does not sound much different than what the New Evangelical camp is saying. With highest regard and due respect for Dr. Pickering, I must still disagree with his conclusion. It is actually a matter of unbelief to say that the Bible was only accurately preserved in the original manuscripts and imply that it is not preserved today. The error of New Evangelicalism has leached into Fundamentalism in view of what fundamentalists are implying about the present status of the Word of God. The implication by many writers is that the Bible is not preserved in its complete accuracy, as it was when it was originally given.

Richard Curtis said:

“We cannot say that the Bible as we have it is the absolute Word of God. It merely represents the original revelation ... to a high degree of probability.”

Pickering would never stoop so low to say this because he has absolute conviction that we have the Word of God. So do not quote me as saying that Pickering does not believe that we have the Word of God today. And yet, one must wonder if there really is any difference between the two conclusions of these writers, when reading them at face value. Both Pickering's conclusion and the conclusion of Curtis will allow the New Evangelicals to continue to argue for a Bible that is not inspired today and not inerrant. **If the Bible is only inspired in the original manuscripts, as so many fundamentalists are assuming, then why should they even try to counteract the left wing New Evangelicals, who are pushing for a Bible that is not inspired today?** If the fundamentalists don't really believe in an inspired Bible today then why should the New Evangelicals! And if the fundamentalists believe it is inspired (like Pickering does), then stop opening the back door for New Evangelicalism with these so-called scholarly statements that the Bible was only inspired in the original manuscripts. Benjamin Warfield made such a statement as this to try and please liberal scholarship that was saying in his day that there were older manuscripts discovered which would change the meaning and content of the Bible. To accommodate their findings he coined this famous saying which has been blindly used for many years by the evangelical world and even fundamental world. But this reasoning wrecks the whole teaching of an inspired and inerrant Bible for today, which Dr. Pickering seems to fully endorse and defend. And yet, in one breath Pickering defends the absolute inspiration of the Bible but in another breath he makes the point that this inspired Bible was only in the original manuscripts which says that we do not have God's accurately inspired Word today. It is my concern that New Evangelicalism has won the victory in the area of the Bible among fundamentalists. They cannot seem to conceive that God who wrote the Bible could keep the Bible preserved down through the centuries of time in its copies. Let's stop playing games with the scholarship of the higher criticism of the Bible who are trying to still discover what the Bible says. ***In arguing for inspiration in only the original copies, we as fundamentalists will only open the door for a Bible today, which is not verbally and equally inspired.*** We must watch out that we do not start our own kind of double talk in the fundamentalist camp today.

The fundamentalist Curtis Hutson went even one step farther when he said: "...we must not allow ourselves, as fundamentalists, to be drawn away to a fuss over translations. While we prefer the King James Version of the Bible, **we must not claim verbal inspiration** for any translation. When we say the Word of God is verbally inspired and inerrant, we speak of the original autographs."

Either Hutson needs a lesson on how to defend the inspiration of the Bible or else he has been blindly taught and has blindly believed what he has been taught that the Bible is not verbally inspired. The Bible is verbally inspired! Every jot and tittle (Matt. 5:18). And when Jesus was talking about the Bible he was talking about copies of the Bible. If we lose the verbal inspiration of the Bible we lose everything and leave the door wide open for New Evangelicalism. Strangely, the booklet that Curtis Hutson

wrote was entitled, "New Evangelicalism, An Enemy of Fundamentalism." This seems contradictory to me. On page 14 Hutson condemns evangelicals for reopening the subject of inspiration and then in the next paragraph on the very same page he argues that the Bible is only verbally inspired in the original manuscripts. How utterly ridiculous and full of double talk can somebody be? If we are going to be fundamental, then by all means, let's take fundamentalism the whole way. God has promised to preserve His word for us in its transmission so that we can have faith that the Bible we have today is the complete Word of God and inspired to every word even as the original manuscripts were inspired in every word.

Isaiah 40:8

"The grass withereth, the flower fadeth: but the word of our God shall stand for ever."

Most New Evangelicals reject the "Received Text" or majority text behind the King James Version of the Bible and have departed into the critical text of the modern versions. They want to claim that the Bible is still being discovered today as older manuscripts are being found. Many times they want to criticize the Bible out of existence. *The New Evangelical compromise has paved the way for today's wholesale acceptance of the modern versions.* When one wants to question the inspiration of the Bible then they usually hold to modern Bibles that are explaining the Bible away and promoting unwarranted omissions that are not supported by the majority of manuscripts. ***New Evangelicalism is sailing on a sea without a compass.*** If you lose the compass of the inspired Scriptures then you will be lost and totally confused concerning what is truth.

Along with the issue of the inspiration of Scriptures, New Evangelicalism has also been questioning and toying with the whole process of *Biblical interpretation*. Evangelicals today can practically make the Bible say what it wants to say by adopting erroneous methods of interpretation.

Francis Schaeffer saw the interpretive trends and warned:

"The Bible is made to say only that which echoes the surrounding culture at our moment of history. The Bible is bent to the culture instead of the Bible judging our society and culture."

This seems to a very accurate analogy of what is going on in Evangelical circles today. The Bible is being pressed into the immediate culture and made to fit into the scheme of living in our own day. How one interprets the Bible depends on the culture of the day. This is an absolute irreverence to the exact meaning of Bible texts in their historic setting and to the grammar of the texts. In addition, there are many interpreting the Bible in a manner today that only sees many Bible texts as being bound in the culture of their own day and time or when the Bible was written. Their reasoning goes like this.

Ephesians 5:22 says:

“Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord.”

Many are saying in the New Evangelical camp that this does not constitute a command from God for churches today; it merely represents Paul’s rabbinical and masculine bias. We can forget it. In other words, what many are saying is that the Bible is written in the culturally accepted norms of that day but is not to be accepted as the culturally norm for today. Therefore, we can dispose of unliked and unwarranted passages. Many are dismissing the eternal truth of the Bible by claiming that it was written in a different cultural climate and therefor is insignificant to our day and time. We can interpret the Bible from a cultural standpoint and reject those matters which we feel are culturally bound to the Bible times. We must remember that the culture of the Bible does not do away with the commands of the Bible, which are written to the church and are clearly for the church today. This is why we have some New Evangelicals accepting the lifestyles of homosexuality and other practices which are worldly in nature. This is why others are questioning the doctrine of hell and writing it off as the culturally accepted mythology of the Bible time. *Many are trying to interpret the Bible as a historical book of cultural and feel free to dismiss passages that press issues and point them out as sinful in their own lifestyle.*

There is a wrong shift in traditional and Biblical interpretation today. People’s concept of Bible study today is to go around the table and tell everybody else what they think a passage means to them. Most of the time this method usually results in an accumulation of ignorance. When we interpret the Bible we are to determine what the passage actually says and not what it mean to us. You cannot properly study the Bible by trying to find out what it means to you. You must find out what the Bible says. This involves the proper method of Biblical interpretation or hermeneutics.

8. A growing willingness of evangelical theologians to converse with liberal theologians.

This seems to be the scholarly thing to do. It is the educated and right thing to show some cooperation and intellectual oneness with the liberal. This is a false assumption and mindset that has inundated evangelicalism today. God says that He hates a mixture! We are not to mix with the enemy in any way or fashion. Cooperation and companionship with the enemy is strictly forbidden in Scripture (Psalms 119:63; Romans 16:17). Liberals do not keep the truth and therefore we must not keep company with them in religious settings and try to associate with their denominations. ***We must mark them and not mix with them!***

The Presbyterian minister Dr. Charles Woodbridge described this movement. Dr. Charles Woodbridge was a strong Fundamentalist leader suggested in a message in the late 1950s that new-evangelicalism started out as “a new theological mood,

developed into a casuistical method, continued into a neutralized message and has culminated in a decaying morality. Succinctly stated, the order is NEW MOOD, NEW METHOD, NEW THEOLOGY and NEW ETHIC."

First – As a mood

It has been said that New Evangelicalism had its beginnings with a mood. This is true as we think how the minds of these men were working in the early days of this movement. The new mood was for established by Woodbridge.

1. A mood of toleration toward the liberal.

The liberal who denies the Bible was once considered the enemy. Now he is to be considered a friend. In fact, most New Evangelicals who talk about agape or unconditional love will make friends with a liberal instead of a Bible believing fundamentalist who wants to stand upon the ground of truth.

2. A mood toward the right wing (the fundamentalist).

The fundamentalist deserves our pity for the culture today has by-passed him. Thus, the neo-evangelical has kinder words to give a Christ-rejecting, Bible-hating liberal than he has for a believer who desires to stand firm on the Word of God.

3. A mood of pride and intellect.

There is a great emphasis on the intellect instead of on the Word of God. There is the desire to be recognized by scholars even though they may be liberal. This is nothing more than pride. And we must remember what God has said about pride. God has said pride goes before a fall (Proverbs 16:18) and how great the fall was with New Evangelicalism!

Second – As a method

The new method that has been accepted is "the ends justify the means." One can adopt questionable methods as long as they get results. *This methodology says that success is the test, not scriptural principles.* This kind of philosophy has overtaken the church with its acceptance of rock music and other worldly gimmicks, which are used in order to win the lost. There is nothing new about this approach to living. The Bible speaks of this liberal philosophy that worldly people adopt.

Romans 3:8 says:

“And not *rather*, (as we be slanderously reported, and as some affirm that we say,) Let us do evil, that good may come? whose damnation is just.”

This is the old philosophy of pragmatism. Pragmatism says that if something works than we should use it. If drawing religions and apostate denominations together into a religious tie accomplishes the end of seeing souls saved, then we must band together for the cause of Christ. The Bible says that this is a false premise and we must obey the Scriptures, which teach separation from all apostasy and error. We must also remember that Jesus did not trim His sails to suit every wind. In fact, he had some of His most condemning words aimed toward religious people who were damning people to hell (see Matthew 23:13-33). You might call this a message to modernism or modern day liberals who are damning people to hell with their false preaching and neglect of the Gospel.

W. Tozer, was considered to be in right wing of the New Evangelical camp but saw the error of what was happening. He said: “I say without hesitation, that a very large part of the activities carried on today in evangelical circles is not only influenced by pragmatism but is almost controlled by it.”

Third – As a new theology

The theology of the movement is one of questioning the Bible itself. Some have begun to question the Bible as being inerrant in the areas of science and history, especially in the historical accounts of creation and the first eleven chapters of Genesis. Man is toying with the theology of the Bible and is trying to make his theology more palatable with science and the evolutionary inventions of man. Such terms as progressive creationism, threshold evolution, theistic evolution and double revelation are being used today to try and bridge the gap between so-called science and the Bible. Let us never forget one thing. *The greatest danger is to begin to question the Bible itself.*

Fourth – A new evangelical ethic

Theological departure will sooner or later bring worldliness into the church. The ethic or philosophy of this movement deals with cooperation or infiltration instead of separation from worldliness. The pattern seeks toleration, then cooperation and finally ends in contamination. Man’s ethic now replaces God’s ethic of purity and holy separation from all ungodliness and false doctrine.

God says, "Walk ye in the old paths" (Jeremiah 6:16), but the New Evangelical reassesses the old paths. God says, "Remove not the ancient landmark, which thy fathers have set" (Proverbs 22:28) but the New Evangelical has removed them one by one. God says, "Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness" (Ephesians

5:11) but the New Evangelical reasons that such fellowship is necessary. God says, "A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump" (1 Corinthians 5:6) but the New Evangelical thinks he can reform the already leavened lump. God says "evil communications corrupt good manners" (1 Corinthians 15:33) but the New Evangelical thinks good manners can uplift evil communications. God says, "I resist the proud but give grace to the humble" (James 4:6) but the New-Evangelical world thinks the way to reach the world is by meeting them on their own proud territory, matching them scholarly degree with degree.

While the philosophy of New Evangelicalism was formulated by theologians, it was popularized by evangelists, Billy Graham figuring most prominently among them. In fact, it would be safe to say that Billy Graham is the "father of ecumenical evangelism." *Billy Graham is the leading evangelistic figure of New Evangelical thought and strategy.* His son Franklin Graham is also highly involved in this type of philosophy today. But initially, it was Billy Graham who forever would change the approach of Christian churches toward evangelism. Billy Graham is responsible for the rise of ecumenical evangelism. There is no doubt that he single handedly popularized this approach to New Evangelicalism and its ecumenical evangelism.

To say anything negative against Billy Graham and his ministry usually means that you will have the wrath of millions of professing Christians upon your head. But we must understand the serious plight that Billy Graham has put the church in over the years. We must also know the departure of Billy Graham from fundamental doctrine and see where compromise leads. ***To not understand the policies and movements of Billy Graham is to miss the historical emergence and spread of New Evangelicalism.*** Many people automatically will criticize any person who questions Graham. They want to talk about the good that Graham does and turn a blind eye to the great atrocities which he condones. Of course, this is typical New Evangelical response. The fact of the matter is this. Billy Graham has defected from Fundamentalism and for many years has drifted farther and farther away from truth. No other man in this generation is more responsible than Billy Graham for breaking down the walls between truth and error. As we talk about Billy Graham we are not attacking his character. Rather, we are attacking his methods and compromise.

Billy Graham was in the fundamentalist camp at one time. He attended Bob Jones University. Graham looked up to Bob Jones Sr. like a father. He once wrote to Bob Jones while he was a young fundamentalist and said: "Modernists are beginning to write letters against me...all of us young evangelists look up to you as a father."

Billy Graham was once a strong defender of the Bible in all areas of doctrine and even the doctrine of ecclesiastical separation from liberalism and ecumenicalism. He once preached against modernism and its heresies. I have personally heard early messages of Graham that once revealed a different man on a different mission to not only preach

the Gospel but to defend the truth from liberalism. Graham was at one time highly respected in the fundamentalist camp. Graham was on the board of John Rice's "Sword of the Lord" that boldly denounced modernism. From 1947-1952 Graham was president of the Northwestern Schools in Minnesota, which were founded by the famous fundamentalist William Bell Riley. He was the editor of the schools fundamentalist publication called "The Pilot" which also boldly denounced liberalism or modernism in every form.

But what happened to Billy Graham? What caused him to disobey God's orders for Biblical separation from liberals and unite with modernism in religious services? *We must conclude that it was the pressure to be popular with the world's religious elite and the pressure to not be found negative or confrontational by people, but accepted by the vast majority of religious people. **The truth of the matter is this. Billy Graham wants everybody to be his friend.*** But God's Word says that if we live to please men we will not be His servant (Gal. 6:10). Who are we trying to please today? Furthermore, we must understand that Graham wants to be on both sides of a question at the same time. But the man of God cannot take such a middle of the road stance as this. God gave Jeremiah the commission to destroy all of the sins and errors of the people so that the truth can grow in a clean and clear atmosphere.

Jeremiah 1:10 says:

"See, I have this day set thee over the nations and over the kingdoms, to root out, and to pull down, and to destroy, and to throw down, to build, and to plant."

The walls of sinful degradation must be torn down in order for the truth to be replanted and grow in the midst of the people once again. There must be a tearing down before there can be a growing in the work of the Lord. You will note that there are four negatives and only two positives in this instruction by God. ***This tells us that destruction of the wrong must precede the erection of the right.***

Somewhere along the line in the early fifties, Billy Graham started wrestling with the battle between truth and error (1 John 4:6). And I must say that the spirit of error won the battle over his thinking because Billy Graham chose to fellowship with liberals in a religious setting instead of following God's clear command to separate from the apostates and apostasy of the present hour. In 1957 he made his very clear separation from fundamentalism by inviting blatant liberals on his committee such as Henry P. Van Dusen who was then the president of Union Theological Seminary. He was one of the rankest left winged liberals in the day. He along with 120 other liberals were on the general crusade committee. Billy wrestled with the truth for some time before giving in to the modernistic liberals. But we must remember that error always begins when you leave the door open just a crack. *We must also remember that error rides on the back of truth.* Once you give in to the error of compromise you will be caught in a downward spiral. This is the sad history of Billy Graham as he eventually fully endorsed the World

Council of Churches and the Roman Catholic Church. Graham spread the disease of ecumenical compromise in the United States as well as overseas in his campaigns. He has done more for uniting the true church with the false church than any other man in the history of the church (Matt. 13:24-27). We should not promote this mixing today.

The promotion of evangelism does not give the evangelist the right to disobey the clear commands of Scripture which command us to reprove those in error and turn away from those who do not uphold the truth (Ephesians 5:11; 2 Timothy 3:5). God is never pleased with compromise and disobedience. We should never think that God will be pleased with our disobedience if souls are saved. This will not be the case. Graham has the philosophy that in the proclamation of the Gospel there should be flexibility in his fellowships.

He said:

“My position as a proclaimer of the Gospel is entirely different than if I were the president of a Bible School or the pastor of a church or a professor of theology. While holding a firm theological position, yet in the proclamation of the gospel there is flexibility and fellowship.”

Does God allow a wider scope of fellowship for evangelists than he does for other believers and pastor? *Where do we find such double talk as this in the Word of God? This is not only double talk but a double standard!* We are told to “rebuke them sharply” (Titus 1:13) and expose the liberals by name (2 Timothy 4:14). One would think that an evangelist preaching the Gospel would have to call men away from systems of error and their sea of theological confusion in order to point them to Christ. He must lead them away from the error of their ways to the beacon of light, which is Christ alone. Why do liberals support Graham’s crusades if Graham is not a liberal himself? The answer lies in the fact that he does not denounce liberalism as the old time evangelists did out of uncompromising obedience. Graham steadfastly refuses to expose the errors of the liberals. How disobedient can someone be to God? Here is an answer from a liberal himself as to why he supports Billy Graham.

The British liberal, Leslie Weatherhead said:

“I do not personally agree with some of Billy Graham’s theology...but I certainly accept the value of Billy Graham’s witness and I note two things about him. He does not thrust his theological views on another person, and secondly, though in all denominations ministers have published criticism of him, he has never once, to my knowledge, lifted his voice or pen to tell us that in his nostrils our theology stinks...I should have thought that any minister who preaches to small congregations might rejoice that Billy Graham is helping to fill our churches for us. We can teach people theology when we have got somebody to teach.”

In short, this liberal tells us why the modernistic churches support Billy Graham. It's because Billy Graham gets the people into their liberal churches so that they can teach them their liberal doctrine. What a terrible tradeoff this is! One man in New York City who was saved at a crusade took Billy Graham's advice and went back into the Roman Catholic Church. Graham said that those who came forward in the meeting were to go back into the church, which they came from. Looking back on the bad advice, the man saved under Billy Graham's ministry said:

"Since Billy Graham sent me to the Catholic Church I was under the impression that this was the right church ... What did I gain from the Billy Graham crusade? I gained about one year and half in darkness and ignorance of the Bible because Billy Graham sent me to the Catholic Church."

Some suggest that it is a good policy to send young converts back into a liberal Protestant church because then the witness of the Gospel can begin in that church and make changes in that church. This is utterly foreign to what God says a church is for. *We must remember that one does not join a church to evangelize it.* There is no such pattern in the entire Bible. *We are to join a Bible believing separated church to learn the correct doctrines of the Bible and worship God with other true believers in the Lord* (Titus 2:1; Hebrews 10:25). We are to fellowship with true believers while in the church and then go out in the world to win the lost (Mark 16:15).

What is wrong with Billy Graham's philosophy of ecumenical evangelism?

First, Graham's evangelism is wrong because the Bible says that we are not to fellowship with liberals in order to win the lost. This may be Billy Graham's approach but it is not God's approach.

2 Timothy 3:5

"Having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away."

God says to turn away from these liberals and have no fellowship with them. The Graham philosophy denies that we should "turn away" or refuse fellowship with them in a religious mixture. It offers a better plan than God's plan and says that we should mix with the religious liberal and their endeavors to the point that we can send people to their churches and you can go to their churches. How utterly disobedient it is!

1 Peter 1:16 says:

"Because it is written, Be ye holy; for I am holy."

Holiness involves separation from all evil. Religious liberalism is evil; thereof, holiness involves separation from it. ***God is more concerned with His own holiness than He is about the results of some evangelistic campaign.*** God's holiness and the

holiness of His people must be preserved at any cost. You cannot put a price tag on God's holiness.

The philosophy of Billy Graham is to stress fellowship at the expense of warning and separation. He said:

“There can be no escaping the conclusion that the main stress of the New Testament is upon fellowship rather than upon separation. The call is not so much to come out as to come together.”

How can Billy Graham say this when he knows what 2 Corinthians 6:17 says about “coming out from among them” (unbelievers)? *It is true that the bible emphasizes fellowship, but it is always fellowship among true born-again believers and not unbelievers.* Many of the religious leaders that Graham fellowship with on a religious level are rank unbelieving apostates. They reject many of the cardinal doctrines of the Bible.

Ephesians 5:11

“And have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove *them*.”

Liberal preachers produce the works of darkness by the doctrines they teach and promote. To fellowship with those who promote such doctrines is disobeying God's clear commands to break fellowship with those sources that are producing evil and darkness. Furthermore, the Bible teaches that our fellowship is to be around truth – all of God's truth and not just some list of five doctrines of “Jesus only.”

Acts 2:42

“And they continued stedfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers.”

Second, Billy Graham's evangelism is wrong because we are not to honor false teachers as true Christian leaders. Graham endorses the pope John Paul as the greatest religious leader of our generation. He openly praises outright liberals as doing God's work and getting God's job done here on earth. Billy Graham is a liar and must be categorized as one when he makes such statements as these. Paul did not call Christ rejecting apostates men of God nor did he have any good words to say about them.

2 Timothy 3:8

“Now as Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses, so do these also resist the truth: men of corrupt (depraved, spoiled) minds, reprobate (unapproved, rejected, worthless) concerning the faith.

Since Billy Graham refuses to make any pronouncement against false teachers, he is popular with them. This is very easy to understand. When you go along with somebody's ideas and philosophies, you can become popular with them.

Third, Billy Graham's evangelism is wrong because we should never disobey the Scriptures to win souls for Christ. Somehow New Evangelicalism has developed the idea and mindset that God needs help in winning souls. They feel that God needs all the help He can get in order that great multitudes can be saved. The idea is that if we must compromise or "fudge" some scriptural principles in order to win souls in order to help God, then this is alright.

William Ashbrook once said:

"The primary business of a Christian is not to win souls. The primary business of a Christian is to do the will of God."

This is absolutely true. Of course, we are to win souls but we are to do it within the context of Scriptural principles. The spiritual lesson of Peter fishing (Luke 5:5) is an apt illustration of how we are to fish for men. *We must let down the nets only in line with God's Word. We must put down the nets to save souls when God tells us to and how God tells us to do it.* Billy Graham wants to drop the net without considering the truth about God's word and His holiness.

Always remember: You cannot substitute a good thing for the best thing! Saul found this out. Saul was told by God to wipe out the enemy and everything connected with the enemy (1 Samuel 15:1-3). But Saul ignored the command and took matters into his own hands just like Billy Graham did. He spared a portion of the flocks and herds of the Amalekites. And yes, he was going to use his disobedience to try and please God. What did Saul do? He was going to use the animals that he spared to sacrifice to the Lord. But what did God say about Saul's disobedience and his tradeoff with the Lord?

1 Samuel 15:22-23

"And Samuel said, Hath the LORD as great delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of the LORD? Behold, to obey *is* better than sacrifice, *and* to hearken than the fat of rams. For rebellion *is* as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness *is* as iniquity and idolatry. Because thou hast rejected the word of the LORD, he hath also rejected thee from *being* king."

Billy Graham's clear rebellion against God is as the sin of witchcraft. Like Saul, he has justified his disobedience with fellowship with apostates as a way to win souls to God. Like Saul giving the animals of sacrifice to God, so Billy Graham attempts to give saved souls as a justification for his clear and disobedient actions. The sacrifices were good and proper when Saul was disobedient but they became evil and wrong when

Saul disobeyed. Likewise, those that are saved through Billy Graham's ministry cannot be used to promote Graham's disobedience to God. We rejoice in saved souls, but we do not rejoice in the manner that some are saved. Furthermore, God does not need out compromising help to see people saved. ***We are to get God's work done in God's way.***

Fourth, Billy Graham's evangelism is wrong because we do not express or display love to God while disobeying God. The Bible is very clear on this matter of love. We have talked about it already. Love and obedience walk together. Consider the words of the Lord once again:

John 14:15

"If ye love me, keep my commandments."

John 14:21 also says:

"He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me: and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and will manifest myself to him."

John 14:23

"Jesus answered and said unto him, If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him."

Obedience is always the hallmark of love for God. An obedient man is a man who truly loves God. When we must compromise in order to win the lost we are actually showing that we do not love God, as we should because we are willing to disobey instead of obey.

Fifth, Billy Graham's evangelism is wrong because he passes off false doctrine as something that is of little consequence. The apostates that Billy Graham fellowships with teach opposing doctrines from what the Bible teaches. They should be exposed for teaching such doctrinal heresies and doctrine must once again be brought to the forefront instead of placed in the back pew.

1 Timothy 4:1 says:

"Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils."

Doctrines of demons are hardly of little consequence or importance. And yet, Graham's refusal to sound the alarm on false doctrine is another way of promoting the very demonic doctrines of the end-times that go against God's holy Word. Graham condones the false doctrines of the Romanism and other liberal denominational leaders who unite with him in his campaigns. Furthermore, Graham forgot that the

Bible teaches the principle of separation from unbelievers in a religious apostate setting even as the Corinthians were to separate from the religious idol services going on in the eating area of the market.

Paul warned them about this in 1 Corinthians 10:20:

“But I say, that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils, and not to God: and I would not that ye should have fellowship with devils.”

Grahams’ religious ties with outspoken liberals and the Roman Catholic church of heresy makes him a fellowship with the demons behind these heresies. Where we go and who we tie ourselves together with religiously makes us a part of their apostasy and demonic instigated errors.

Sixth, Billy Graham’s evangelism is wrong because it does not promote the necessity of sound doctrine in all areas and issues. God places a high priority upon sound doctrine that must be applied to the teachings of the Holy Spirit and inspiration and to every area of doctrinal teaching. This idea that we must follow a “Jesus only” doctrinal statement or five fundamentals is erroneous. God’s view of doctrine is much stronger than that of the New Evangelicals.

2 Timothy 3:16

“All scripture *is* given by inspiration of God, and *is* profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness.”

Doctrine means teaching and is actually the systematizing or organization of truth so it can be easily communicated to someone else. You will also notice that “all” the Scripture is important and profitable to our lives. This idea that only five fundamentals or Jesus only is what is important is a another brainy concept promoted by the New Evangelical movement to try and produce ecumenical evangelism. Paul says that all of the teachings of the Bible are profitable. Who are you or I to say what teachings are more important than other teachings. The teaching of the Gospel may have a more profound effect on men’s lives, but this is not to say that it is more important than the doctrine of the Holy Spirit or the doctrine of inspiration or inerrancy.

Titus 2:1

“But speak thou the things which become sound doctrine.”

The word for “sound” indicates the use of medical analogy and literally means healthy. This means that doctrine is to be healthy and not contaminated with error. Paul was very concerned about what kind of doctrine was brought forth in the local churches. It had to be healthy doctrine.

1 Timothy 4:13 says:

“Till I come, give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine.”

1 Timothy 6:3-4 says:

“If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, *even* the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, **and to the doctrine which is according to godliness**; He is proud, knowing nothing, but doting about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings (suspicion).”

You will notice that Paul spoke about the doctrine or teaching that promotes godliness or holiness. The correspondence between truth and godliness, and error and moral deficiency, is one of the recurrent themes in the Pastoral Epistles.

1 Timothy 4:6

“If thou put the brethren in remembrance of these things, thou shalt be a good minister of Jesus Christ, nourished up in the words of faith and of good doctrine, whereunto thou hast attained.”

Growth and true nourishment comes from good doctrine or teaching. It does not come from going to growth seminars and reading the latest book on twelve steps to growth or how to improve your relational skills with others. Nor does it come by going back into the Roman Catholic Church after you are saved or the modernistic church down the street as Graham endorses.

Titus 1:1 also says:

“Paul, a servant of God, and an apostle of Jesus Christ, according to the faith of God's elect, and the acknowledging of the **truth which is after godliness.**”

When one repudiates the teaching or doctrine about separation or holiness, then they will surely depart into ungodly practices in their living. This is what has happened in the church today. However, if the truth about God's holiness is maintained then godliness will come about in the lives of God's children. Right teaching always promotes right behavior. *Truth is inseparably bound to godliness and holiness.* This means that there must be right doctrine in order to maintain right living and the spirit of godliness and holiness. ***To negatively say that doctrine divides is to miss what the Bible says about godliness. Right doctrine or teaching creates the atmosphere of godliness.*** Bad doctrine creates the atmosphere of ungodliness in God's eyes. Therefore, when one must set aside healthy doctrines such as separation, inspiration, inerrancy, teachings on the Holy Spirit and hell in order to maintain a loose tie with false denominations and false teaching, then you begin to undermine doctrine and sweep it under the carpet. You send the message that doctrine is unimportant. *In doing this, you create an atmosphere that is not based upon true godliness because godliness is centered in all doctrinal truth or teaching. Sound teaching always produces*

an environment where godliness can thrive. However, when unsound teaching is accepted or set aside in view of a greater good, then God's healthy teaching begins to take a back seat and the atmosphere can no longer be deemed one of godliness.

Today the evangelicals are saying that doctrine divides. But God says we must maintain sound doctrine at all costs, even the cost of evangelism.

2 Corinthians 6:14 says:

"...what communion (agreement) hath light with darkness?"

Ernest Pickering has said:

"God has separated light from darkness and no one, not even in the cause of evangelism, should attempt to take down those divinely erected barriers."

The Bible also teaches that two cannot walk together unless they agree (Amos 3:3). The ecumenical evangelism of Billy Graham is not in line with the principles and commands of God's Word. He is disobedient and compromising the very testimony of God's holiness which refuses to bow to any sin and error. In ecumenical evangelism, the holiness of God is swept under the carpet.

Billy Graham began to question the truth about Biblical separation early in his ministry. The seed was planted in his mind that there should be a cooperation with those who are not on the same ship as the Fundamentalist. There should be a working together with the Christ rejecting liberals so people within their ranks can be won for Christ. This New Evangelical philosophy proved to be his downfall from God's perspective because Billy Graham flatly disobeyed God on the matter of separation and began to compromise his own testimony and God's truth by joining with modernistic Christ-rejecting liberals in an effort to see people saved. ***We must remember that it is never right to do wrong in order to do right!***

Many strong fundamentalists tried to save Billy from his wrong step and detour in his fight against modernism and heresy. Billy Graham had begun to take a doctrinal fall and there were those who sought to restore him on the basis of Galatians 6:1.

Galatians 6:1

"Brethren, if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual, restore such an one in the spirit of meekness; considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted."

Let us make no mistake about it. Billy Graham sinned when he went down the road to tie himself together with liberals and promote the notion and appearance that he was accepting them and their doctrinal deviations. Billy Graham decided to give up the fight early on in his career as an evangelist. He decided to no longer fight the good fight of faith (2 Timothy 4:7) and war a good warfare (1 Timothy 1:18). He no longer wanted to

endure hardness as a good soldier of the Lord Jesus Christ (2 Timothy 2:2). For all of these reasons, Billy Graham decided to put down and stop his battle cry. However, there were many men who tried to rescue him from the pitfall of compromise.

There was James Bennet who was a prominent New York attorney and Bible teacher who knew Graham from the time he was a graduate from Wheaton. Dr. Bob Jones Senior also tried to persuade Billy from going the ecumenical compromising path. Jack Wyrzten, founder of Word of Life also tried to convince Graham of his wayward path. Dr. Robert Ketcham who was the leader of the General Association of Regular Baptist Churches in 1950 also tried to persuade Billy to turn away from his path of disobedience who was then turning over decision cards to Roman Catholic parishes. Wilson Ewin was a long time missionary to Roman Catholics in Quebec also tried to persuade Graham to turn away from his compromises with apostate Romansim. There was Dr. John R. Rice who was a close friend to Graham. He pleaded with him on many occasions as Graham would invite him to his home. Graham listened but would not obey God's Word. He actually promised John R. Rice that he would never have any Christ rejection liberals on his committee.

Graham said:

"I Have promised God I will never have on my committee working in any active way in any of my campaigns men who do not believe in the virgin birth of Christ, who do not believe in the verbal inspiration of the Bible – these men will never be on my committee. I have promised God."

Graham did not keep his promise. By 1957 there were 120 modernists working on his committee and Billy was allowing Christ rejecting liberals on stage with him to pray and associate themselves with the same Gospel he was preaching. Men such as Henry Van Dusen (president of Union Theological Seminary) were on his committee. He wrote a book entitled "Liberal theology" where he stated that Jesus is not God and denied Christ's virgin birth. Later Henry Van Dusen committed suicide with his wife. Many other liberals such as John Sutherland Bonneell (pastor of Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church in New York), Bishop James Pike (a notorious liberal) actually led in prayer at a crusade. Pike was involved in several of Grahams campaigns and was rank, unbelieving modernist. He denied all the doctrines of the Bible. He later became a drunken man and became deeply involved in the occult. His maggot infested body was found in 1970 in a remote canyon in the Israeli desert near the Dead Sea. He had fallen 70 feet. The 56-year-old theologian had gotten lost in the desert while on his third honeymoon with his 31-year-old third wife and long time mistress. Scores of other liberal men were associated with Billy Graham's ministries over the years and to this day. There was Bishop Gerald Kennedy, E. Stanley Jones, Malcom Muggeridge and Karl Barth to name such a few. Since these early days Graham has had countless number of liberals identified with his ministry in many ways. Billy Graham has long promoted the modernistic World Council of Churches and the Roman Catholic cult.

Billy certainly has broken his promise to God to never compromise with liberalism. Sooner or later you will have to break your promise if you cooperate with Christ rejecting liberals who deny the virgin birth of Christ, deity of Christ, blood of Christ and the key doctrinal truths of the Bible. In 1956 Graham said, "I don't call myself a fundamentalist, I prefer to call myself a constructionist" explaining that he was seeking to build the church. Graham openly abandoned the fundamentalism he once preached. Because of his connection and infiltration with liberals over the years, Billy Graham defected from doctrinal truth. Why is this? It's because of what the Bible says.

1 Corinthians 15:33

"Be not deceived: evil communications corrupt good manners."

You cannot fellowship with those who teach error and listen to their side and read their books of neo-orthodoxy without eventually having their mindset and philosophies affect you. When you compromise with false teachers and error long enough, you will sooner or later find it rubbing off on you. You will find yourself beginning to compromise with their teachings, dictionary and language, which are full of heresy. This is exactly what Billy Graham has done through the years. He has become weak in doctrinal conviction about important truths of the Bible because of his interaction with apostates and his desire to no longer offend them. He has forsaken the stand and teachings he once promoted and loved. This is the other side of Graham, which nobody knows about, or wants to talk about.

Billy Graham refuses to defend the inerrancy of Scripture:

"I don't use the word inerrant because it has become a brittle divisive word."

Billy Graham says that the virgin birth is not a necessary part of the Christian faith:

"While I most certainly believe that Jesus Christ was born of a virgin, I do not find anywhere in the New Testament that this particular belief is necessary for personal salvation."

How can a person truly be saved if they reject the virgin birth of Christ? The entire Gospel stands or falls on the virgin birth. If Jesus was not born of a virgin then he is part of a sinful human race and cannot be our savior.

Billy Graham denies that people need to hear about Christ in order to be saved:

"He is calling people out of the world for His name, whether they come from the Muslim world, or the Buddhist world, or the Christian world or the non-believing world, they are members of the Body of Christ because they have been called of God. They may not even know the name of Jesus but they know in their hearts that they need something that they don't have, and they turn to the only light that they have, and I think that they are saved and that they're going to be with us in heaven."

This is a totally false idea. The idea that any pagan, practicing idolatrous worshiper, having not the slightest knowledge of the Bible, the Gospel of grace and the saving work of Christ is saved is an absolute foolish and heretical thing to say. The idea that if someone is sincere in what they believe and is a good person is automatically redeemed by the blood of Christ is a false doctrine and Billy must be chided for saying such things as this.

Billy Graham denies that unsaved pagans will go to hell:

“I used to believe that pagan in far off countries were lost – were going to hell – if they did not have the gospel of Christ preached to them. I no longer believe that. I believe that there are other ways to recognize the existence of God – through nature, for instance – and plenty of other opportunities, therefore, of saying yes to God.”

This flatly denies what the Bible says about the heathen. The Bible teaches that they do not say “yes” to God but actually seek their own false ways in life and therefore cannot be saved (Romans 1:18-27). They refuse to believe in the true God of creation and therefore are lost and will be judged by God (verse 18). By the way, creation does not save any person, only the message of the Gospel can save people (Romans 10:14-15).

We must also remember that people will be judged according to the light that they have (Acts 17:30). After Paul shared the Gospel with the heathen people God required them to repent of their sin and be saved. If these people would have died and not heard the Gospel they would have been judged only by the light of creation. Nevertheless they would have went to hell and been judged by God according to their degree of light. But those who hear and reject the Gospel will be judged not only for rejecting creation light but the Gospel light as well.

Billy Graham now denies that there is a literal hell:

“I think hell is essentially a separation from God forever. And that is the worst hell that I can think of. But I think people have a hard time believing God is going to allow people to burn in literal fire forever. I think the fire that is mentioned in the Bible is a burning thirst for God that can never be quenched.”

How utterly blind can Graham be to what the Bible says about hell! The Bible teaches a type of fire that literally burns and torments an unbeliever throughout eternity (Luke 16:24; Mark 7:42-48; Rev. 20:15).

While being interviewed by the Lutheran standard in 1961, Billy Graham said this about infant baptism: “I do believe that something happens at the baptism of an infant ... we cannot fully understand the mysteries of God, but I believe that miracle can happen in

these children so that they are regenerated, that is, made Christian, through infant baptism.”

This is absolutely erroneous and was said by Graham by his years of fellowship with liberals who believe in infant baptismal salvation. It is nothing more than ignorant liberalism. People are saved by the grace of God and not baptism (Eph. 2:8-9). Furthermore, young children do not have to be saved because the Bible teaches that they are covered by the redemptive act of Calvary in their state of infancy. We can gather this by the statements that Jesus made about children during His earthly ministry (Matt. 18:2-3, 10) and by what David said about the death of his own child (2 Samuel 12:23).

Billy Graham also believes that the Catholics have the same Gospel as you and me today. After receiving an honorary degree from a Catholic college in North Carolina, Billy said: “Finally, the way of salvation has not changed. I know how the ending of the book will be. The Gospel that built this school (Belmont Abbey College) and the Gospel that brings me here tonight is still the way **to** salvation.”

This is absolute blasphemy in my opinion. You will note that Graham did not say that “way of salvation” but he referred to it as the “way to salvation.” This is significant because Roman Catholics teach that salvation is a step by step process and that you receive salvation in installments by eating the actual body and blood of Jesus at their mass. The Catholic Gospel includes the need for initial baptismal regeneration and then is maintained by the Roman Mass. This is hardly the Gospel and the way of salvation. This is why Billy says to the Roman Catholics about the way **to** salvation. He wanted to accommodate the Catholic theology, which views salvation as a journey of works and not an instantaneous event. This goes contrary to Scripture which teaches that salvation is an finished transaction and that we can be completely saved the moment we believe on Christ (Acts 4:12; 16:31).

Graham praises the pope:

“The pope came as a statesman and pastor, but I believe he also sees himself coming as an evangelist. The pope is almost and evangelist because he calls for people to turn to Christ, to turn to Christianity. Pope John Paul II has emerged as the greatest religious leader of the modern world.”

The Bible teaches that there will be many false Christ’s like the pope in the end times (Matt. 24:24). The pope claims to be the vicar (replacement) for Christ here on earth. He claims to be able to forgive sins like Christ. The priests of the Romish Church also claim to have this ability to forgive sins. And multitudes of evangelical believers today have bought into the lie that Rome has changed for the better!

If you really want to know the finality of how compromise can dull the senses and spiritual dedication truth, then listen to what Graham said: “World travel and getting to know clergy of all denominations has helped mold me into an ecumenical being. We’re separated by theology and, in some instances, culture and race, but all that means nothing to me any more.”

How sad that Graham now insists that theology means nothing to him any longer. Little by little wrong association will tear down your stand and love for truth. It will take you away from your first love for the Bible and bring you to the place where theological truth is no longer dear to your heart and seen to be relevant.

Micah 3:2 says what takes place when compromise sets in. People begin to hate the good and love the evil. What a description this New Evangelicalism is to the average Christian today. “Who hate the good, and love the evil; who pluck off their skin from off them, and their flesh from off their bones.”

Graham has been the leader in this ecumenical New Evangelical compromise with liberals. This is why I have taken some time to expose just a few of his departures from truth and wrong associations. But there have been multitudes that have jumped on the ecumenical express with Graham. The vast majority of Christians and churches today have departed into this movement of New Evangelicalism. Those who were once separated in their stand against denominational apostasy are now taking busses to ecumenical rallies. They are associating with the modernism they once refused to join hands with.

The result of this new thinking has been dramatic. ***Within a mere fifty years, evangelicalism has lost all resemblance of its past purity, power, and glory.*** This so-called New Evangelicalism has taken the historic pattern of purity out of evangelicalism.

John Ashbrook has said:

“The movement of new evangelicalism is an example of how fast Satan will grease the skids when we no longer stand fast and contend for our position. Disintegration does not take centuries.”

In 1956 the magazine “Christianity Today” began publication which became the major magazine of New Evangelical thought. In 1957n the giant ecumenical crusades came onto the horizon. There was ecumenical fever spreading among those New Evangelicals. Since these days and up to the present time, every phase of the Christian ministry has come under the mood of New-Evangelicalism. Churches, once fundamental schools, Sunday School literature, publishing houses, evangelism and music had all been affected by this New-Evangelical spirit of compromise with unholy practices. New-Evangelicalism is blind and naked, but is not aware of it. In fact, New-

Evangelicalism glories in its new-found acceptance by the world and apostate Christendom, its vast material wealth, its satellites and transmitters, its worldwide television and radio networks, its vast publishing enterprises, its massive conferences.

It is God who has commanded that His people separate from error and from those who teach and practice it; it is God who has commanded that His people "earnestly contend for the faith once delivered to the saints." It is God who has said that His people must remain holy (separate) in both doctrine as well as living. And when these and other aspects of old-time evangelicalism were rejected, the power and blessing of God was removed just as it was from Samson of old when he broke his Nazarite vow.

As noted already, even key New Evangelical leaders have noticed the spiritual decline of their movement. Harold Lindsell, former editor of Christianity Today, made this amazing statement at the 27th annual convention of the National Association of Evangelicals (NAE) in April 1969: "Evangelical Christianity is in spiritual jeopardy right now. Complacent, affluent, self-satisfied, we are lacking of great spiritual dynamic" By 1985, Lindsell had become even more forceful about the decline of evangelicalism: "Evangelicalism today is in a sad state of disarray. It is clear that evangelicalism is now broader and shallower, and is becoming more so. Evangelicalism's children are in the process of forsaking the faith of their fathers" (Christian News, Dec. 2, 1985). Carl Henry was reported as saying at a graduation: "We have gone too far."

At the 1976 convention of the NAE in Washington D.C., Francis Schaeffer spoke on "The Watershed of the Evangelical World," which is the perfect inspiration of Holy Scripture. Schaeffer observed: "What is the use of evangelicalism seeming to get larger and larger in number if significant numbers of those under the name of 'evangelical' no longer hold to that which makes evangelicalism evangelical?" We must understand that compromise leads down the path of more compromise until one moves farther away from orthodoxy. That's why God tells us to never compromise.

To one degree or another, the evangelical world has ignored the concerns of those who have lifted a voice of warning. New-evangelical thought has been adopted by such well-known Christian leaders as Billy Graham, Jerry Falwell, Bill Bright, Harold Lindsell, John R.W. Stott, Luis Palau, E.V. Hill, Leighton Ford, Charles Stanley, Bill Hybels, Warren Wiersbe, Chuck Colson, Donald McGavran, Tony Campolo, Arthur Glasser, D. James Kennedy, David Hocking, Charles Swindoll, J. Vernon McGee and a multitude of other men. Through publications such as "Christianity Today" and "Moody Monthly," and through publishing houses such as InterVarsity Press, Zondervan, Tyndale House Publishers, Moody Press, and Thomas Nelson--to name but a few--new-evangelical thinking was broadcast across the world. In addition to the powerful influence of the printed page, compromised new-evangelical teaching was promoted by institutions such as Fuller Theological Seminary, Moody Bible Institute, Wheaton College, BIOLA, the Lausanne Conference for World Evangelism (LCWE), the National Association of

Evangelicals, the World Evangelical Fellowship, National Religious Broadcasters, Radio Bible Class, Youth for Christ, Back to the Bible, Campus Crusade for Christ, Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship, World Vision, Operation Mobilization, and the Billy Graham Evangelistic Association.

There have also been countless conferences, which have been organized with the main purpose of promoting the new-evangelical thought of infiltration. In these meetings there is the teaching of building bridges and tearing down walls of doctrine. The teaching of unity in the midst of cultural diversity is stressed. There is also the promotion of worldly music and worship in these types of meetings, which is dishonoring and disrespectful to God's house. A holy God deserves holy music and worship.

2 Corinthians 7:1

“Having therefore these promises, dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God.”

We must remember that whenever a movement develops a lenient attitude toward liberalism and wants to repudiate the doctrine of separation, it's only a matter of time until that movement begins to slip away from the standard practices of separation. This has been the sad history of New Evangelicalism. When there is no separation from apostasy, sooner or later the philosophy of infiltration will effect the standards of separation for personal holiness.

The New Evangelicals promote a much freer life-style and flippant attitude toward certain practices that Bible believing discerning Christians have historically found unholy and worldly. They have developed a disobedient attitude toward the holy warnings of Scripture and the clear principles taught in Scripture. Instead of seeing black and white areas they are looking for gray areas and loopholes. A popular expression among the New Evangelicals today is to talk about what they call “gray areas.” They refer to those unmentioned areas of conduct not found in the Bible. If they don't see a direct verse saying that you can't drink a beer now and then with your buddies, then they think it's alright to drink beer. If they don't see a verse that says you cannot smoke Camel cigarettes then they feel its okay to turn yourself into a walking smoking chimney. *Instead of drawing together all the principles of the Bible about these areas of questionable conduct they would rather pass them off as non-applicable to their freer lifestyle of so-called Christian liberty.* They talk about these “gray areas” on their radio programs today and in their books. It sounds so sweet and good to their New Evangelical audiences. But this kind of talk is really the spirit of compromise. Did you ever stop and think how the color gray is produced. It is made by mixing black and white together. The idea behind gray is the mixing of the unholy with the holy so that you can have both at the same time. And this is what New Evangelicalism strives to maintain by their areas of compromise. They want the black (evil and questionable)

and the white (the good) together at the same time. The flesh or old nature always wants to create a mixture, which God hates.

People like to talk about gray areas today so that they can keep one foot in the door and see what's on the other side! They want to engage in a looser lifestyle of worldly amusements than their past and antiquated ancestors (the fundamentalists) did. Now we must remember that gray areas become expandable and flexible over time. Thus, we see the great tide of continual compromise today. When people try to see how close they can get to a line they will end up eventually going over the line and begin to descend down the spiral stairs of compromise. In short, so called gray areas of unmentioned areas of conduct

There is much more openness in the modern church today and Christians no longer want to see or accept the Scripture as plainly denouncing certain actions and taboos. For instance, smoking, dancing, drinking, theatre-going and gambling are no longer seen as taboos in the church. The whole attitude toward these types of amusements has changed, The New Evangelicals openly endorse these types of practices by placing them under the area of "Christian freedom." *They talk much about Christian liberty but never talk or preach about Christian separation, which is to place Christian liberty in its proper perspective.* The cry of the New Evangelical is cultural accommodation. These long believed taboos or activities are only cultural trifles that need not be pressed upon anyone as being sinful.

The ardent right wing New Evangelical Richard Quebedeaux said:

"It is also clear that with upward social mobility and cultural accommodation, conservative evangelicalism as a whole – even some of the more conservative evangelical churches, colleges, seminaries, and campus ministries no longer spends much time condemning the older distinctive taboos that have now become socially dysfunctional, drinking in particular."

This mentality is warping the whole doctrine of separation, which seeks to separate the believer from the culture instead of attempting to adopt the culture to his life. *As we have noted already, the believer must counteract culture when culture violates the timeless principles in the Word of God.* Cultural accommodation is just another way of saying that Christians can engage their lives in wrong and sinful activity with God's approval. The fact of the matter is that God will not approve of their worldly lifestyles that excite their flesh and take them into places that compromise the Christian testimony of holiness and purity in life.

God has always said that we are not to be controlled by other substances other than the person of the Holy Spirit.

Ephesians 5:18

“And be not drunk with wine, wherein is excess; but be filled (controlled) with the Spirit.”

God has always condemned the consumption of alcohol as a beverage.

Proverbs 23:31 says:

“Look not thou upon the wine when it is red, when it giveth his colour in the cup, *when* it moveth itself aright.”

God has always said that we must not associate with very clear places of wickedness.

1 Thessalonians 5:22 states:

“Abstain from all appearance of evil.”

God has always said that we must be careful what we view with our eyes.

Psalms 101:3

“I will set no wicked thing before mine eyes...”

God’s word has never condoned gaining wealth by chance or gambling.

Proverbs 13:11

“Wealth *gotten* by vanity shall be diminished: but he that gathereth by labour shall increase.”

New Evangelicalism wants to expand Christian liberty to areas that go against the Biblical principles of Scripture and God’s standards of holiness. They have been taught to believe that living by grace means to tear down doctrinal walls and disregard Biblical standards of separation as unloving and biased. This same New Evangelical compromise keeps going farther away from obedience to Scriptural commands. Remember, once the roller coaster is going down the hill it cannot be stopped.

Another example the New Evangelical disobedience to the Word of God is their acceptance of woman as preachers. There is a kind of “religious woman libber’s movement” going on in this movement today. This philosophy really hit the mainstream of evangelicalism when Paul King Jewett of Fuller Seminary proposed that the Pauline instructions in Ephesians, and elsewhere, simply reflected the culture that Paul lived in within his own day, and do not constitute divine directives for us today. Women preachers really got swinging in the 70’s. The rise of woman preachers is phenomenal and is immediately a disgrace to God’s design. There is nothing plainer in Scripture

that women do not qualify to be preachers. God could not make it plainer. But the New Evangelicals do not like plain things! Let the Bible speak for itself.

1 Timothy 2:12-13

“But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence. For Adam was first formed, then Eve.”

1 Corinthians 14:34-35

“Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but *they are commanded* to be under obedience, as also saith the law. And if they will learn any thing, let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a shame for women to speak in the church.”

There were no women apostles. There were no women pastors or deacons (1 Timothy 3:1-7; Titus 1:5-9). There is not one example of an ordained woman in the Scripture. New Evangelicalism has disgraced God’s design of leadership in the church by allowing women to teach men the Word of God. It is nothing more than old-fashioned, one hundred percent, bonafide disobedience to God’s Word.

Neo – Fundamentalism

Neo – Fundamentalism is a modern movement, which has been shifting away from separatist Fundamentalism but is still trying to use the name or label fundamental. It is sometimes called “reconstructional fundamentalism” because it is trying to reshape or restructure the separatist position in Fundamentalism to a much more lenient position on separation. It is a modified type of fundamentalism. ***New fundamentalism encompasses those ministries that once held to separatist fundamentalism but have now abandoned the old separatist position and departed into unholy, worldly practices and the compromise with error.*** This is the form of evangelical Christianity that differs in the doctrine and practice of separation but is identical to Fundamentalism in the rest of their theology. This has been properly labeled pseudo-fundamentalism. This kind of New Fundamentalism centers on unity around five fundamental doctrines, personal evangelism and stresses social and moral reform of our society. Leading figures in this movement are Jerry Falwell, Pat Robertson, Chuck Colson and Bill Bright. Most of these men are familiar to many in our day and time through the radio, TV, and books that they have written.

Jerry Falwell has especially been a sad commentary on Fundamentalism. He knows about Fundamentalism better than any of these other men because he was once a practicing fundamentalist. In fact, Jerry Falwell knows better but has decided to be disobedient to God for the sake of money and the building of his giant empire. At one time Falwell boldly stood against modernism and was willing to speak out against ecumenical gatherings with liberals and charismatic errors. He took a very clear stand

against the worldly methods of evangelism and worship. Jerry Falwell was a true fundamentalist because he was willing to steer clear of associating with apostasy and worldly or unholy practices. He wanted to keep his ministry clear of any compromise or error. Sadly, today he has jumped on the ecumenical express with everybody else and now fully endorsed ecumenical rallies with liberal denominations and also willingly allows worldly music to be played in his church. He now invites Billy Graham to Liberty University.

After all the compromise with modernistic liberal denominations and the acceptance of New Evangelical compromise with unholy practices in his church, Jerry still calls himself a Fundamentalist. This is simply not true and Jerry Falwell knows it. It is absolutely wrong to call yourself part of a movement that no longer wants you within its ranks. Fundamentalists have long written off Jerry Falwell as one who tries to promote the Fundamental doctrine of holiness or separation. Falwell is not following the history of true Fundamentalism, which had to break away and separate from their associations with the denominations because of their apostasy. He has tired re-invent fundamentalism as some newer brand of fundamentalism, which can now endorse apostasy and worldly methods and practices. How utterly sad this is! Fundamentalism always had holiness at the core of it's foundation. There was to be holiness by separation from apostasy and holiness by separation from worldly living. Today Jerry Falwell with his "Falwellian Fundamentalism" has tries to break down the history of Fundamentalism" and recreate some kind of new brand of Fundamentalism which does not need to be holy in their worship and associations with apostasy. *This is not fundamentalism. It is the same old New Evangelicalism.* Why would Jerry Falwell not consider himself a New Evangelical when he does the very same things that New Evangelicals do best, which is to compromise? Neo-Fundamentalism is simply "Pseudo-Fundamentalism" meaning a "false-fundamentalism." Like so many in our day, Jerry Falwell has tried to build an empire at the expense of fundamental holiness!

Because of the tremendous influence of these types of New Evangelical men and organizations, new-evangelical thought has swept the globe. ***Today it is no exaggeration to say that almost without exception those who call themselves evangelicals are new-evangelicals; the terms have become synonymous. Furthermore, those who call themselves fundamentalist are not even fundamentalist.*** The phenomenal growth of this New Evangelical movement is now offered by New Evangelical Christians as proof that their position is right and that Fundamentalism has totally failed. ***But let us not forget, however, that God measures success by faithfulness and not by numbers or popularity.***

1 Corinthians 4:2 says:

"Moreover it is required in stewards, that a man be found faithful."

We must be faithful to God and His Word and not be concerned about being a success in the world's eyes. It is very interesting to know that even the father of New Evangelicalism, Harold Ockenga, once was a fundamentalist who stood for the truth! Billy Graham was once a Fundamentalist. Jerry Falwell and Jack Van Impe were once Fundamentalists. They all preached and practiced Biblical separation. One of the most informative pamphlets that I have in my library on separation was written by Jack Van Impe. How sad that today he now repudiates Biblical separation and fully endorses New Evangelicalism and claims that the pope is doing God's bidding.

The same was true for men like Donald Grey Barnhouse who was a Philadelphia pastor. Back in the 30s and 40's Dr. Barnhouse spoke loudly against the apostasy in his own Presbyterian Church. He even advised young candidate in his church that he would cut off his hair if he allowed the liberal presbytery to touch his head and ordain him for ministry! Many left the liberal denomination by 1936 but Barnhouse decided to stay in spite of the overwhelming apostasy. And he paid the price of compromise. By November 1954 Dr. Barnhouse had completely reversed his former position with respect to the apostasy in the Presbyterian Church. Satan must have laughed when Barnhouse surrendered to the liberal Presbytery in his day. In short, Barnhouse said this about his past stand against apostasy, "I now recognize that this has been a mistake." This goes to show you that when you take a first step to compromise, there is not telling where the final step will take you. Barnhouse became so deluded over the whole matter of separation that he began to question the need for a Reformation and because he claimed that "if any man believes that Jesus Christ is Lord and Saviour of the world, I must not be separated from him." With sarcasm and a pathetic childish appeal, Barnhouse appealed to a radio audience by offering anyone one hundred dollars if they could prove to him from the Bible that one Christian should separate from another Christian who claims to be Christian. He then raised the amount to one thousand dollars. This message was so unchristian and unloving that even the Moody Bible Institute radio station cut it off the air.

What has happened to these men and what is happening in the church today? These men have given in to the tremendous pressure to compromise. They have been pressured to compromise because of financial obligations and dreams to create super churches and empires that God does not intend for them to create. How do I know this? Because God never condones compromise. These men have simply said "no" to God and "yes" to the devil. They have given to the people what they want so that they can excel in their popularity and acceptance of the general crowd of Christians. How sad it is to see these men and ministries become swayed by the pressures of the majority. God will hold these men accountable for their compromise.

Many today are flowing in the direction of the majority. ***But we must remember that God has never been impressed with the majority.*** The majority has always been wrong in spiritual matters. The majority was wrong in Jesus' day because Jesus said

("fear not little flock") – Luke 12:32. The majority was wrong in Noah's day. The majority was wrong when the twelve spies voted 10 to 2 not to enter the Promised Land and the entire congregation endorsed the wrong decision (Numbers 13:1-3, 26-33 & 14:1-9). The majority rejected the Lord (John 1:11) and crucified the Lord. God has never been impressed with the majority. And we must always remember that we should obey God rather than man (Acts 5:29). And let us not forget that our obedience always brings down the wrath of the religious majority even as it did in the days of Jesus.

Today the old-line evangelicals have either aligned with the fundamental movement or have adopted or embraced new-evangelicalism. I have meant many pastors who have become soft to New Evangelicalism over the years. They are men who once had thriving separated ministries. But time seems to have eroded their boldness and stand for the Lord. In their retirement they now will participate with ministries that are New Evangelical or at least see positive things in them so that they are permissive of the unholy practices going on. They may not like everything but they go along with the general flow. I have been disappointed with some of the men that have become soft to New Evangelicalism over the years. It's easy to compromise. It's easy to become a kind of passive fundamentalist and become tired of fighting. But God wants us to go down firing. **God wants us to die in the battle with our boots on our feet.** By God's grace I intend to remain in the historic line of true fundamentalists that had to break away from apostasy and who promoted holiness in doctrine and practice. I want to die with my boots on! Or should I say, "I want to fly with my boots!" Jesus is coming back. The rapture could take place at any moment. I want to be found holding the line when He returns so that I will not be ashamed before Him at His coming.

1 John 2:28

"And now, little children, abide in him (by obeying truth as seen in 21-27); that, when he shall appear, we may have confidence (that we are living for Him and that God is pleased with our life), and not be ashamed before him at his coming."

The discerning Christian must see what has happened to the church over the years. They must see how this great whale of New Evangelicalism has swallowed the church and brought the church into a compromising position before God. They must understand what has really happened. What fundamentalist believers must do today is continue to hold the ground that we still have and refuse to compromise with the trends, teachings and tolerant attitude of New Evangelicalism.

Revelation 2:25 says:

"But that which ye have *already* hold fast till I come."

Revelation 3:11 tells us why we must hold the line:

"Behold, I come quickly: hold that fast which thou hast, that no man take thy crown."

God does not settle His accounts in the present day! But there is coming a day when everything will be brought out into the light.

2 Timothy 4:8

“Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day: and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing.”

There is coming a day when we will be rewarded for our uncompromising stand on truth and holiness. Living a righteous, holy and separate life will bring eternal reward. Therefore, we must remain steadfast and cling to the ground that we already have. We cannot afford to surrender any more ground. We must stand boldly and continue to be unremoved in our stand against unseparated ways, unholy practices, ecumenical folly and false teaching.

Martin Luther refused to renounce his writings and was willing to take a stand against the religious opposition of his day. He said:

“Here I stand, I can do no other.”

Athanasius, who was a champion of the doctrine of the deity of Christ, counteracted the Arian heresy of his day. He was warned by a colleague, “The whole world is against you. Then Athanasius replied, “Then I am against the whole world.”

We have now seen what has historically happened to the church down through the centuries. We have also seen why this church still maintains a fundamentalist stand against all unholy doctrine and practices. We are simply following the Biblical traditions that were established by the apostles and maintained throughout the church life by those who wanted to remain pure in doctrine and practice. We are following the traditions that the fundamentalist Christians maintained by standing against all apostasy and error. We are maintaining a non-worldly spirit and methodology in our worship and efforts to win the lost. We want to maintain sensitivity to purity or holiness in our doctrine, associations and approach to Christian living. There is no room for compromise in any areas of the Christian walk and church life. God never compromises on any issue.

2 Thessalonians 2:15 says:

“Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions (Biblical traditions) which ye have been taught, whether by word, or our epistle.”

The church has been taught the Biblical based traditions of the apostles through the inspired writings of Scripture. It is the mandate of the church to remain fundamentally

sound in all of their doctrinal teachings. This must out of necessity also include the Biblical doctrine of holiness or separation from all apostates and unholy doctrine and practices. God is not pleased with the compromise of the church today who follow the sin-warped minds of unbelievers and believers who are entrenched in a system that is going down a different path than the established traditions of holiness or separation.

The modern church has willfully and ignorantly chosen to overlook the matter of unholy associations with apostasy and the worldly or unholy lifestyles, which are plaguing the church today. God wants to give believers the light of discernment on these matters but they are not willing to turn on the lights. Therefore, the light of understanding and Biblical discernment remains lost in the darkness of their own ignorance and deception.

Jesus said in Matthew 6:23:

“...If therefore the light that is in thee be darkness, how great *is* that darkness!”

The context is dealing with riches and worldly living that does not promote treasure in Heaven. The idea Jesus is promoting is that people can become spiritually blinded to those important things that really matter such as living for eternal reward instead of money. The same could be said concerning the matter of separation and holiness before God.

Matthew 6:22

“The light of the body is the eye: if therefore thine eye be single (good), thy whole body shall be full of light.”

Jesus explains that it is through the physical eye that the body receives illumination and can see. If the eye is good, the whole body is flooded with light. But if the eye is bad, then vision is impaired. Instead of light, there is physical darkness. But what is true in the physical realm is also true in the spiritual realm. Our proper spiritual outlook on life can become darkened or blurred by our own willful ignorance and deception about money. But Jesus is really taking the physical illustration and turning it into a spiritual truth.

Matthew 6:23

“But if thine eye be evil (hurt), thy whole body shall be full of darkness...”

In other words, Jesus is saying that if you know that Christ forbids trusting earthly treasures for security, yet you do it anyway, then the teaching you have failed to obey about heavenly reward becomes darkness - a very sad form of spiritual blindness. In a similar manner or by way of application, when the followers of Christ lose their perspective on what is holy and right in this life, as it is declared in the Word of God,

then the teaching of God's word about separation and holiness becomes darkened to their minds.

That's why Jesus adds at the end of Matthew 6:23:

"...If therefore the light that is in thee be darkness, how great *is* that darkness!"

How great is the darkness within New Evangelicalism today! They have chosen to snuff out the light of sound reasoning concerning God's clear word on separation and the absolute hatred for wrong doctrine, unholy living and liberalism. As we see the ramped spread of great ecumenical gatherings and such unholy amusements in the lives of God's people today, one can readily agree that the light of discernment and proper reasoning has gone out in the minds of many Christians today. *New Evangelicals have allowed the light of separation to become darkness.* Today there is so much darkness in Evangelical circles concerning the Biblical truth of separation and holiness that you must wonder if there is any light shining through the keyhole.

Jeremiah 5:30-31 spoke of a terrible thing, which happened to the people of God long ago. Sadly, it has happened again in our day and time with the rise of New Evangelicalism.

"A wonderful (astonishment of horror, appalment) and horrible thing is committed in the land; The prophets prophesy falsely, and the priests bear rule by their means; **and my people love to have it so:** and what will ye do in the end thereof?"

What a sad commentary this is on God's people! But what was said in Jeremiad's day can be said today. New Evangelical believers love to engage in the spirit of compromise and error. They have grown to appreciate compromise and find it novel and the "in thing" of modern Christianity in the new millenium. This fits the New Evangelical story of our own day and time. Many undiscerning Christian people simply accept the statements and attitudes of other Christian leaders who are promoting the need to unite with other liberal denominations and downplay a fundamentalist attitude and stance against other views on Scripture. Christians have wholly embraced those who claim to have expert relational skills and who are now marketing techniques for worldly methods of evangelism and worship in the local church. Most Christian literature, TV and radio programs are filled with New Evangelical compromise and confusion. Some of these programs and magazines were at one time sound in the faith, but have now adopted the New Evangelical attitude of love without purity and peace without firm doctrinal stance. The cancer has spread to epidemic proportions. The great multitudes are aiding unscriptural practices. God cannot and will not commend any believer for helping in the distortion of truth and the aiding of those who are contrary to His Word.

2 John 1:8

“Look to yourselves, that we lose not those things which we have wrought, but that we receive a full reward.”

With the infiltration and open acceptance of apostasy, unholy doctrine and worldly practices taking place within the church today, we could say what Jeremiah said many years ago, **“and my people love to have it so.”**

What else can be said concerning what really happened to the church? *The church has willingly married the world by embracing this unbiblical philosophy of infiltration and tolerance.* We can readily see what has happened to the church by examining the past. Now we can understand why the present situation of the church is so worldly. Because of the past failure of leaders to direct the church in the paths of holy separation, the great multitudes of believers in the church today have swallowed this philosophy of infiltration and have *lost their sight and sensitivity* to the whole package of separation and holiness. They have lost their will to discern between holy and unholy practices and between those who are promoting error and those who are remaining true to the Word of God. Many have been caught in the ecumenical web of confusion and compromise. They have been pulled out into the sea of compromise by the tide of books, preachers, Christian radio, TV ministries and literature that is New Evangelical in nature and practice. Most Christians want to play follow the leader. They have developed a picture of what the church is to be like by watching TV ministers and ministries and then try to mimic those ministries in their own churches. If one ministry starts clapping and applauding speakers and singers then they all start doing it. If one leading ministry promotes something that is different and questionable, then others will follow in their footsteps. The problem is this. *The Word of God is to be our final guide or authority - not the present status of disobedient church ministries.* God must have the final say about what is happening in the church today and we must acknowledge the right of Jesus Christ to control the activities of His church. Most Christians are simply unaware of the great compromises of the hour and the real condition and plight of the church. They are blindsighted by the ignorance and positive preaching of today.

Judges 2:17 also tells us what happened:

“And yet they would not hearken unto their judges, but they went a whoring after other gods, and bowed themselves unto them: **they turned quickly out of the way which their fathers walked in, obeying the commandments of the LORD; but they did not so.**”

Oh how sad these words are to our ears today, “But they did not so.” How true this is of New Evangelicalism today. The emergence of New Evangelicalism in the past 50 years has come about because the preachers and people did not respect the Biblical stand of their forerunners. So they turned quickly out of the way of their forerunners and chose to not obey the commandments of separation. New Evangelicalism is a

direct choice – “but they did not so.” It the conscious choice to abandon a Biblical position that was once held by those fathers and forerunners who have set the Biblical standard before them. New Evangelicalism is not a syndrome. It is a choice.

I am convinced that many ministries, which have subtly drifted into the New Evangelical Movement, are not aware of their drift. They seem to think that they are the same as they always were. They claim that they have not moved. There are multitudes of churches drifting into this movement that do not realize that they have departed from the Biblical positions of those that preceded them. *They also can become blinded to the inroads and impact of this movement in their churches and personal lives.* The Laodicean church was totally blind or oblivious to the spiritual losses it has suffered and the same can be said for many churches that begin to go down the road of New Evangelical compromise (Revelation 3:17). ***Many churches out of ignorance have gradually slipped from a once held Biblical position.*** Unconscious spiritual loss is the worst kind of loss! Some ignorantly and others willfully allow their ministries and lives to become saturated with the infiltration mood. In order to keep this ministry and other fundamental ministries free from the cancer of compromise, there needs to be the continuous and diligent instructions given to new generations about separatist principles (Deuteronomy 6:7). We must never assume that incoming church people and those who seem to be good leaders know about the past and what the Bible teaches about Biblical separation. The church must remain strong in separation or holiness in both congregation and leadership. We must remember that nice men may not be separated men and be qualified to take a stand against New Evangelicalism. Weak leadership is the beginning of the end for any separated church.

I am thoroughly convinced that most believers who are the new generation of New Evangelicals have no history of the past controversies and the battles fought to preserve truth and doctrine. This is partly because the New Evangelical generation has grown up and been brainwashed about the true tenets of Biblical separation and the acceptance of worldly compromise. They are blindly following their New Evangelical leaders without any realization of the past or the truth about Biblical separation. They have been totally absorbed in a New Evangelical atmosphere and are ignorant of the greatness of their own compromise and God’s teaching on the subject of holiness or separation. Many are also following this philosophy of infiltration because of their own desire to follow a method, message and a movement, which pleases their own flesh and leads down the path of least resistance. This cancer of compromise has spread to epidemic proportions within the body of Christ. ***The path to a total apostasy is being prepared!*** Our job is to defend the truth of the Word of God in a day when many are opposing the truth of pure doctrine and pure living. ***We must guard our borders! We must hold the fort! We must maintain the ground that we have!***

Titus 1:9 reminds us to hold fast:

“Holding fast the faithful (trustworthy) word as he hath been taught, that he may be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers (those who speak against or oppose – the truth).”

Most Christian ministries are becoming infected with the disease today. They are compromising and the reasons are very obvious why they are compromising. They want to go along with the flow of the times and not be noticed as being different. It's much less tension and turmoil when you learn to adjust and go along with the *drift of the times*. Pressure to be like others is also overtaking the churches. They want to be successful like the rest of the churches who are changing and filling their pews with people. Success in the world's eyes is another reason for all of this compromise. Therefore, they start the Evangelical express by bringing in worldly music and other church marketing principles. Then too, New Evangelicals never want to appear to others as being unloving and unkind. Furthermore, they want to keep their big church ministries and educational institutions operating. Financial pressures also play a role as to why the church and educational institutions of Christian learning compromise. Larger churches and schools are forced to go along with the drift of the times in order to get more people or students. This in return helps these ministries to continue to survive and prosper in the world of New Evangelical success.

So what do we stand to lose by this cancerous spread of New Evangelicalism? First, we will lose sacred truth that we need to hold onto in these last days. Second, we have already lost and will continue to lose good churches to this philosophy of infiltration and compromise. These are churches which once stood firm on the truth about separation and holiness. They are churches that men have given their lives for and built over many years of battles with apostasy. Third, we also stand to lose many children to the popular musical trends and other worldly amusements and compromises connected with this movement. This in return only produces more widespread corruption and widens the generation gap among the so-called old-timers of a past generation and the younger people of a new generation. Fourth, we will lose the very foundation of the Bible and its preservation in the Greek “Received Text.” This is because modern versions, connected with the popular movement, are replacing the King James Version of the Bible, and continue to steal the hearts of millions away from God's accurately preserved truth. Fifth, we stand to lose part of our reward, which God has promised to those who remain faithful to God's Word and obey the truth, instead of compromise. May God help the churches; that is to say, if the churches want to be helped, for as Jeremiah said, “my people love to have it so” (Jer. 5:31).

*A chart is available for the breakdown and definitions related to this study. Please click the button on the church website marked “**Charts**” and then find the chart labeled “**The History of Modernism and Fundamentalism with Related Definitions.**”