

# **- THE VARIOUS GROUPS IN PROTESTANT CHRISTIANITY TODAY -**

**An explanation of the religious positions of:**

**“LIBERALISM,”  
“NEO-ORTHODOXY,”  
“NEW-EVANGELICALISM” &  
“FUNDAMENTALISM”<sup>1</sup>**

**By: Rev. Mike Edwards  
Baptist Chaplain  
University of Goroka  
November, 2003  
(Revised September, 2011)**

---

<sup>1</sup> **EXPLANATORY NOTE:** The material contained in this paper is primarily and intentionally composed of quotes from a wide variety of highly respected pastors, Bible teachers, and Christian scholars, &/or the representatives and proponents of the various viewpoints. This has been done to establish the veracity and credibility of the statements made regarding the positions of the groups and individuals discussed. Individual quotes are referenced in footnotes throughout, for those who wish to consult the primary sources for further study. Much of this information was originally presented at the Independent Baptist Pastors Conference in Kerowagi, Chimbu, Papua New Guinea in September, 2003.

# LIBERALISM, NEO-ORTHODOXY, NEW EVANGELICALISM & FUNDAMENTALISM<sup>2</sup>

## INTRODUCTION:

Many people, including pastors and church leaders, are unfamiliar with the correct meaning of the terms “*Liberal*,” “*Neo-Orthodox*,” “*New Evangelical*,” & “*Fundamentalist*.” They do not understand what those who hold to such viewpoints believe nor the history behind the development of those positions. Recently, in Independent Baptist circles in Papua New Guinea there has been a great deal of interest in, and more than a few questions about, the meaning of the terms “*New-Evangelical*” and “*Fundamentalist*” in particular. In an effort to dispel confusion and enlighten Bible-believers, it is my desire here to explain where those terms have come from and what they mean. Every pastor, church, mission, and denomination falls into one of those four categories. The great Christian scholar Dr. J. Gresham Machen, in the introduction of his famous book “*Christianity and Liberalism*” set forth his goal in writing and I’d like to quote what he said (with a couple of slight modifications), and apply it eight decades later to this present paper, since it summarizes so well my own objective in writing:

*“The purpose of this (paper) is not to decide the religious issue of the present day, but merely to present the issue as sharply and clearly as possible, in order that the reader may be aided in deciding it for himself. Presenting an issue sharply is indeed by no means a popular business at the present time; there are many who prefer to fight their intellectual battles in what Dr. Francis L. Patton has aptly called a ‘condition of low visibility.’ Clear-cut definition of terms in religious matters, bold facing of the logical implications of religious views, is by many persons regarded as an impious proceeding. May it not discourage contribution to mission boards? May it not hinder the progress of consolidation, and produce a poor showing in columns of Church statistics? But with such persons we cannot possibly bring ourselves to agree. Light may seem at times to be an impertinent intruder, but it is always beneficial in the end. The type of religion which rejoices in the pious sound of traditional phrases, regardless of their meanings, or shrinks from ‘controversial’ matters, will never stand amid the shocks of life. In the sphere of religion, as in other spheres, the things about which men are agreed are apt to be the things that are least worth holding; the really important things are the things about which men will fight... In trying to remove from Christianity everything that could possibly be objected to in the name of science, in trying to bribe off the enemy by those concessions which the enemy most desires, the apologist has really abandoned what he started out to defend. Here as in many other departments of life it appears that the things that are sometimes thought to be hardest to defend, are also the things that are most worth defending... we are animated, therefore, by no merely negative or polemic purpose; on the contrary, by showing what (biblical) Christianity is not, we hope to be able to show what (biblical) Christianity is, in order that men may be led to turn from the weak and beggarly elements and have recourse again to the grace of God.”<sup>3</sup>*

What follows are brief definitions and descriptions of the various theological viewpoints found in Protestant churches and denominations, followed by some history of how they came about, and some examples of the core beliefs that differentiate them from each other. Also included are a sizable number of *specific* examples of people and schools illustrating the various positions. These are included in order to help the reader better recognize and understand each one. My desire is that this material will enable each of us to discern right from wrong, and that we will take and maintain a biblical position—regardless of the cost! The Bible says in I Chronicles 12:32 that the men of Issachar “...*were men that had understanding of the times, to know what Israel ought to do...*” In a similar way, may God grant us the ability to understand the times in which we live.

- I. **LIBERALISM (MODERNISM)**. In a nutshell, Liberals or Modernists, reject almost everything the Bible teaches, e.g. the miracles recorded in Scripture, the virgin birth of Christ, the literal, physical resurrection of Christ from the dead, the verbal, plenary inspiration & inerrancy of the Bible, the substitutionary atonement of Christ, the second coming of Christ, etc. Many pastors and leaders in the mainline Protestant denominations are Liberals, or Modernists! They may possess religious titles such as “*Reverend*,” “*Father*,” “*Pastor*,” “*Bishop*,” etc., but if confronted and asked hard questions, they would admit that they don’t believe any of the above-mentioned basic doctrines of biblical Christianity.
  - A. **DEFINITION OF LIBERALISM (MODERNISM):**

---

<sup>2</sup> Note: The Roman Catholic Church is not included in the discussion contained in this paper, nor are false cults such as Mormonism, Jehovah’s Witnesses, Seventh-Day Adventists, etc. The RCC has major theological errors and is not a part of Protestantism, while such groups as Mormons, Jehovah’s Witnesses, etc., are false cults that are so far removed theologically from Christianity that they are more properly categorized as blatant non-Christian heresies.

<sup>3</sup> “*Christianity and Liberalism*,” by J. Gresham Machen. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company: Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1923 (1985 reprint), pp. 1-2, 7-8, 16.

1. *“Modernism is the theological position that rejects the doctrine that the Bible in its entirety is the verbally inspired Word of God. Modernism (Liberalism) denies the supernatural elements of the Bible and the miraculous character of the person and work of Christ. It magnifies the false doctrine of the universal Fatherhood of God and the universal brotherhood of man. It emphasizes the Social Gospel as opposed to the Gospel imperative of individual need for salvation from sin by repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ.”*<sup>4</sup>
2. *“Modernism is the theological position that rejects any or all of the Bible as the Word of God; that denies the supernatural elements of the Bible and miraculous character of the Person and work of Christ; that magnifies the false doctrine of the universal fatherhood of God and the universal brotherhood of man, with an emphasis on the social gospel as opposed to the New Testament gospel of grace to the individual.”*<sup>5</sup>
3. *“The modern Liberal movement draws directly on the work of the German theologian Schleiermacher... he taught that the true source of theology was not the Bible, but man’s religious consciousness. Thus the objective revelation of God in the Bible was set aside, and man’s subjective opinions were exalted to the position of authority. Schleiermacher argues at length that nothing should be accepted just because it occurs in the Bible. Even though he would accept some things in Scripture, it would be because they agree with his previous opinions... In other words, man decides what belongs in Christianity. If part of the Bible agrees with his opinions, he accepts it; if part disagrees, he is free to throw it out... The most outspoken advocate of this view in modern times was Harry Emerson Fosdick. Although he purported to teach others the value of the Bible, he led the attack on the inspiration of the Scriptures... (Liberal) Henry P. Van Dusen, formerly president of Union Theological Seminary (New York), singled out the Creed of Chalcedon for some degree of scorn because it referred to Christ as ‘God truly and man truly,’ by saying, ‘**To the logical mind, it sounds like distilled nonsense** (sic).’...Another typical line of attack is Rudolf Bultmann’s attempt to ‘de-mythologize’ Scripture... **Bultmann (was) convinced that Scripture is filled with ‘myths’**...”*<sup>6</sup>
4. *“The ‘Modernists’ (i.e. Liberals) denied the inspiration of Scripture, the Deity and the Virgin Birth of Christ. They scoffed at His Blood and the doctrine that men must be Born Again. They cried out against a God who would judge men and condemn them to eternal torment. They said, ‘THE BIBLE IS NOT GOD’S WORD.’”*<sup>7</sup>

**B. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF LIBERALISM/MODERNISM.** “Modernism was born from German rationalism and destructive higher criticism, which came from Europe just before the turn of the century (1900) to infiltrate the theological seminaries and denominational schools of our country (America)... The writings of philosophers such as Christian Wolff, Immanuel Kant, Georg Hegel and theologians such as Friedrich Schleiermacher, Julius Wellhausen and Soren Kierkegaard provided the background for the departures of men such as Shailer Mathews, Walter Rauschenbusch and Harry Emerson Fosdick of the twentieth century. Denominational schools such as Colgate Rochester Divinity School, Chicago Divinity School, Union Theological Seminary of New York and McCormick Theological Seminary of Chicago also departed from their long-standing teachings of the inerrancy of the Scriptures, the deity of Christ, the depravity of man and the gospel of the grace of God.”<sup>8</sup> Other typical centers of liberalism would include: Duke Divinity School, Yale Divinity School, etc. Their flagship magazine is called “*Christian Century*.”

<sup>4</sup> \*From “*Terms You Need to Know*”, Appendix #15 of the Campus Bible Fellowship Staff Manual. Baptist Mid-Missions; Cleveland, Ohio, 1981, 1983, p. 83. This appendix is a list of definitions “...from a handbook prepared by the Campus Bible Fellowship organization, for use by their campus workers and members of their local liaison committees of pastors and laymen.”

<sup>5</sup> \*Bryce B. Augsburger, “*Do Fundamentalists No Longer Need to Fear the Dark Shadow of Modernism?*” An article which originally appeared in the “The Baptist Bulletin,” the official magazine of The General Association of Regular Baptist Churches (GARBC); Schaumburg, IL, June 1982. (pp. 13-15).

<sup>6</sup> Dr. Stewart Custer, “*Does Inspiration Demand Inerrancy?*” The Craig Press: Nutley, NJ, 1968, pp. 68-69.

<sup>7</sup> Dr. Bob Jones, Jr. “*Today-The Four Groups in Protestantism*.” Bob Jones University Press: Greenville, SC, n.d., emphasis in the original.

<sup>8</sup> \*Augsburger, op. cit., p. 13

**II. FUNDAMENTALISM.** This term came into common use in the early 1900's primarily in the United States, to describe what we would today call "Bible-believers." They believed and held to the "fundamental or foundational" (i.e. "basic") teachings that virtually all true Christians have believed and held throughout the past centuries. At that time (i.e. the early 1900s) in America there were only two main Protestant theological viewpoints: "Liberalism/Modernism" and "Fundamentalism." Those who denied the Bible and its teachings were thus "liberals," or "modernists", and those who believed the Bible and supported its teachings were called "conservatives" or "fundamentalists."

**Important Explanatory Note:** Until recently in Great Britain, the term "*fundamentalist*" has been rarely used at all. Instead, there have typically been two terms and categories used: "Liberal" and "Evangelical." Until the 1960s an "evangelical" in Great Britain was equivalent to being a "Bible-believer." It was somewhat similar to a "*fundamentalist*" in the United States. To the British it was not the same as the American term "new-evangelical" (see explanation of this term under #IV below). However in the mid-1960's, the Bible-believers ("*evangelicals*") in Great Britain split into two divisions, the majority of them moving to an unbiblical, more liberal position very much like American "new evangelicals." A minority continued to hold firm to a conservative, biblical ("*fundamentalist*") position. In fact even today many of these conservative British Bible-believers are often still referred to as evangelicals-which makes things a bit confusing. Adding to the confusion in the last decade or two have been compromising British evangelicals such as John R.W. Stott who have taken up the "*new evangelical*" position, and have begun labeling the conservatives as "*fundamentalists*"-primarily as a term of derision. Dr. Peter Masters of The Metropolitan Tabernacle (Spurgeon's old church) has written an excellent booklet answering such compromising evangelicals who have departed from a separatist, biblical stance.<sup>9</sup>

#### A. DEFINITION OF FUNDAMENTALISM:

1. "*Biblical faith in and practical reliance upon what have been historically accepted as the fundamental doctrines of Scripture about the deity of Christ, His substitutionary sacrifice on the Cross, the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures, the reality of Heaven and Hell and sin, the absolute need of man to be saved, and the absolute reliability of God's promise of eternal life.*"<sup>10</sup>
2. "*Fundamentalism is a theological position that began at the turn of the century and is defined as a Biblically loyal movement of ecclesiastical (i.e. church) separation of the twentieth century that is simply a restatement of the historic Christian faith, emphasizing all the essential doctrines relating to the Person and work of Christ as revealed in the Holy Scripture, which is regarded as infallible, inerrant and authoritative.*"<sup>11</sup>
3. "*The 'Fundamentalists' stood for the defense of the Faith. They declared, 'THE BIBLE IS THE WORD OF GOD-Divinely Inspired, Eternal and God-breathed.' They stood for the Virgin Birth of our Lord, His atoning death, His bodily resurrection, His second coming, a literal Hell and a literal Heaven. They emphasized the Blood of Christ and the necessity of the New Birth.*"<sup>12</sup>
4. Masters writes from the British perspective: "*Old-style evangelicals are often called fundamentalists, particularly in the USA. New-style evangelicals adopted the term 'new evangelical' to describe themselves in the 1950s (1947-48?). In the UK (United Kingdom) the term fundamentalist has not been much used... We are told that the fundamentalist label was first coined in America in 1920... It is often said that a fundamentalist is an evangelical who is angry about something. It would be fairer to say that a fundamentalist is someone who cares about the defense and preservation of the gospel.*"<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> The title of Masters' booklet is: "*Are We Fundamentalists?*" I highly recommend it! It can be ordered from: Tabernacle Bookshop, Metropolitan Tabernacle, Elephant & Castle, London, England SE1 6SD, U.K. (Fax: 020 77353 7989; email: [Bookshop@MetropolitanTabernacle.org](mailto:Bookshop@MetropolitanTabernacle.org)). A very helpful companion booklet on the subject of biblical separation is titled "*Stand for the Truth*" & is also available from them. They cost around .60p each.

<sup>10</sup> \*"Terms You Need to Know," op. cit.

<sup>11</sup> \*Augsburger, op. cit.

<sup>12</sup> Jones, Jr., op. cit., p. 3, emphasis in the original.

<sup>13</sup> Dr. Peter Masters, "*Are We Fundamentalists?*" Sword & Trowel-Metropolitan Tabernacle, London, England, UK, 1995, p. 4

5. “A Fundamentalist is a born-again believer in the Lord Jesus Christ who... Maintains an immovable allegiance to the inerrant, infallible, and verbally inspired Bible... Judges all things by the Bible and is judged only by the Bible; ...Affirms the foundational truths of the historic Christian Faith (‘The doctrine of the Trinity, The Incarnation, virgin birth, substitutionary atonement, bodily resurrection, ascension into Heaven and Second Coming of the Lord Jesus Christ, The new birth through regeneration of the Holy Spirit, The resurrection of the saints to life eternal, The resurrection of the ungodly to final judgment and eternal death, The fellowship of the saints, who are the body of Christ’)... Practices fidelity to that Faith and endeavors to preach it to every creature; ...Exposes and separates from all ecclesiastical denial of that faith, compromise with error, and apostasy from the Truth; and ...Earnestly contends for the Faith once delivered. Therefore, Fundamentalism is militant orthodoxy set on fire with soul-winning zeal. While Fundamentalists may differ on certain interpretations of Scripture, we join in unity of heart and common purpose for the defense of the Faith and the preaching of the Gospel, without compromise or division. Unless a man holds and defends the Faith of Scripture and is concerned for the salvation of the lost, he is not a true Fundamentalist.”<sup>14</sup>

B. **HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF FUNDAMENTALISM:** “To counteract (Modernism/Liberalism)... godly men (mostly among the Baptists, Methodists and Presbyterians) waged a furious war against these antichrists; and men and churches by the thousands seceded from their conventions and denominations. The result of this ‘all-out’ attack upon the modernists was the beginning of a movement known as ‘fundamentalism,’ a name of derision given to them by the modernists. Though many godly men were involved in the controversy, certain names can be identified with the battle against modernism in those early days. Among the Baptists was W.B. Riley in the north, J. Frank Norris in the south and T.T. Shields in Canada. The leader among Presbyterians was J. Gresham Machen; and among Methodists, Bob Jones, Sr., and Robert Shuler, Sr.”<sup>15</sup>

Fundamentalism came about as a reaction by Bible-believing Christians to the heresy and false teachings of Modernism/Liberalism that were rapidly creeping into the mainline Protestant denominations around the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Historically speaking, the roots of this battle between Modernism and Fundamentalism actually began even earlier than that, and in England rather than America, when the great Baptist preacher **C.H. Spurgeon** exposed the pervasive errors and apostasy (falling away) from the truth that was occurring in the Baptist Union denomination in England. It was called the “**Downgrade Controversy**.” The name came about in 1887 when an article appeared in Spurgeon’s widely read magazine *The Sword and Trowel*. It spoke of a “Downgrade” that was occurring in the Baptist Union. It is not my purpose here to give the history of that theological controversy in detail. However what Spurgeon saw occurring in England in 1887 quickly leaped across the Atlantic and was also occurring in the USA. The valiant spiritual warriors who stood up and spoke out against Modernism’s attempt to take over the mainline Protestant denominations of America became known as “*Fundamentalists*.” **There were two primary reasons why they were given that name in America:**

1. The term Fundamentalist described what such a person believed, i.e. the “*fundamental*” or “*basic*” (i.e. foundational) teachings of the Bible (e.g. the virgin birth of Christ, His incarnation and physical resurrection from the dead, his substitutionary atonement for sin through His shed blood, the Bible as the infallible, inerrant (errorless) Word of God, miracles, etc).
2. In 1910 a series of booklets titled “*The Fundamentals*”, which contained essays by conservative Bible scholars answering liberal arguments and attacks on Scripture, was written, printed, and distributed free of charge worldwide to approximately 300,000 English speaking pastors, missionaries and Christian workers. This theological endeavor, funded by two wealthy Christian laymen, further cemented the name “fundamentalist” to those who were Bible believers.

“...many leading preachers and seminary professors took a firm stand (against Modernism), issuing a series of volumes defending foundational truths. Two wealthy

<sup>14</sup> Formal resolution of the definition of Fundamentalism approved by the two thousand official delegates to the first World Congress of Fundamentalists held in Edinburgh, Scotland in 1976, quoted by David Beale, “In Pursuit of Purity,” Bob Jones University Press: Greenville, SC, 1986, p. 348.

<sup>15</sup> \*Augsburger, op. cit., p. 13

laymen... financed the venture, ordering that these books be sent out free to pastors and Christian workers not only in America, but throughout the English-speaking world. Between 1910-1915 twelve paperback volumes were issued. These contained numerous articles by many leading figures... ready to take a stand against modernism. They included American and British writers. Some of the finest treatments of many subjects are to be found in this publication, entitled, *THE FUNDAMENTALS*... This term was consolidated when thousands of preachers and supporters gathered in Philadelphia in 1919 for The World Conference on Christian Fundamentals. Soon afterwards ‘fundamentalism’ became a recognized term for a readiness to defend the old doctrines and standards.”<sup>16</sup>

**C. IS FUNDAMENTALISM A NEW & STRANGE VIEWPOINT OF RECENT INVENTION?**

Today the term “fundamentalist” has a very bad connotation and image. The term is used to refer to cult leaders who poison their followers, terrorists who blow up airplanes, buses and buildings, and assorted other crazy or unbalanced individuals. Consequently liberals, neo-orthodox, and new-evangelical proponents, as well as skeptics and atheists like to use the term when referring to conservative Bible-believers who try to faithfully follow God and obey His Word-since it gives the impression that such people are candidates for “Ward Five” (i.e. a mental or psychiatric hospital). But the historical facts are very different. It usually comes as a shock to most people to find out that **“fundamentalists” stand doctrinally where virtually ALL Bible believers of the past centuries have always stood! Fundamentalism is not something new. It is the solid, historic, biblical Christianity of the past still existing in the present!** Beale has remarked that “Both friends and foes have regarded Fundamentalism as the lengthened shadow of Moses and the prophets, of Christ and the apostles, of Augustine and Calvin, of the English Separatists and Puritans, of Wesley and Whitefield, of the German Pietists and the English Brethren, of London’s Spurgeon and Princeton’s Warfield-and of all who continue loyal to its principles and genius.”<sup>17</sup>

Confirmation of this fact comes from a surprising source: the late, well-respected liberal scholar, Dr. Kirsopp Lake. Dr. Lake was totally opposed to fundamentalists/conservatives, but he honestly admitted that Liberalism (& by extension, Neo-Orthodoxy and New-Evangelicalism) is the “new” viewpoint-NOT fundamentalism. He bluntly wrote:

*“It is a mistake, often made by educated persons who happen to have but little knowledge of historical theology, to suppose that Fundamentalism is a new and strange form of thought. It is nothing of the kind: it is the...survival of a theology which was once universally held by all Christians... The Fundamentalist may be wrong; I think that he is (sic). But it is we (i.e. the liberals) who have departed from the tradition, not he, and I am sorry for the fate of anyone who tries to argue with a Fundamentalist on the basis of authority. The Bible and the corpus theologicum (i.e. body of theology) of the Church is on the Fundamentalist’ side.”<sup>18</sup>*

**III. NEO-ORTHODOXY (Also known as “CRISIS-THEOLOGY” or**

**“BARTHIANISM.”<sup>19</sup>). In simple layman’s language, neo-orthodoxy is simply the old liberal viewpoint, dressed up with new clothes to make it look more appealing. Neo-orthodox scholars do not believe the Bible is the inerrant Word of God any more than liberals do. Nor do they believe in a literal virgin birth, a literal resurrection by Christ from the dead, or Christ’s substitutionary atonement for the sins of mankind-but they talk as though they do! They use familiar words, but without telling others that what they mean by those words is something totally different! Neo-Orthodox individuals refer to the Bible as “*the word of God.*” **But they don’t mean what you and I mean.** They believe that while most of the Bible is false, error-filled, &/or myth, there may, nonetheless, be parts that speak to you (i.e. “zap” you), and such words or passages are the word of God to you-though they may not be the word of God to me! Such is neo-orthodox thinking.**

**A. DEFINITION OF NEO-ORTHODOXY :**

1. “*Neo-orthodoxy is that inconsistent and illogical contemporary movement of theological deception also called ‘Crisis-Theology’ or ‘Barthianism.’ ...Whereas the old modernism*

<sup>16</sup> Masters, op. cit., pp. 6-7

<sup>17</sup> Beale, “*In Pursuit of Purity*” Unusual Publications: Greenville, SC, 1986, p. 3.

<sup>18</sup> Kirsopp Lake, quoted by Beale, p. 4.

<sup>19</sup> It is often referred to as “*Barthianism*” in deference to Neo-Orthodox theologian Karl Barth’s powerful influence on Neo-Orthodoxy’s development and promotion.

*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.”<sup>20</sup>*

2. *“Neo-orthodoxy: A pretense to orthodoxy that is only an attempt to move away from the stigma of liberalism and gain acceptance from an appearance of Biblical faith. Its claim to faith in the Bible is deceptive because it only believes what the subjective reactions of the heart feel like accepting. Its claim to the name Christian is false because, while it uses the same words and expressions that fundamentalists use, its meanings are the meanings of the modernist unbeliever. Neo-orthodoxy is also called Crisis Theology or Barthianism.”<sup>21</sup>*
3. *“**This so-called ‘New Orthodoxy’ is misnamed. It is neither new nor orthodox. It is Modernism gone underground.** Not brazenly do its disciples flaunt their infidelity. They say, ‘THE BIBLE CONTAINS THE WORD OF GOD.’ They set themselves to judge the Bible and decide what is God’s Word and what is not God’s Word. They use much of the language of old-fashioned Biblical Orthodoxy, but the terms they use do not mean what they have traditionally meant. They speak of Christ as God, but they do not refer to the Christ of Scripture-Virgin Born, risen bodily from the dead, and ascended bodily on High. They are masters of deceit and double talk. They are more dangerous than open ‘Modernists,’ as a Communist working underground-infiltrating and sabotaging-is more dangerous than a Communist in uniform. These are the underground workers, the saboteurs of Satan.”<sup>22</sup>*
4. *“Many conservative Christians make the mistake of thinking that Neo-Orthodoxy is just another name for the old Liberalism. In reality there is a distinct difference. Liberalism is a frontal assault upon practically every important doctrine of the Christian faith, whereas Neo-Orthodoxy will outwardly agree with a great many of the major doctrines. Consequently, the points of disagreement must be carefully examined; the doctrine of inspiration is in the forefront of these contested points. Although the Neo-Orthodox sounds conservative when he stresses the value and importance of the Bible, he does not mean the same things that the conservative (fundamentalist) means by these words. The conservative holds that the Bible is God’s revelation; the Neo-Orthodox holds that it is not God’s revelation, but rather the **witness** to the revelation. That is why Karl Barth can refer to the Bible by saying: ‘It witnesses to a revelation from God, but that does not mean that God’s revelation is now before us in any kind of inherent quality of being divinely revealed... Barth also makes clear that the Bible is a very human witness, shot through with errors (sic). He claims that ‘at every point it is the vulnerable word of man’... The prophets and apostles were actually ‘fallible, erring men like ourselves.’ ...The illustration that the Neo-Orthodox usually gives is that the Bible is like a minister preaching the Gospel. Although there may be many mistakes in his sermon, he is still witnessing to the truth, and this is sufficient to secure salvation for men. In the same way, the Neo-Orthodox say, the Bible is full of errors, and yet it witnesses to the truth and is therefore ‘adequate’ for man...”*

Custer comments: **“NO CONSERVATIVE WOULD AGREE THAT THIS IS AN ACCURATE PORTRAYAL OF THE VALUE AND IMPORTANCE OF THE BIBLE...** Whenever man denies that the Bible is God’s authoritative revelation, he must substitute his own human reason as the final governing authority in ascertaining all truth. If, in reading the Bible, a part of it strikes a man as inspired, it is inspired; if it does not strike him as inspired, it is not inspired. Thus Neo-Orthodoxy has made the mind of man the standard for everything. This means that the Word of God is a subjective experience and not an objective revelation. It is because of this overemphasis on the mind of man that C.H. Dodd can say concerning Romans, ‘Sometimes I think Paul is wrong, and I have

<sup>20</sup> \*Augsburger, op. cit., p. 14

<sup>21</sup> \**“Terms”*, op. cit.

<sup>22</sup> Jones, Jr., op. cit., pp. 3-4

ventured to say so...(!)' ...As Kierkegaard put it, 'there is no truth until there is truth to me...'<sup>23</sup>

## B. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF NEO-ORTHODOXY.

1. "As the modernists counted their losses, they realized they had moved too far to the left. If they were to stop the trend and recapture some of their losses (i.e. of church members), they were going to have to restructure themselves in more orthodox clothing. This reaction away from liberalism (i.e. modernism), 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 with respect to the Bible. Yes, the modernism of the twenties and thirties gave way to neo-orthodoxy, the dialectic theology of Barth, based upon the existentialist philosophy of Kierkegaard, followed by the more negative and destructive theology of Bultmann."<sup>24</sup>
2. **Neo-Orthodoxy was the third of the four groups or theological movements to appear on the religious scene**, and as noted in the quotes above, it was an attempt to dress up Modernism/Liberalism and repackage it in a more acceptable manner. However it is a fake, a wolf in sheep's clothing, and a classic example of man's subjective feelings determining what is true, instead of a belief that the Bible is, ipso facto, the objective Word of God-regardless of any feelings man may or may not receive when he reads it!

IV. **NEW-EVANGELICALISM** (Also known as "**NEO-EVANGELICALISM**"). Just as Liberalism had a "*child*" named Neo-Orthodoxy, **so too Fundamentalism also had a "*child*."** That "*child*" was named **New-Evangelicalism**. It began in the late 1940s when some of the men from the fundamentalist camp changed their views. Instead of separating from apostate churches, denominations and schools, they felt that fundamentalists should try *infiltrating* them (i.e. go undercover into dead denominations and try to straighten them out)! Instead of ignoring liberals they decided they would "*dialogue*" with them. These "*new*" evangelicals also hungered for respect, prestige and recognition from unsaved, liberal scholars and academics. So they founded new schools &/or tailored existing ones, with the specific goal of gaining such recognition and praise from secular sources. Finally, these "*new*" evangelicals wanted to more strongly emphasize "*social issues*" (i.e. the meeting of people's physical and social needs), claiming that fundamentalists had not given sufficient attention to those issues.

In addition to the initial differences highlighted above, additional differences between New Evangelicalism and Fundamentalism have surfaced in the decades that have followed. One has been a renouncing of belief in the inerrancy of Scripture by a number of new evangelical colleges and seminaries (e.g. Fuller Theological Seminary). Another change has been in the area of hermeneutics (hermeneutics refers to principles of Bible interpretation). There has been a major shift in how many new evangelicals interpret the Bible. Where before they would let the Bible say what it says, now many in the evangelical realm are trying to make the Bible say what they wish for it to say. There is a world of difference between the two. They are now practicing eisegesis (i.e. injecting their views into a text) instead of exegesis, i.e. letting the text say what it says. This practice of promoting techniques for reinterpreting the Bible in order to make it fit in with the world's views on issues such as female pastors, homosexuality, abortion, racism, socialism, etc., is another recently emerged characteristic of new evangelicalism. This has been done under the guise of "*contextualization*" & "*cultural relevance and sensitivity*." Another mark of new evangelicalism which has appeared in the past few decades, is an obvious dropping or loosening up of previously held moral standards. New evangelicals have made a concerted effort to jettison previously held convictions against a host of moral issues that Bible-believers had previously been opposed to, such as drinking alcohol, smoking, dancing, gambling, immodest dress, worldly music, attendance at movie theaters, purchasing of questionable videos, etc. Another very obvious and more recent characteristic of new evangelicals is that generally speaking they are far more concerned with being nice, than in telling the truth. I will elaborate on & illustrate all of these marks of new evangelicalism in the pages that follow.

**IMPORTANT NOTE:** Today the term "*new-evangelical*" is used less and less, if at all. Instead such individuals simply refer to themselves as "*evangelicals*." **In other words, the terms "*new evangelical*" and "*evangelical*" have become basically interchangeable today and are nearly**

<sup>23</sup> Custer, op. cit., pp. 74-77, emphasis added.

<sup>24</sup> Augsburg, op. cit., p. 14



**synonymous.** In addition, a number of scholars have pointed out that today the term “evangelical” means almost anything:

*“Part of the current confusion regarding new-evangelicalism stems from the fact that there is now little difference between evangelicalism and new-evangelicalism... It is no doubt true to state that ‘Ockenga’s designation of the new movement as “New or Neo-Evangelical” was abbreviated to “Evangelical.” ...Few people today characterize themselves by the term New Evangelical. That does not mean, however, that there are no New Evangelicals. It merely means that the nomenclature (i.e. system of names) has been shortened.”<sup>25</sup>*

#### A. DEFINITION OF NEW-EVANGELICALISM:

1. *“Neo-Evangelicalism is a relatively recent theological movement of neutralism affecting orthodox Christianity that is designed to close the gap between fundamentalism and neo-orthodoxy.”<sup>26</sup>*
2. Augsburger writes that New Evangelicalism is...*“An evangelicalism that attempts to close the gap between fundamentalism and neo-orthodoxy but that is actually inimical to fundamentalism and friendly toward neo-orthodoxy. It presents the Bible as the inspired Word of God in only the weakest terms; it maintains a compromising stand upon the doctrine of Special Creation by favoritism toward unbelieving scientific scholarship; and it tends to promote the Social Gospel by its over-reliance upon social-action projects to commend the Gospel to the unsaved. In practice, it universally applies the inclusive policy and promotes the fraternization between evangelicals and liberals by means of so-called dialogue, which pretends to advance the mutual understanding of groups that have historically held opposite views on Biblical doctrine.”<sup>27</sup>*
3. Ashbrook adds: “When confronting school men, mission leaders, and other pastors with the danger of new evangelicalism, I have often been met with the cavil (i.e. objection), ‘What is new evangelicalism? It can’t be given a clear definition.’ It is strange that fundamentalists can’t define new evangelicalism, because new evangelicals can... a...definition of evangelicalism (was) given by the ‘Father of New Evangelicalism’... Dr. Harold John Ockenga.”<sup>28</sup> **Here is Dr. Ockenga’s published definition, as found in Harold Lindsell’s blockbuster book, “The Battle for the Bible”:**

*“Neo-Evangelicalism was born in 1948 in connection with a convocation address which I gave in the Civic Auditorium in Pasadena (California). 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. The name caught on... We had no intention of launching a movement, but found that the emphasis attracted widespread support and exercised great influence. Neo-evangelicalism differed from modernism in its acceptance of the supernatural and its emphasis on the fundamental doctrines of Scripture. It differed from neo-orthodoxy in its emphasis upon the written Word as inerrant, over against the Word of God which was above and different from the Scripture, but was manifested in Scripture. 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. Neo-evangelicals emphasized the restatement of Christian theology in accordance with the need of the times, the reengagement in the theological debate, the recapture of denominational leadership, and the reexamination of theological problems such as the antiquity of man, the universality of the Flood, God’s method of creation, and others.”<sup>29</sup>*

---

<sup>25</sup> Ernest D. Pickering, *“The Tragedy of Compromise: The Origin and Impact of the New Evangelicalism”*. Bob Jones University Press: Greenville, SC, 1994, p. 96.

<sup>26</sup> \*Augsburger, op. cit., p. 14.

<sup>27</sup> \*Terms, op. cit., p. 84.

<sup>28</sup> John E. Ashbrook, *“Thirty Years of New Evangelicalism.”* Ohio Bible Fellowship Visitor, December, 1976, p.1

<sup>29</sup> Harold J. Ockenga, from his foreword to Harold Lindsell’s, *“The Battle for the Bible.”* Zondervan Publishing House: Grand Rapids, MI, 1976, pp. 11-12.

4. **Peter Masters of Spurgeon’s Tabernacle presents the British viewpoint on Evangelicalism**<sup>30</sup>: “(In Great Britain) *every believer should know that there are now two kinds of evangelical, an **old** and a **new** kind. The old is the authentic, biblical position (in America known as Fundamentalism). The new is far off the track, not in its basic view of salvation, but in its readiness to compromise with doctrinal error and worldly ways. The new is selling the faith for earthly respect and recognition... Today old style evangelicals (i.e. fundamentalists) are in the minority. It was not always so. Once there were no new-style evangelicals at all. But now, the new view is dominant... Old style evangelicals are often called fundamentalists, particularly in the USA... Why are the new-style evangelicals calling us fundamentalists (in the UK)? They are doing so for reasons of tactical self-advantage. They seem to have decided that the term ‘new evangelical’ coined by their American forerunners is too honest and open for comfort. When, at that time, Harold J. Ockenga, the distinguished Boston pastor, joined with Carl F. Henry and Billy Graham to steer American evangelicals into a more liberal position, they were keen to be known as new evangelicals. They founded the magazine **Christianity Today** as the flagship journal for their new direction. To a considerable degree, things were above-board. It was obvious that new attitudes were being advocated, and that the new-style evangelicals wanted to break with the evangelicalism of the past. From the beginning of this movement there were many differences. The new evangelicals were inclusivistic rather than separatistic. They mixed with non-evangelicals. They urged Bible-believers to stay in compromised denominations and not to renounce positions of influence in such circles. Liberal scholarship was studied and in many respects embraced, and non-evangelicals fraternally recognized as true Christians. Many other new directions soon emerged. The old, sharp line between worldly activities and spiritual activities was swept away, and believers were encouraged to be much more involved in worldly culture, leisure and entertainment.*

“In the early days, the advocates of new evangelicalism were not ashamed to produce books with titles such as *The New Evangelical Theology*. They represented a new way, and wanted to make this clear. Soon, however, then new evangelicals discovered the disadvantages of their chosen label. It made them sound unorthodox and novel. It was too easy for the OLD evangelicals to demonstrate the differences between the OLD and the NEW, the orthodox and the unorthodox. **So the new evangelicals began to put less stress upon the new, and to speak of themselves simply as evangelicals, and the old-style believers as fundamentalists.** This made them sound more orthodox. All that remain was to give the term fundamentalist an objectionable, negative image, and new evangelicals would then appear to be mainstream. **That is precisely what is now happening in Britain ... Like their American mentors they define the latter term in the most objectionable way... However... let us at least explain the term correctly, and not allow our critics to invent their own definition.**<sup>31</sup>

5. “New Evangelicals...say in effect, ‘...Let us seek some basis of understanding and co-operation with these other groups.’ They are the collaborationists (i.e. those who cooperate with an enemy) *aiding the Enemy of Truth. Some of these will claim to be sound in the Faith while ridiculing those who contend for the Faith. The ‘New Evangelicals’ are especially zealous in attacking the ‘Fundamentalists,’ whom they like to call ‘Rank*

---

<sup>30</sup> **Important Reminder:** Writing from London, Dr. Peter Masters, pastor of Spurgeon’s Metropolitan Tabernacle since 1970, uses the terms evangelical and fundamentalist in a distinctly British way-which those outside that background may not fully understand. As noted earlier, in the past in Great Britain the term fundamentalist was rarely used at all. Instead the term *evangelical* was generally employed to describe conservative Bible believers. **However in the past few decades in Great Britain a new type of “evangelical” has appeared who in his theology & practice is the British equivalent of American “new-evangelicals.”** These “New-style” evangelicals in Britain (e.g. John Stott, J.I. Packer, etc) have basically hijacked the name evangelical and infused it with a new meaning roughly equal to the term “new evangelical” in America. In addition these British “new evangelicals” have recently begun branding “Old-style” evangelicals such as Dr. Masters as “*fundamentalists*”—a term previously quite foreign to most people in the UK—and typically considered by them a term of scorn and derision. Dr. Masters is writing out of that background and perspective, and the reader must realize that, in order to properly and fully understand his use of the term evangelical in this and other quotes by him included in this paper. Iain Murray has written a very helpful and extremely well-documented book that historically traces the radical shifts in British evangelicalism, as well as the errors and techniques of manipulation used such men as Billy Graham, Stott, and others to accomplish their agenda of marginalizing and denigrating fundamentalists and assuming the key positions of power in New Evangelicalism. That book is: “***Evangelicalism Divided: A Record of Crucial Change in the years 1950-2000*** (Iain H. Murray. Banner of Truth Trust: Edinburgh, Scotland, 2000). I highly recommend that book to the reader!

<sup>31</sup> Masters, op. cit., pp. 3-6

*Fundamentalists, 'Extreme Fundamentalists,' or 'Ultra-Fundamentalists' thereby implying that a man can be too Fundamental-too strong in the defense of the Faith-that one can put too much credence in the Inspiration and Inerrancy of the Bible... (New Evangelicals) have a great deal to say about the 'social implications of the Gospel'-a term much favored by the 'Modernists' a generation ago... In order to justify their compromise with unbelief and their unscriptural position, the 'New Evangelicals'...misrepresent facts by such absurd charges as 'Paul was sponsored at Mars Hill by the Stoics and Epicureans' or 'Christ preached under the sponsorship of unconverted Pharisees and Sadducees.'...**They talk much about 'love' but seem to have much more of it for those who deny the Fundamentals of the Faith than for those who defend them.** They praise 'Modernists' and extend Christian recognition to men who deny the Inspiration of the Bible and the Christ of the Book. They speak in flattering approbation of the scholarship of Neo-Orthodox theologians."<sup>32</sup>*

**B. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF NEW-EVANGELICALISM.** The *New-Evangelical* (or *Neo-Evangelical*) movement was the last of the four theological movements or positions to appear, **coming into being, as noted above, in 1948 when Harold Ockenga used the term in his famous inaugural address at the recently established Fuller Theological Seminary.** Right up through 1942 when the National Association of Evangelicals was founded, nearly all who claimed the name fundamentalist or evangelical were separatists, abandoning denominations, mission boards and schools that could not be turned back from Liberalism or Neo-orthodoxy. However with Ockenga's bombshell plea for a new type of evangelicalism, this fourth group or movement came into existence. It was to be called, in Ockenga's own words, "*New-Evangelicalism.*" This theological movement would differ markedly from Fundamentalism.

**C. KEY DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE ORIGINAL NEW EVANGELICALISM AND FUNDAMENTALISM:**

1. Well-respected church historian and author Dr. David Beale comments: "According to Ockenga's definition, new evangelicalism (originally differed) from fundamentalism in three major areas:
  - a. **"A REPUDIATION OF THE DOCTRINE OF SEPARATION,"**<sup>33</sup> (cf. II Cor. 6:14-7:1; II Jn. 7-11; Gal. 1:8-9; Mt. 7:15-23; Acts 20:28-31; Eph. 5:11; I Thess. 5:21; etc).
  - b. **"A SUMMONS TO GREATER SOCIAL INVOLVEMENT;"** (cf. Mt. 28:18-20; Mk. 16:15; Lk. 24:47; Jn. 15:27; 21:16; Acts 1:7-8; etc), **and**
  - c. **"A DETERMINATION TO ENGAGE IN THEOLOGICAL DIALOGUE WITH LIBERALISM"**<sup>34</sup> (i.e. Modernism/Liberalism and Neo-orthodoxy). (cf. Jesus' example: Mt. 12:34; 15:7-9; 17:17; 23:13-33; Jn. 18:19-23; John the Baptist's example: Mt. 3:7-10; Paul's example: Gal. 1:8-9; II Tim. 2:17; 4:14-15; etc. It's worth noting that Jesus and the apostles were not sparing on disobedient believers either: Mt. 12:47-50; 16:23; 19:14; 26:40; I Cor. 4:18-21; Gal. 2:11-15; I Tim. 1:18-20; II Tim. 1:15; III Jn. 9-10; etc). Beale states: "*Ockenga expressed three areas of dissatisfaction with Fundamentalism. The first area was Fundamentalism's (sic) 'wrong attitude' toward those who do not hold to every orthodox doctrine. The second was Fundamentalism's 'wrong strategy' of separating from religious liberalism. As a 'correct strategy,' Ockenga proposed 'infiltration,' that is, laying aside doctrinal differences and looking for areas of agreement and cooperation. New evangelicalism's third area of dissatisfaction, according to Ockenga, was Fundamentalism's 'wrong results' in having lost nearly every battle with liberalism. Liberalism had taken over virtually all of the schools*

<sup>32</sup> Jones, Jr., op. cit., pp. 4-5

<sup>33</sup> \*Definition of Separation: "Ecclesiastical Separation (is) the separation of the Church in all of its relationships, associations, and affiliations, from unbelief, so that its identity as the Body of Christ may be maintained and its integrity as a true witness for the Lord Jesus Christ may be kept pure. It is the Biblical principle established by God for the preservation of His people and the propagation of the true Gospel by which men are reconciled to God and added to His true Church." ("Terms You Need to Know", op. cit.)

<sup>34</sup> Beale, op. cit., p. 262

of the mainline denominations, and the new evangelicals aimed to 'recapture denominational leadership.'"<sup>35</sup>

2. **The errors in Ockenga's thinking are immediately obvious to anyone with a basic knowledge of the Bible:**
- a. **First of all, to expect people to hold to every orthodox doctrine is something Christians for twenty centuries have insisted upon before seeking to fellowship with them** (e.g. II Jn. 7-11, etc). Where would we be today, if Athanasius had not stood virtually alone against the theological opinion of his day? A close friend implored him to cave in to the popular view, telling him, "*The whole world is against you Athanasius!*" His immortal reply was: "*Then it is Athanasius against the world!*" His uncompromising stand saved the Christian church from heresy.
  - b. **Secondly, withdrawal and separation from religious liberalism, which denies virtually all the cardinal doctrines of Scripture is commanded in Scripture (II Cor. 6:14-7:1; etc), while "infiltration" is clearly unbiblical.** God never told the Jews of the Old Testament to "infiltrate" the Philistines, the Amorites, the Hittites or any of the other "*ites*," but rather to separate from them! The NT likewise is full of admonitions to stay separate from the world (Jas. 2:15-17; 4:4-5; etc) as well as false teachers (Mt. 7:15-23; Acts 20:28-31; etc).
  - c. **Thirdly, Ockenga's reference to "results" as the final judge of whether a course of action is right or wrong is faulty on at least four counts:**
    - (1) Outward results are never to be the test and touchstone of whether something is right or wrong. God's Word and its standards alone is the test of whether something is right or wrong! (cf. Isa. 8:20; II Cor. 10:12; etc),
    - (2) Results as the determiner of right or wrong is a Jesuit, "The ends justify the means" philosophy, and is condemned in Scripture! (cf. Rom. 3:8)
    - (3) If you wish to appeal to results, one must consider ALL the results, not just a few outward ones (cf. I Sam. 16:7). Ashbrook has wisely observed:

*"First, God has never called us to judge obedience by results. Christianity is not pragmatic (i.e. if it works, it's good). It is authoritarian with God as the authority. God says, 'Come out from among them and be ye separate...' He does not tell us to try cooperating (with compromisers) and evaluate the results. Second, if something is to be measured by results you must evaluate all the results... Think about the other results. One result of compromise is that the line between belief and unbelief in any given community is obscured. Before an ecumenical effort comes to town churches are clearly branded as fundamental and modernistic. After such a campaign, in which most of the churches have cooperated, no such clear line can be marked and God's true work suffers. Another result of compromise is that hungry-hearted souls are led to believe that their modernistic pastor and church are all right... a corollary to this is that the new converts are left on the doorstep of unbelieving churches where they will never be fed. Do you believe in abandoning babies on doorsteps? Then why abandon spiritual babies there? ... If you are going to measure by results, these results must be considered. Think over the following two statements: God's work done in God's way will always produce good results. God's work done in man's way will produce both good and bad results. That is exactly what every compromising effort produces ... (and) results do not mean that something is the will of God.... Dr. Charles Woodbridge...pointed out the disobedience of Moses in Numbers 20. In the attempt to get water for the rebellious Israelites, Moses disobeyed the Lord by angrily smiting the rock twice. For that disobedience Moses was not allowed to set foot in the Promised Land—a stern judgment from God.*

---

<sup>35</sup> Ibid, pp. 261-262.

*But, did Moses have good results? The water gushed out and quenched the thirst of millions of Israelites and their beasts. God, in His grace, quenched the thirst of His people, but that did not make Moses' actions right. Is 'good' ever done by compromising efforts? Yes, perhaps so. But, do not be deceived. That does not make it right in God's sight... Results are not the question.*"<sup>36</sup>

(4) **Fourthly, Ockenga's perspective was short-sighted and thus erroneous.**

As L Eugene Mohr has noted:

*"Dr. Ockenga likes to call attention repetitiously to losses suffered by the early fundamentalists, mainly, 'their bureaucracies, their endowments, their theological seminaries, their publications, their schools—they lost them and they were driven by persecution into an isolation complex in which they said wherever this liberalism exists, you must come out and form some other institution or some other form of worship.' ...Dr. Ockenga never seems to get far enough in his presentation to acknowledge the growth of the fundamentalist movement since the early 1940's. True Biblical separatists have 'come out' from liberalism and apostasy and have established a very significant number of Bible colleges and seminaries, many of which are growing rapidly, founded a multitude of publications expressing the fundamentalist position and providing practical information and help to their readers, not to mention the multiplication of Christian day schools and establishment and growth of local churches."*<sup>37</sup>

3. **Loss of meaning of the term "Evangelical"** (i.e. the "defining down" of evangelicalism). "The name 'evangelical' at one time stood for the strong points of fundamentalism, but today it has become a rubber word, used to refer to all shades of religious groups and their leaders (cf. Pickering's comment at the beginning of this section on new-evangelicalism). This movement (new-evangelicalism) was born in the forties and has remained with us to this day, bridging fundamentalism and neo-orthodoxy. It is weak on verbal inspiration of the Bible, enamored of unbelieving scientific scholarship, benevolent toward social actions projects, committed to the inclusive policy<sup>38</sup> and noted for a sympathy toward neo-orthodoxy. New evangelicalism is characterized by an antagonism toward fundamentalism and pretribulational dispensationalism, and is given to 'dialogue'..."<sup>39</sup>
4. **To reiterate, "...there were three major points in which new evangelicalism originally differed from fundamentalism:**
  - a. **A REPUDIATION OF SEPARATION;**
  - b. **A SUMMONS TO SOCIAL INVOLVEMENT;**
  - c. **A DETERMINATION TO ENGAGE IN THEOLOGICAL DIALOGUE.**"<sup>40</sup>
5. One other original mark of new evangelicalism that began at its inception and will be illustrated later: **AN OVEREMPHASIS ON SECULAR SCHOLARSHIP AND RECOGNITION.**

D. **ADDITIONAL DIFFERENCES THAT HAVE ARISEN BETWEEN TODAY'S "NEWER" BRAND OF NEW-EVANGELICALISM AND FUNDAMENTALISM.** Churches, denominations and religious movements change as time goes by. This is certainly true in regard to evangelicalism/new evangelicalism. The highly respected preacher Dr. Martyn Lloyd-Jones saw this clearly, and made some wise comments in that regard, as he saw dramatic shifts occurring inside British evangelicalism during the 1960's & 1970's (British evangelicals had been a group that had previously been quite biblical). He stated:

<sup>36</sup> John E. Ashbrook, "*Separation from Brethren.*" Ohio Bible Fellowship Visitor, August-September, 1975, pp. 5-6.

<sup>37</sup> Rev. L. Eugene Mohr, "*Christian ACCCent.*" The American Council of Christian Churches, Valley Forge, PA, June, 1976, pp. 2-3.

<sup>38</sup> *Inclusive policy* may be defined as: "A policy adopted by a nominally fundamentalist denomination, church, school or religious agency by which operating personnel are procured from all different shades of religious belief and by which, in contradistinction (against) the policy of ecclesiastical separation, the church's purity is greatly adulterated and the modernist is invited to work with the evangelical, the Roman Catholic with the Protestant, and so on." (From: "*Terms You Need to Know*", CBF, op. cit.)

<sup>39</sup> Augsburger, op. cit., p. 14, emphasis added.

<sup>40</sup> Ibid, p. 15 cf. John E. Ashbrook, "*Thirty Years of New Evangelicalism*", op. cit., pp. 2-7.

“...a situation has developed, and is continuing to develop, in which the whole question of the meaning of ‘evangelical’ (& ‘fundamentalist’!-mwe) has been thrown again into the melting pot. We must be sure and certain that we know exactly what we mean...

“Why is this necessary? Well, my first answer would be that... the church throughout the centuries shows very clearly that **there is nothing static in the life of the church. There is always a process of change and development, and unfortunately, as is true of nature, the process is generally one of degeneration.** This, of course, is one of the main results of sin and of the fall... In the New Testament you already see heresy, false teaching arising, subtle changes taking place with regard to what the Christian truth really is... Nor is this all. There is something further to point out as we look at the history of the church throughout the centuries. It is that **this process of change is never a sudden one. It is always a subtle and slow process.** You remember our Lord’s own comparison about moth and rust. Rusting is a very slow process... Perhaps the clearest demonstration of this that one can give is...the so-called Higher Critical movement....the striking thing about it was the slowness and subtlety with which it came. There were, of course, men who were very extreme, and who made bold statements...they did not do the harm. They never do the harm. The obvious, open, arrogant heretic generally produces a reaction, and he is not the dangerous person. **The really dangerous man is the man who introduces some very slight or very subtle change... Now this is the sort of man who has generally done the greatest harm because, to all appearances, and if you looked simply on the surface, you could not see any change at all...** the great Charles Haddon Spurgeon saw all this, but when he began to denounce what he called the ‘Downgrade’ movement he was attacked ferociously by evangelical people. They said, ‘What is the matter with Mr. Spurgeon? He’s become hypercritical; he’s turning molehills into mountains; he’s exaggerating!’ History has proved that he was not exaggerating. He saw these subtle changes...

“I want to suggest that we are confronted today by this selfsame process and that even in the last ten years a very serious situation has arisen... **My whole contention is that for us to assume that because we have once said that we are evangelical (or fundamental!-mwe), therefore we must still be evangelical now and shall always be, is not only to misread the teaching of New Testament, but to fail completely to grasp and to understand the great lessons which are taught us so clearly by history...** Some people are saying, ‘But you’re exaggerating; these men (i.e. the compromisers among the evangelicals in Great Britain in the 1960’s) are still making great Christian affirmations; what right have you to say that they are changing?’ My answer is that these changes always happen in this subtle way; but let me add to that. This kind of change has another characteristic and this again has been proved from New Testament times right down to this day. **At the beginning the changes generally take place on the periphery (outer boundary) and not at the center...** You do not find men suddenly making different statements about certain central truths; the difference begins with something right on the outside. And because the change generally begins there, some people argue that there has been no change at all. They say, ‘These men are all right on the great central matters.’ **But no, although change may begin somewhere outside, on the circumference, that is the serious aspect of the matter, for this reason, that Christian truth is one.** It is the glory of the Christian truth that it has many parts, but they are all interrelated. What the apostle Paul says about the church in I Corinthians 12, where he compares it to a body, is equally true with regard to the body or the corpus of the Christian faith. Every part belongs to every other part, and the result is that if you make what appears to be a minor change somewhere on the circumference it will soon have its effect even upon the center.”<sup>41</sup>

I (mwe) believe the above comments addressing the deteriorating theological situation among Bible-believers in Great Britain over forty years ago are incredibly appropriate to the situation we find ourselves in today, in regard to new evangelicalism vs. fundamentalism.

During the past five decades, new evangelicalism has definitely not remained static, but has continued to evolve, change, degenerate, and move further away from historic, fundamental, biblical Christianity.<sup>42</sup> In addition to the above-mentioned problems, today’s new evangelicals often abandon

<sup>41</sup> “What Is An Evangelical?” from “*Knowing the Times-Addresses Delivered on Various Occasions*”, 1942-1977, by Dr. D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones. Banner of Truth Trust: Edinburgh, Scotland, pp. 300-305.

<sup>42</sup> A variety of books-written by evangelicals, not fundamentalists (!)-thoroughly documents this degeneration. See, for example: “*No Place For Truth-Whatever Happened to Evangelical Theology*,” by David F. Wells (William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company: Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1993), “*Dining With The Devil*,” by Os Guinness (Baker Book House: Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1993), and “*Jesus the Word According to John the Sectarian*,” by Robert H. Gundry (Eerdmans Publishing Company: Grand Rapids, Michigan, 2002), “*The Great Evangelical Disaster*,” by Francis A. Schaeffer (Crossway Books: Westchester, Illinois, 1984).

belief in the inerrancy of Scripture and have reinvented the rules and methods of Bible interpretation in order to tailor the Bible and its message to fit in with the world and its philosophies and politically correct viewpoints. Another huge shift has occurred in regard to personal and corporate church moral standards (e.g. music, dress, alcohol, gambling, smoking, etc), which have declined greatly. Under the guise of “grace”, almost anything goes in evangelical [& fundamentalist!] circles today. Pronounced sympathy for evolution and other secular viewpoints has also appeared, and a prevailing mentality of concentrating on being “nice” instead of “correct,” has risen to the surface. Consequently at this point I would like to document some of these newer additional differences within new evangelicalism and even fundamentalism:

1. **A Lowered View Regarding Scripture**. Francis Shaeffer, in his final book written just prior to his death, courageously spoke out against the changes in the evangelicalism in which he had served and ministered:

*“Within the evangelical circles things are moving rapidly in the direction of what happened fifty years ago in the denominations... There is **the growing acceptance of higher critical methods in our colleges and seminaries. There is a growing acceptance of the neo-orthodox existential methodology. There is a growing infiltration of humanistic ideas into both theology and practice. There is a growing acceptance of pluralism and accommodation.** And what has been the response of the evangelical leadership? Overwhelmingly it has been to keep silent, to let the slide go further and further, to paper over the differences. Here again we see the great evangelical disaster-the failure of the evangelical leadership to take a stand really on anything that would stand decisively over against the relativistic moral slide of our culture-the failure to take a stand on anything that would ‘rock the boat’ concerning our personal projects and acceptance.”<sup>43</sup>*

2. **Evolution & “Semi-Universalism” taught at some Evangelical Schools**. Famous New-Evangelical statesman Carl F.H. Henry, the first editor of *Christianity Today*, New Evangelicalism’s flagship magazine, saw the slide and boldly observed:

*“When one focuses not on marginal, but on centrally important control, **the evangelical campuses surveyed, as a group, do reflect disconcerting theological deterioration.** Moreover in my graduate teaching on numerous seminary campuses, I have confirmed to my own satisfaction the accuracy of Hunter’s indications, for example, **that even on some of the best evangelical college 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.**”(!)<sup>44</sup>*

3. **Abandonment of the Doctrine of Inerrancy**: “In 1965, while professor of theology at Bethel Theological Seminary in St. Paul, Minnesota, Clarence Bass gave a workshop at Founder’s Week (Feb. 16, 1965). His subject was ‘*The Relation between Inspiration and Inerrancy.*’ In that lecture Bass declared that the view of inerrancy held by the modern fundamentalist is recent in origin and was not held by orthodox scholars of earlier ages (sic). James Hollowood, then Executive Secretary of the Minnesota Baptist Convention, asked Bass for clarification of his views. In a letter to Hollowood on September 16, 1966, Bass said, ‘*That is to say I clearly distinguish between inspiration as a Biblical doctrine and inerrancy as a logical correlative.*’ **In other words, the Bible can be inspired, but not inerrant.** (!)... Back when Fuller Seminary changed its doctrinal statement, it became fashionable among many New Evangelicals to distinguish between inerrancy (which they did not believe) and infallibility (which they professed to believe). That distinction is still maintained by some. What they mean is that the Bible does contain errors in non-crucial areas such as geography, history, and numerology, but that it is still reliable (infallible) when it comes to the important and critical doctrines which it teaches. One summarizes the situation in this way: ‘...**Thus a doctrine of “limited inerrancy” began to be promulgated during the 1960’s that was finally, in 1972, incorporated into the statement of faith held by Fuller Theological Seminary, (new) evangelicalism’s most prestigious graduate school of theology.**’...What a sad day it is when professedly evangelical theologians will scuttle the view of inspiration which the Bible itself teaches

<sup>43</sup> Francis A. Schaeffer, “*The Great Evangelical Disaster*”. Crossway Books: Westchester, Illinois, 1984, pp. 88-89, emphasis added. For a more detailed story of Fuller’s apostasy on this point, see Lindsell, “*The Battle for the Bible*,” pp. 106-121.

<sup>44</sup> Pickering, op. cit., p. 97.

so they can employ a Bible-study method spawned in the minds of rank unbelievers who hate the Word of God and its message!”<sup>45</sup>

Schaeffer wisely observed in this regard: “***There is no end to this. 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. Once men and women begin to go down the path of the existential methodology under the name of evangelicalism, the Bible is no longer the Word of God without error—each part may be eaten away step by step. When men and women come to this place, what then has the Bible become? It has become what the liberal theologians said it was back in the days of the twenties and thirties. We are back in the days of a scholar like J. Gresham Machen, who pointed out that the foundation upon which Christianity rests was being destroyed. What is that foundation? It is that the Infinite-personal God who exists has not been silent, but has spoken prepositional truth in all that the Bible teaches—including what it teaches concerning history, concerning the cosmos, and in moral absolutes as well as what it teaches concerning religious subjects. Notice though what the primary problem was, and is: infiltration by a form of the world view which surrounds us, rather than the Bible being the unmovable base for judging the ever-shifting fallen culture.***”<sup>46</sup>

4. “**Niceness**” Elevated over Truth and Doctrine. Ernest Pickering commented that one way of recognizing the newer version of New Evangelicalism is what he calls a “...*spirit of niceness. Evangelicalism today is consumed with relationalism, the fine art of getting along with people.* Bruce Larson, a leading New Evangelical author himself, advises us that ‘*the quality and scope of relationships and the ability and willingness to related are marks of orthodoxy rather than doctrine.*’ In other words, the emphasis in theology becomes *relational* and not *conceptual*... The attitude of evangelicals today is, ‘*Let’s not offend anyone. Let’s preach the gospel in such a way as to be well-thought-of by the unsaved world.*”<sup>47</sup> In regard to this tendency, another has observed: “***Evangelicals are a lot like jellyfish. They float with the tides ... Being fashionably uncontroversial, or at least choosing fashionable controversies to talk about (peace, Third World, ‘social justice,’ etc.), seems more important than the judgment of God... The clear, loud call for accommodation comes wrapped in the name of the Gospel of Niceness. Sin as the source of all human problems is banished and a call for repentance is rarely made.***”<sup>48</sup> Carl Henry, one of the founding fathers of New Evangelicalism has... candidly observed: “*In contrast to inclusive modernism, evangelical spokesmen have hesitated to declare all nonbiblical religions false. They have spoken rather in terms of ‘superiority’ of evangelical orthodoxy. In short, in deference to the growing mood of tolerance and for the sake of civility in dialogue, the Christian belief was packaged for greater marketability... The term ‘heresy’ vanished from inter-religious dialogue.*

(Pickering continues)... **What saith the Scriptures?** Our Lord did not seem to concern Himself with the gospel of niceness when He thundered, ‘*Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites*’ (Matt. 23:14 et al.). Paul was not being very nice when he indicted his fellow Jews with the crucifixion of Jesus and declared that ‘*wrath is come upon them to the uttermost*’ (I Thess. 2:14-16). No thought of ‘helpful dialogue’ seemed to be in the apostle’s mind when he emphatically denounced those who preached a false gospel as those who would be ‘*accursed*’ (Gal. 1:9).”... We need to listen to Martin Luther, who wrote, ‘***Doctrine is not ours but God’s... Therefore, we may not yield or change even one tittle of it... Accursed be that love which is preserved to the detriment of the doctrine of faith.... For doctrine is our sole light which... shows us the way to heaven. If it becomes wobbly at one part, it must necessarily become wobbly altogether. When that happens, love cannot help us.***”<sup>49</sup>

Presumably, new evangelicals like Chuck Swindoll would not get along very well with Luther. While Swindoll has written many helpful things, I consider his book “**The Grace Awakening**” one of the most damaging writings to the cause of Christ that has

---

<sup>45</sup> Ibid, pp. 100-101.

<sup>46</sup> Schaeffer, op. cit., p. 60.

<sup>47</sup> Pickering, op. cit., p. 104, emphasis added.

<sup>48</sup> “*Bad News for Modern Man*,” by Franky Schaeffer. Crossway Books: Westchester, Illinois, 1984, p. 45.

<sup>49</sup> Pickering, op. cit., pp. 105, 112.



**appeared in the past several decades.** He illustrates this overemphasis on “niceness” when he writes: “*I’m not a charismatic. However, I don’t feel it is my calling to shoot great volleys of theological artillery at my charismatic brothers and sisters. Who knows how much good they have done and the magnificent ministries many of them have? The church I pastor is not a charismatic church... But that does not mean that we break fellowship with individuals who are more of that persuasion or that we take potshots at them. There was a time in my life when I would have done that. Thankfully, I’ve grown up a little...*”<sup>50</sup>

That sounds “loving,” but as Pickering has observed: “**The question, however, that must be faced, is this: Are the teachings of the charismatics biblical? If the answer is yes, then we should all adopt them. If the answer is no, then we must oppose them.** It is not a question of whether charismatics are nice people, or even Christians. At issue is the nature of the truth. Does the Bible teach that there is a gift of tongues operative in the church today, along with other special gifts claimed by many charismatics? If it does not, then faithful Bible teachers cannot sit quietly while such doctrines are spread abroad, infecting large numbers of people... **It is not a mark of Christian grace and love to remain silent in the face of error.**”<sup>51</sup> I would add that while Swindoll says he doesn’t feel called to shoot “*great volleys of theological artillery at (his) charismatic brothers and sisters*”, he had no hesitancy in shooting at his fundamentalist brethren, writing an entire book in order to take them to task!

**Another example of this new evangelical mentality of “niceness over truthfulness” is seen in how new evangelicals have treated some of their own evangelical brethren who have dared to speak the truth about Islam** (i.e. that it is an evil religion that promotes and advocates violence, terrorism, and hatred of non-Muslims.) Franklin Graham, (Billy’s son), along with Jerry Falwell, Jerry Vines a former president of the Southern Baptist Convention, Pat Robertson, etc., have all dared to challenge Islam. Vines “*called the Prophet Muhammed ‘a demon-possessed pedophile.’* Falwell in a television interview branded Mohammed a terrorist. Such comments **are** historically defensible. However they are not acceptable in today’s climate of “*tolerance.*” Consequently all those men were asked to apologize and retract their statements. Some of them did, some didn’t. But the point I wish to make here, is that the *National Association of Evangelicals* leadership has “...publicly condemned (verbal) assaults on Islam by the Rev. Franklin Graham and other fellow religious conservatives, and (have) pledged to heal rifts with Muslims... *‘We must temper our speech,’* said the Rev. Ted Haggard, president of the National Association of Evangelicals, which represents more than 43,000 congregations and helped organize a meeting on the issue Wednesday. *‘There has to be a way to do good works without raising alarms.’*...Hodan Hassan, a spokeswoman for the Council on American-Islamic Relations, which is among Graham’s harshest critics, said... *‘We can understand theological differences but what’s important is that the dialogue is one of respect, not demonization,’*...Muslims were outraged when Franklin Graham called Islam ‘*a very evil and wicked religion*’ following the Sept. 11, 2001 attacks...At one point in the (NAE) gathering, Michael Cromartie...asked if anyone wanted to defend the comments made by Graham, Robertson and Falwell. No one did...”<sup>52</sup>

**How tragic! What Graham and the others said was correct.** Read the Qur’an. Read the Hadith (sacred traditions)! Look at Mohammed’s own life history, the battles he fought, the lies he spoke, the treaties he broke, the men and women he had assassinated-sometimes for simply writing poems that criticized him! And yes, Mohammed was sexually obsessed (he had 13-14 wives). And he certainly could qualify as a pedophile, since some of those girls were promised to him when they were as young as 6-8 years old! But sadly in today’s new evangelicalism it’s more important to be polite & nice, than to be truthful & right!

**Compare this with the speech and conduct of Jesus, who repeatedly, publicly rebuked false teachers and religious leaders (Mt. 12:34; 15:7-9; 17:17; 23:13-33; Jn. 18:19-23) and even his own followers when they walked disobediently or spoke incorrectly (Mt. 12:47-50; 16:23; 19:14; 26:40).** John the Baptist (Mt. 3:7-10), Paul (Gal. 2:11-15; I Tim. 1:18-20; II Tim. 1:15; 2:17; 4:14-15; I Cor. 4:18-21) and John (III Jn. 9-10) all likewise

<sup>50</sup> “*The Grace Awakening*,” by Chuck Swindoll. Word Publishing: Dallas, Texas, 1990, p. 188.

<sup>51</sup> Pickering, op. cit., p. 122, emphasis added.

<sup>52</sup> Fox News Online, “*Evangelical Leaders Condemn Anti-Islam Statements by Conservative Christians*,” Washington, D.C. byline, 08 May, 2003, p. 1.

demonstrated a characteristic, public bluntness! The giants of Church history nobly followed in their train. One thinks of the outspoken fearlessness of Reformers like Luther, Calvin, Knox, Whitefield, Tyndale, Hus and countless others, and in more recent days Spurgeon, Machen, Sunday, Ketcham, Riley, Lloyd-Jones, etc. How tragic that new evangelicals are ashamed of such behaviour, when both Scripture and church history bear testimony to the fruitful blessings that attended the ministries of such men who refused to be intimidated.

5. **Changes in Bible Interpretation Methods to Fit in With the World's Views.**

Feminists, homosexuals, and others have worked to radically change principles of Bible interpretation, in order to make the Bible and its message “fit in” with the world and its philosophies. “Those who call themselves “evangelical feminists” declare that historic, orthodox theology was ‘*thought up*’ by males and reflects their biases. Eloise Fraser, a theology professor at Eastern Baptist Seminary at the time of writing, complains... ‘*that most theology has been written out of the male’s experience of God, the world, and others.*’...Whence has come this new and wondrous system known as evangelical feminism? How is it that none of the great and respected exegetes of the church through all these centuries have uncovered these new (so-called) ‘truths’? Why is evangelical feminism a late-twentieth-century phenomenon?... **it is because feminism has become popular in the world and some evangelicals now wish to make the church ‘modern,’ ‘up-to-date,’ and ‘relevant.’**... We are aware that effort has been made in recent years by proponents of evangelical feminism to justify their views from Scripture, but such efforts were never made until some found it necessary to bring the world’s concept of the role of women into the church. Then some scriptural defense must be found for it so as to make it palatable to Christians.”<sup>53</sup>

Francis Schaeffer observed: “*Some evangelical leaders, in fact, have changed their views about inerrancy as a direct consequence of trying to come to terms with feminism.*”<sup>54</sup>

Pickering comments: “While evangelicals, theoretically at least, are committed to the final authority of the Word of God, in practice, through culturally influenced interpretation, they undermine its authority. This observation by Pinnock (a classic example of an apostate-*mwe*), while lengthy, is essential in understanding what is happening in current evangelical circles:

“*Every generation reads the Bible in dialogue with its own vision and cultural presuppositions and has to come to terms with the world view of its day...Today...we are reading the Bible afresh, but in the twentieth-century context and finding new insights we had not noticed before. Just as Augustine came to terms with ancient Greek thinking, so 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. (!) The time is past when we can be naïve realists in hermeneutics; who we are influences what we see, and the rich diversity of biblical doctrine means that changes in orientation are always going to be possible (!), enabling us to communicate in fresh tones to our contemporary hearers.*”

“Study this statement carefully. Pinnock says first of all that our study of the Bible must not be merely an exercise in exegesis, finding out what the Scripture says, but must also be accompanied by input from the culture of the world. **This is a totally different approach from that which has been taken historically by fundamentalist interpreters of Scripture. The world is now helping us interpret the Scriptures. This can lead only to spiritual disaster, as it has.** We cannot be ‘*realists in hermeneutics,*’ says Pinnock. We cannot simply draw the meaning from Scripture that is there. We must interpret it through the lenses of modernity. In so doing we shall be ‘*seeing things in the Bible we never saw before.*’ (!) Some evangelicals, embarrassed by the fact that the traditional interpretations of Scripture are out of step with the opinions of our contemporaries, have devised a way of adjusting Scripture to those modern opinions while still maintaining that they are ‘evangelical.’ It is a clever hermeneutical manipulation, but one which destroys the

---

<sup>53</sup> Ibid, pp. 109-110.

<sup>54</sup> Francis Schaeffer, op. cit., p. 137.

inerrancy and authority of Scripture in a manner even more devious than attacks of the 'modernists' of old."<sup>55</sup>

6. **A Drop in Moral Standards and Convictions.** It is obvious to anyone who has observed the past 35 years, that standards and convictions among Bible-believers and in Bible-believing churches have dropped dramatically in such areas as music, dress, gambling, drinking of alcohol, and general behaviour. "In his interesting work 'Will Evangelicalism Survive Its Own Popularity?' Johnston says that *'in no area is evangelical faddism more apparent than in our musical preferences and expressions... Musical tastes can be dictated by fads rather than by the deep yearning for true spirituality... and this means that the latest toe-tapping ditty (i.e. tune) is likely to become our compulsion.'*<sup>56</sup> More will be said about this later in this paper.
7. **"Contextualization"- i.e. "Adapting" the Bible to various cultures.** In new evangelicalism today, there is a huge push to adapt the Bible to fit into whatever culture one finds himself. One writer has commented thusly: "*The notion is prevalent today that, in order to be successful in reaching today's pagans, we must study their culture and seek to adapt the Christian message to it... It seems that God needs help in converting sinners. We must seek to remove as much of the distinction between the church and the world as possible so as to make the gospel of Christ more palatable (i.e. easily swallowed). The trouble is that, once that process is begun, the church begins to look more like the world than the world looks like the church.*"<sup>57</sup>
8. **IMPORTANT CAUTION: Whether or not you are "King James only" has *NOTHING* to do with whether you are a fundamentalist or a new evangelical!** I cannot stress this too emphatically! This is not a mark of anything one way or the other! There are new evangelicals who are "*KJV only*," and others who are not. Likewise, there are fundamentalists who are "*KJV only*," and others who are not. **Your viewpoint on this unrelated issue has ABSOLUTELY NOTHING to do with whether you are New Evangelical or not!** This is known as a "*red herring*" i.e. "something used to divert attention from the basic issue."<sup>58</sup>
9. **THE FIRST SIGNS OF A NEW EVANGELICAL SHIFT.** Not all of the marks and trends of new evangelicalism surface or appear at once! This is an important point to keep in mind. For instance, such things as the abandonment of belief in the inerrancy of Scripture and the introduction of new methods of reinterpreting the Word of God, do not normally appear at the first instance, but tend to appear later.

It has been my observation over several decades that when schools, missions, and individuals begin moving towards becoming new evangelical, they *begin by involving themselves in more ecumenical endeavors* and working with and fellowshiping with individuals with whom they would not have previously cooperated. About that same time *personal standards in moral areas often begin to shift* and decline from previously held positions in areas such as dress, music, behaviour, etc. There often appears a noticeable reticence (shyness) to speak out against disobedient new evangelical leaders and practices &/or liberal denominations and religious groups. Instead the previously mentioned *concern over being nice rather than right begins to surface.* This may be aided by the individual's *involvement with more secular or social-oriented organizations*, as well as a rising concern over social issues. While interest and involvement in such "civic" or "social" activities is not wrong, in and of themselves, they often cause the believer to become comfortable working with non-Christians &/or new evangelicals.

There may also be an expanding *emphasis on winning recognition in the eyes of others*, especially the secular world, through an overemphasis on advanced degrees and scholarly attainments. Only much later do more obvious aberrations such as *abandonment of inerrancy and blatant reinterpretations of Scripture* in order to fit in with the world and its

---

<sup>55</sup> Pickering, op. cit., p. 117.

<sup>56</sup> Jon Johnston, "Will Evangelicalism Survive Its Own Popularity?", p. 35, quoted by Pickering, op. cit., p. 115.

<sup>57</sup> Ibid, p. 115.

<sup>58</sup> Webster's New World Dictionary, Warner Books: New York, NY, 1990, p. 494.

philosophies begin to appear. Abandonment of firm belief in such basic doctrines as the creation of the universe by God, the everlasting nature of hell, and the exclusive nature of salvation through Christ alone by faith alone, often accompany such hermeneutical shifts. The end result is often a complete change in doctrine (e.g. John Stott, Chuck Colson and other evangelicals publicly declaring that all Roman Catholics are fellow Christians!).

E. **SOME SPECIFIC EXAMPLES OF THE MARKS OF NEW-EVANGELICALISM.** Before ending this section on new evangelicalism (evangelicalism), I would like to review the above-mentioned marks of new evangelicalism and give some names and concrete examples/illustrations of each of those characteristics. That way you may more easily recognize new evangelicalism when you encounter it. I have tried to be as brief as possible, while still giving sufficient information to establish the credibility of the points and be clearly understood. Any comments I make in regard to individuals, schools, etc., can be further supported with additional documentation, should you desire it. I have simply tried to be brief in order to conserve space.

1. **REJECTION OF SEPARATION** (i.e. The practice of *infiltration* and *inclusivism*, as opposed to the biblical teaching of separation from error):
  - a. **Billy Graham.** Though now retired, he is certainly the world's greatest example of new evangelicalism- full stop! In my opinion as well as that of many others, he has done more to cause the destruction of conservative, separated, biblical Christianity than any other single person during this past century. For decades he has deliberately involved Roman Catholics, liberals, and other heretics in his crusades and has given them praise and prominence.<sup>59</sup> For decades the Billy Graham Evangelistic Association's policy has been to send alleged "converts" back to the churches that they came from-which in many cases are "dead ones" where the gospel is neither heard nor taught. There is also significant documentation regarding, and serious questions about how many genuine conversions actually occur in his mass crusades, the huge numbers publicly cited notwithstanding.<sup>60</sup> Graham consistently dialogues with liberals, has visited with and commended popes, etc., etc.
  - b. **Chuck Colson.** He is the head of *Prison Fellowship*. Mr. Colson has written a lot of good books and articles, but he refuses to observe ecclesiastical separation from unbiblical and apostate groups such as the Roman Catholic Church. He, like Graham, works hand in hand with Roman Catholics, liberal Protestants, charismatics, etc. Mr. Colson was a major contributor to a document called "***Evangelicals & Catholics Together.***" Others who either worked on it or endorsed it, included J.I. Packer, Bill Bright (the late President of Campus Crusade for Christ), Richard Land & Larry Lewis of the Southern Baptist Convention, Dr. Jesse Miranda of the Assemblies of God, Dr. John White of Geneva College, Dr. Richard Mouw of Fuller Theological Seminary, Dr. Mark Noll of Wheaton College, as well as at least 13 Roman Catholic priests, archbishops or Cardinals. **The stated goal, as the title indicates, was to get Roman Catholics and evangelicals to recognize each other as fellow Christians (sic) and encourage them to fellowship and work together!** Note the following statements from the ECT document: "*Evangelicals and Catholics are brothers and sisters in Christ... We together, Evangelicals and Catholics, confess our sins against the unity that Christ intends for all his disciples... As Evangelicals and Catholics, we pray that our unity in the love of Christ will become ever more evident... We do know that God who has brought us into communion with himself through Christ intends that we also be in communion with one another (sic).*"<sup>61</sup>

---

<sup>59</sup> Two recent books that document some of Graham's multitudinous compromises and unbiblical stands are "*Evangelicalism Divided*" by Iain Murray. Banner of Truth: Edinburgh, Scotland, 2000, & "*The Tragedy of Compromise*" by Ernest Pickering. Bob Jones University Press: Greenville, South Carolina, 1994. There are many other sources of information, but those give some concise evidence, especially in a couple of chapters within those books. Note: In the future I hope to complete a brief paper documenting more extensively some of Billy Graham's major unbiblical compromises and alliances, so that those with questions will have some certifiable information for their files.

<sup>60</sup> See, for example, Murray, "*Evangelicalism Divided*".

<sup>61</sup> "*Evangelicals & Catholics Together-The Christian Mission in the Third Millennium.*" reprinted in "*First Things*", May 1994, pp. 15-17. Copy mailed directly to me by Sharon Moss, Mr. Colson's senior correspondent, along with a personal letter in response to a letter I had written to Mr. Colson. Other statements by Colson in that June 1994 letter are also instructive: "*I believe that many*

- c. **Dr. James Dobson**, Christian psychologist and former President of “*Focus on the Family*.” Like many others mentioned here, he and his organization also say many good things, but will work with almost anyone.<sup>62</sup> Dobson and Colson have met with Pope John Paul II and have highly praised him.<sup>63</sup> His counseling is also an unfortunate mixture, some of it being helpful and biblical, but much of it being based more on secular psychological systems, than the Word of God.<sup>64</sup>
- d. **“Promise Keepers.”** This huge men’s movement in America sought to mobilize “Christian” men to band together in huge rallies. However anyone from Mormons to Catholics to Charismatics was involved in it. The music was often poor, the speakers a mixed bag of solid and suspect men, and a totally unbiblical ecumenism the order of the day. For instance, at one “PK” pastor’s conference, 39,000 pastors from every kind of denomination were encouraged to stand up, mix around and find pastors from completely different denominations than their own, and apologize to them for having not accepted them in the past. Well known Christian singer **Steve Green** sang “*Let the Walls Come Down*” while the pastors did just that. An eyewitness account records:
- “...And did we exaggerate when we wrote about the massive emotional outbreak during Steve Green’s song ‘*Let the Walls Come Down*’, sung after the conclusion of **Max Lucado**’s message on Unity. Here’s how the same P.K. magazine analyzed it: ‘*In lock-step, 40,000 cheering pastors jumped from their seats cheering louder and louder as Steve Green sang his new song “Let the Walls come Down.” Five minutes later, with every pastor still standing, Green returned for a dramatic reprise.*’ The report called it an ‘*explosive ovation.*’...Recounting this session, the P.K. article states: ‘*The session ended as Lucado instructed pastors to search out brothers from other denominations whom they had possibly prejudged or offended. Subsequently, pastors throughout the stadium drew together, huddling one-to-one and in small groups, sharing prayers of confession and repentance.*’”<sup>65</sup>
- e. **The National Association of Evangelicals.** This is the official organization of new evangelicalism. “Anybody & everybody” is a member, and the unbiblical groups and aberrant teachings of some of its representative organizations are far too numerous to list here.
- f. **John R.W. Stott.** The late Dr. Stott, like so many other new evangelicals mentioned here, wrote some helpful books and said some good things during his lifetime. Unfortunately he was also perhaps the most famous ecumenical Anglican in Great Britain. He was the one who publicly opposed Dr. Martyn Lloyd-Jones’

---

*members of the Catholic church are part of Christ’s body... While I might not take communion in a Catholic church, I certainly would have fellowship with Catholic believers in many other ways... I love the Lord with all my heart and soul; so does my wife, who happens to be Catholic. So do many of my friends, some of whom are Catholics with a commitment to Christ not surpassed by any Protestants I’ve known... You should know that Prison Fellowship staff and volunteers include both Protestants and Catholics...”* (p. 2 of a personal letter on file, 08 June, 1994).

<sup>62</sup> An example of Focus on the Family’s unwillingness to take a stand against theological error occurred when in one of their magazines (“*Citizen*”) they published a host of letters by Greek Orthodox and Roman Catholic Church members who were upset that a previous *Citizen* article had implied that members of those groups were not “*Bible-believing Christians.*” Instead of taking advantage of what was a golden opportunity to point out the major biblical errors that such groups have in such crucial theological areas as soteriology, etc., the *Citizen* editor apologized and stated that the members of both groups *are* Christians: “*We owe Orthodox and Catholic readers an apology. Although we did not intend to imply that they are not Christians, upon reflection we can see why many readers took it that way.*”(1) In reality, while there are true believers in those denominations, one *cannot* hold to the doctrines they teach (e.g. a salvation by works through seven sacraments, in the case of the RCC) and be truly saved. Fundamentalists will unapologetically point that out. New evangelicals will not and typically have no problem working with such unbiblical, ecumenical denominations & groups.

<sup>63</sup> WORLD magazine reported in 2001: “*James Dobson and Charles Colson took part in a three-day Vatican conference in December on the breakdown of the family and deterioration of respect for human life. They met with Pope John Paul II, and Mr. Dobson said he ‘thanked him for his defense of the family.’*” (WORLD, Dec. 30, 2000/Jan. 6, 2001, p. 34).

<sup>64</sup> See “*Prophets of Psychoheresy II*”, by Martin & Deidre Bobgan. Eastgate Publishers: Santa Barbara, CA, 1990.

<sup>65</sup> “*Men of Action*”, Spring 1996, p. 5 (a Promise Keeper magazine, cited in a documented secondary source. cf. “*Promise Keepers and the Rising Tide of Ecumenism*”, by Dr. Gil Rugh. Indian Hills Community Church: Lincoln, Nebraska, 1994, pp. 13-17). It is worth noting that Max Lucado is the pastor of Oak Hills Church of Christ, part of the church denomination called the “Church of Christ.” This denomination believes and teaches that baptism is part of the gospel and that a person is not saved until he/she is baptized!

1966 call for British evangelicals to separate from and come out of the dead denominations. Stott instead worked to convince those on the fence to stay *in* such bankrupt denominations and compromise with error! He went even further, as Masters relates: “Readers are reminded of the conclusions of the Nottingham Conference of 1977, chaired by J.R.W. Stott, which included the clause, ‘*Seeing ourselves and Roman Catholics as fellow-Christians, we repent of attitudes that have seemed to deny it.*’ In other words, (Stott and other) new evangelicals believe that people may be saved without understanding or responding to the central truths of the gospel.”<sup>66</sup>

- g. **Joseph Stowell III/Moody Bible Institute.** Dr. Stowell was the president of Moody Bible Institute and is currently the president of Cornerstone University in Grand Rapids, Michigan. The National Association of Evangelicals listed him as a “*Member-at-Large*” in 1995. He has been (& still is? -*mwe*) an “*Advisory Editor*” for Christianity Today, which is the unofficial flagship magazine of new evangelicalism. He has spoken at several Promise Keepers rallies (see above), and “...served as ‘Leadership Chair’ for the Luis Palau ‘*Say YES Chicago*’ crusade in June of 1996. Luis Palau is known far and wide as the Billy Graham of South America. His methods and sponsorships are basically identical to those of Billy Graham.”<sup>67</sup> Stowell has also been a featured speaker at Billy Graham’s “COVE” Conference Center on a number of occasions (e.g. 1995 & 2002).

MBI has had a number of very questionable speakers at their Founder’s Week conferences for many years (e.g. Howard Hendricks, Franklin Graham & other BGEA personnel, Bill Hybels-who has been part of Robert Schuller’s conferences in California, etc).<sup>68</sup> In 1996, Moody Bible Institute’s devotional guide “Today in the Word” highlighted a new major in Applied Linguistics which was now available. It stated: “...the program is a partnership between Moody and the Summer Institute of Linguistics of the Wycliffe Bible Translators.” SIL/Wycliffe is an unquestionably new evangelical organization. Worse yet, for several years at least, SIL knowingly and unapologetically trained members of the Mormon cult in linguistics (I do not know if they still are doing so or not? -*mwe*).<sup>69</sup> Over the years Moody has had many questionable speakers, e.g. new evangelicals like Chuck Colson. “Southern Baptists like Charles Stanley and W.A. Criswell have been there... Dr. John R.W. Stott, the worldwide ecumenicist, spoke at the World Council of Churches meeting at Nairobi and at (Moody) Founder’s Week two years later. Shortly after being on the Moody platform, Stott chaired the National Evangelical Anglican Congress in Nottingham, England which pledged to work toward full communion between the Church of England and the Roman Catholic Church.”<sup>70</sup>

## 2. EVANGELICAL OVEREMPHASIS ON SOCIAL INVOLVEMENT.

- a. Peter Masters writes that new evangelicals have often accused fundamentalists of being “...*indifferent to social evils, whereas evangelicals are politically diverse and put the social implications of the Gospel into practice*’ (He then goes on to ask) ... Is it true that new evangelicals are more involved than fundamentalists, and that the latter are unconcerned? It is certainly not true. The difference is a matter of

<sup>66</sup> Masters, op. cit., p. 17. The quote is from “The Nottingham Statement, Second National Evangelical Anglican Congress,” Church Pastoral Aid Society, London (1977), p. 45, emphasis added.

<sup>67</sup> “MBI: The Stowell Legacy,” by Graydon Cox. The Ohio Bible Fellowship Visitor, p. 2, n.d.

<sup>68</sup> Ibid, pp.2-3.

<sup>69</sup> This undeniable fact was pointed out by Dr. Ruth Tucker during a 1991 lecture at The Institute of Mormon Studies Conference, held in Salt Lake City, Utah. Please keep in mind that these Mormons are not trying to learn linguistics in order to translate the Bible. On the contrary, they were enrolling and undergoing the training in order to be able to translate the Book of Mormon into other languages so that they might be better able to continue to promote their heresy. Nevertheless, SIL was unapologetic when contacted, with an SIL executive stating in a letter, “‘*We believe that we should be at service to all in our training program and thus Mr. Strickland would not have been refused to our summer training program on the basis of being a Mormon.*’ In defending this position he made an interesting comparison. ‘*This has sometimes included Catholics and in the case of Mr. Strickland it has obviously included a Mormon.*’” (“Mormons Moving into the Mainstream”, Dr. Ruth Tucker. C.I.M.S. Conference, Salt Lake City, Utah, 13-15 June, 1991, personal copy of transcript, p. 1).

<sup>70</sup> Ashbrook, New Neutralism II, op. cit., p. 95.

priorities. According to fundamentalists the Word of God commission's believers to put soul-winning firmly at the top of the agenda, and that is what we must do. Lower on the agenda, but still close to the heart of the believer, is the showing of compassion and sympathy to a suffering world. New evangelicals often reverse the Lord's order. Many of them are more interested in social endeavour than in the proclamation of the Gospel... Fundamentalists say that the greatest social impact of all will be that made by the Gospel... The greatest social work is *spiritual* work... Back in 1739, when George Whitefield, John Wesley and others began to preach the sermons of that great awakening, British society was utterly depraved and poised on the threshold of revolution. It was *spiritual* blessing which saved the land from its squalor and misery... Furthermore, with so many renewed and tender hearts, ministries of compassion sprang up everywhere *in the wake of the revival.*"<sup>71</sup>

- b. **Bethel Seminary.** This well known new evangelical seminary and others like it, such as Fuller Theological Seminary, not only overemphasize social involvement. In addition, they follow the current craze in the secular world of "*beating up*" on western civilization, and blaming it for the vast majority of the world's ills, in a classic example of "political correctness." **Consider the following 2003 course descriptions from two courses that students in EVERY field of study at Bethel Seminary except one, were required to take before being allowed to graduate:**

*"TL100 - Culture and Ministry... explores in depth the issues of sexism and gender, race relations, and the pervasive and insidious nature of racism ... TL110 - Celebrating Diversity and Embracing Unity. This course is designed to help each person come to grips with his/her own learned and socially prescribed attitudes and beliefs concerning 'others.' An attempt will be made... to engage the issues of ethnocentrism and cultural imperialism, language supremacy, racial bigotry and fear, slavery in its many forms, gender status and inequalities, degradation of the poor and powerless, the status of the refugee, the unequal distribution of goods and resource consumption, and the significance of non-Western ideologies..."*<sup>72</sup>

For those unfamiliar with this terminology, roughly translated it means that the course will blame all of the above societal ills on western civilization, especially the United States of America, and especially white people, blaming them for everything that is wrong with the world including worldwide poverty, ecological problems, slavery & refugee problems, as well as for having the audacity to think that certain economic systems are better than others, that certain cultural traditions and languages are better than others, that women are not to preach or pastor (i.e. gender equality), etc. The most liberal, atheistic secular university catalog couldn't have said it any better!

Interestingly, one well-respected member of the secular academic community visited several evangelical institutions of higher learning, such as **Fuller Seminary & Wheaton College**, to critically examine how and what they are teaching. He wrote thusly about academic evangelicals: "(They) *are as insistent on multicultural diversity as any good leftist...* (when it comes to) *the way wealth and power are distributed around the world, Fuller seems little different from other campuses that have made issues of globalization and poverty central to their concerns.*"<sup>73</sup>

Unfortunately, while it is easy (and very appealing) to blame everything that's wrong with the world on other countries, it is intellectually and biblically indefensible. The Bible clearly teaches individual responsibility, makes it clear that there are a number of reasons for poverty, many which directly relate to countries and societies violating biblical principles of stewardship, work ethics, etc. And while "gender equality" may sound innocent enough, it is simply a politically correct buzz word to keep open the Pandora's Box of homosexual pastors & priests,

<sup>71</sup> Ibid, pp. 19-20.

<sup>72</sup> From Bethel Seminary's website, "*The Center for Transformational Leadership*," p. 2 (Interdisciplinary Courses), April, 2003. Printed copy on file.

<sup>73</sup> "*Whose Mind Needs Opening?*" by Gene Edward Veith, WORLD Magazine, 14 Oct. 2000, p. 15

female pastors and preachers, etc.-all of which is contrary to Scripture, and will further destroy the biblical concept of marriage and the family.

- c. **Billy Graham.** Another example, from dozens that could be cited, is the following statement by Graham: “*Certainly we as Christian citizens have no right to be content with our social order until the principles of Christ are applied to all men. As long as there is enslaved one man who should be free, as long as slums and ghettos exist, as long as any person goes to bed hungry at night, as long as the color of a man’s skin is his prison, there must be divine discontent.*”<sup>74</sup>

On the surface, such words sound very good, and they certainly make one popular with the general public. But they ignore the fact that there are actually various reasons for such things as ghetto squalor and suffering, including a variety of sinful behaviours such as drug pushing & use, prostitution and rampant fornication, which is producing whole generations of children with no fathers-which even U.S. government studies confirm is the number one reason for such social pathologies among succeeding generations. A similar example of oversimplification is hunger and poverty in India. The main cause is not too many people, but rather a false religious system (Hinduism) which prohibits the people from killing or eating cows and keeps them stuck in an oppressive “caste system.” Fact: There are two hundred million “sacred cows” roaming around India that no one will touch, and which consume enough food to feed 1.7 billion people!<sup>75</sup>

3. **THEOLOGICAL DIALOGUE WITH LIBERALS & NON-BELIEVERS.** This is another characteristic of new-evangelicalism/evangelicalism that is biblically indefensible. What kind of meaningful *dialogue* can a Bible-believer have with a person who does not believe the Bible is the inerrant Word of God, does not believe Christ physically rose from the dead, does not believe Jesus is God, and does not believe that when Christ died on the cross He shed his blood to pay for man’s sins? What “*common ground*” can a true Christian find with someone who thinks Christ was just a great teacher, one of many great prophets, or can’t be approached except through his mother? The whole idea is absurd on the face of it. Yet evangelicals constantly “dialogue” with liberals, Catholics, etc., in their pursuit of truth and common ground. A couple of examples should suffice:

- a. **Billy Graham.** Graham has, of course, visited with popes and given them unqualified praise. He has also invited rank unbelievers to sit on his platform, etc. Pickering observes: “...when ministering in Poland, (Graham) preached in Roman Catholic churches and was received warmly by their leaders. One Roman Catholic leader hailed Graham as typical of evangelicals with whom the Catholic Church can have ‘*fruitful dialogue.*’ The executive vice president of Belmont Abbey College, a Roman Catholic school that bestowed an honorary doctorate upon Billy Graham (!), gave his opinion of the evangelist’s ministry... ‘*Billy Graham is preaching a moral and evangelical theology most acceptable to Catholics.*’”<sup>76</sup> While that statement was intended as a compliment to Graham, no greater indictment could be made concerning his preaching & ministry.
- b. **Bethel Seminary.** On their website, one statement reads: “*Different personalities, educational backgrounds, and methods combine to create a varied pattern of theological instruction...The seminary’s history reveals several distinctives that contribute to the Bethel spirit...The current vision...seeks to embody a spirit of tolerance in areas of evangelical disagreement... Theological education at Bethel has never been static... the seminary combines the continuing foundational truths of evangelicalism with the best insights of contemporary thought... there is a healthy interaction of faculty and students with the larger ecumenical world of*

<sup>74</sup> Billy Graham, quoted in Quebedeaux, op. cit., p. 34.

<sup>75</sup> See, for example, “How to Understand Humanism,” Institute in Basic Life Principles. Oak Brook, Illinois, 1983, p.7. Regarding the reasons for poverty and a biblical evaluation of economic systems see, “Free Enterprise, A Judeo-Christian Defense,” by Harold Lindsell (Tyndale House Publishers: Wheaton, Illinois, 1982); “The Generation That Knew Not Josef-A critique of Marxism and the Religious Left,” by Lloyd Billingsley (Multnomah Press: Portland Oregon, 1985); “Productive Christians in an Age of Guilt Manipulators,” by David Chilton (Institute for Christian Economics: Tyler, Texas, 1981); etc.

<sup>76</sup> Pickering, op. cit., pp. 65-66.



theological discussion.<sup>77</sup> All of the underlined statements above are simply euphemisms (tok bokis'), and another way of admitting that they tolerate all kinds of views and "dialogue" with people from more liberal viewpoints.

- c. **Fuller Theological Seminary.** This seminary is of course the flagship seminary of New Evangelicalism, purposely started by them to model and practice the above three characteristics of New Evangelicalism. Examples could be multiplied, but one news brief is sufficient to illustrate where Fuller stands in regard to religious dialogue:

*"Fuller Theological Seminary hosted a 'Global Christian Forum' in June 2002. The forum included participants from Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Anglican, Reformed, Protestant, Pentecostal and Evangelical churches. The forum, approved by the World Council of Churches (WCC), was a religious 'umbrella' under which the above groups, 'along with other world religions' could gather for joint purposes."*<sup>78</sup>

4. **AN OVEREMPHASIS ON SECULAR SCHOLARSHIP & RECOGNITION.** This has been a hallmark of new-evangelicalism from the start, i.e. a desire to be noticed and respected by academics and scholars in the secular, non-Christian realm. To achieve that however, compromise with error has been engaged in, and largely unseen effects have inevitably occurred.

- a. **The Dangers of Such an Emphasis.** Peter Masters makes an important point: *"Fundamentalists have always vigorously engaged in scholarship, but always in believing scholarship. Were there ever more industrious scholars than people like B.B. Warfield and J. Gresham Machen? Was there ever a greater period of studiousness and depth in the entire history of the Christian Church than the ultra-fundamentalist age of the seventeenth-century Confessions and the Puritans? All round the world today there are fundamentalist seminaries and Bible colleges teaching large numbers of people. Are we to say these dislike study? And what are we to make of the fact that practically all the most prestigious theological institutions in the West began as fundamentalist places of learning, even if liberals later managed to infiltrate and steal them?... The issue, as already noted, is – what kind of scholarship? While fundamentalists are traditionally great lovers of biblical scholarship, they are highly suspicious of unbelieving scholarship. In fact they reject it entirely. What can a cynically minded unbeliever understand about spiritual matters? How can an enemy of God's plan of salvation be accomplished in theology? The Bible says that the illumination and anointing of regeneration is essential to spiritual understanding. Augustine named faith as the first qualification of an interpreter of Scripture. What can a liberal know or say? The new evangelical, however, virtually worships at the feet of unbelieving scholarship. He submits himself to liberal study courses, consults liberal commentators, quotes liberal writers, and allows them to shape and condition his views. In fairness, it must be said that he disagrees with the most offensive pronouncements of liberals, and even takes issue with them. But he nevertheless borrows and absorbs a massive amount of their poison, and this is so because the new evangelical wants to be accepted in the academic world dominated by liberals."*<sup>79</sup>

Dr. Martyn Lloyd-Jones wisely remarked: *"My contention is that the evangelical (i.e. a Bible-believer), while he realizes the danger of reason and scholarship, is not afraid of them. He does not run and hide, and just turn in on himself and the enjoyment of his own feelings. No, he is aware of scholarship, he meets it on its own level, but he does not submit himself to it. He does not go down on his knees because some man is a great scholar. He knows that the great scholar, even the great scholar in the Bible, may be an unbeliever, so he does not worship the*

---

<sup>77</sup> Bethel Seminary website, under the following web pages: "Bethel Seminary St. Paul-Faculty," "The History of the Seminary," & "Doctrinal Position" (p.1 of each respective section), emphasis added.

<sup>78</sup> From "Faith and Freedom", John S. MacKenzie editor, Para Hills, Australia, Feb. 2003, p. 11.

<sup>79</sup> Masters, op. cit., pp. 12-13, emphasis added.

*scholar... Paul became 'a fool', laughed at by the philosophers. They regarded his teaching as utter foolishness. This has always happened to the true Christian; it happens today... **Why I am elaborating and emphasizing this is because the movements to which I referred yesterday, the 'new evangelicalism', and so on, are concerned with scholarship, in my opinion, in the wrong sense. This is a part of evangelicalism's inferiority complex.** We want to be considered intellectual and respectable, and in doing that we are in grave danger of submitting ourselves to philosophy, to reason, and to scholarship, and it will lead to the same result with us as it has in the case of those who have gone before us.'*<sup>80</sup>

Pickering observes: "How do supposedly evangelical schools drift from their moorings? Primarily, it is through the influence of faculty members. The faculty member has daily touch with the student and—far more than the administrator—has a lasting impact upon him. If one is to maintain a strong, fundamentalist stance, one must hire faculty members who are of that persuasion. But where have many professors at evangelical schools obtained their training? They have graduated from some of the most liberal institutions in the world. While there are isolated examples of great fundamentalists who have come through such institutions unscathed, their numbers are very small. Although a person may not buy into everything to which he is exposed in an institution of higher learning, he will most certainly be greatly influenced by it. 'With the proliferation of faculty with the best doctorates in every academic discipline teaching at evangelical seminaries and colleges, it is small wonder that these same institutions have been profoundly influenced by the scholarship produced and taught at the most prestigious secular universities.'<sup>81</sup>

Schaeffer concurs: "Sadly we must say that in the area of scholarship the evangelical world has not done well. In every academic discipline the temptation and pressure to accommodate is overwhelming... Many young evangelicals heard this message, went out into the academic world, and earned their undergraduate and graduate degrees from the finest secular schools. But something happened in the process. In the midst of totally humanistic colleges and universities... many of these young evangelicals began to be infiltrated by the anti-Christian world view... In the process, any distinctively evangelical Christian point of view was accommodated to the secularistic thinking in their discipline and the surrounding world spirit of our age. To make the cycle complete, many of these have now returned to teach at evangelical colleges where what they present in their classes has very little that is distinctively Christian."<sup>82</sup>

"Hunter, in evaluating his extensive survey of evangelical institutions, remarked, 'The focus of education also changed. Perhaps the most concrete measure of this was the shift in the role of the professor. Where previously, orthodoxy (in the correct denomination) had been a major test of an academic's eligibility for a college position, the emphasis was now almost exclusively on the academic's competence and his credentials.' One faculty member from an evangelical college said, "Who wants to preserve (religious) dogmatism...? Not me—and not most of my colleagues ... What some may call 'contamination' or 'erosion,' I call a success."<sup>83</sup>

- b. **Related Compromises with Humanistic Theories.** Many "evangelical" colleges and seminaries now teach theistic evolution or are sympathetic to it. Virtually the entire science faculty at **Wheaton College**, formerly a bastion of conservative evangelical thought, holds to or promotes theistic evolution, i.e. the idea that God used evolution as His process of creating what we see in the world today! As Custer has noted: "*The New Evangelicals, however, seem to favor the side of science in any contradiction with Scripture. Bernard Ramm (professor at Fuller Seminary at the time) has stated the New Evangelical position succinctly: 'If the*

<sup>80</sup> *Knowing the Times*, "What is an Evangelical?" op. cit., p. 328, emphasis added.

<sup>81</sup> Pickering, op. cit., p. 120, underlining added.

<sup>82</sup> Francis Schaeffer, op. cit., p. 119, underlining added.

<sup>83</sup> Hunter and others, quoted by Pickering, op. cit., pp. 120-121.

differences between the sciences and the Bible were to grow to a very large number and were of the most serious nature, it would be questionable if we could retain faith in Scripture. (!) This implies that where there is a serious contradiction between what science teaches and what Scripture teaches, the New Evangelicals will ultimately choose the side of (so-called) science.”<sup>84</sup> Similarly, faculty at many evangelical colleges and seminaries have absorbed humanistic, unbiblical thinking in such other academic areas as psychology, sociology, etc.

5. **SERIOUS CHANGES IN VIEWPOINT IN REGARD TO BIBLICAL INSPIRATION & INTERPRETATION.** A few examples:

- a. **The late E.J. Carnell from Fuller Seminary.** “Typical of the way the New Evangelicals question the inerrancy of Scripture is the statement by Edward John Carnell, ‘*Orthodoxy may never officially decide whether the Holy Spirit corrected the documents from which the Chronicler drew his information.*’ This means that the writer of the Book of Chronicles may have quoted genealogies that had errors in them; he just quoted the errors accurately! The strict Conservative-one who believes in verbal inerrancy-would say that the Biblical writers were preserved from selecting erroneous material whatever source the writer used.”<sup>85</sup>
- b. **Daniel Stevick.** “Another ... (individual who) claims to be a New Evangelical, Daniel Stevick, in a ... (1964) work...argued at some length that the Bible itself cannot prove inerrancy... Consequently, the result of this attitude of irreverence is that, according to Stevick, man himself must decide what part of the Bible is inerrant and what part is erroneous. It is obvious that Stevick has already decided against a good many passages in the Bible. In one place he says: ‘*If the barbarous ethics of Judges or the imprecatory “hate songs” in the Psalter or a vindictive vision in Revelation seems remote from, or even opposed to, the emerging Gospel (sic), we need not defend any of them.*’ (!) This tendency to throw out passages in Scripture is actually the same practice to which Neo-Orthodoxy has come.”<sup>86</sup>
- c. **Under the guise of advanced methods of Bible interpretation, new evangelicals reinterpret the Bible to fit their preconceived ideas and views.** Peter Masters, in his excellent rebuttal to a series of published accusations against fundamentalists by John Stott and Paul Tidball (two new evangelicals in Great Britain), observes:

“The Tidball-Stott definition actually says more. It charges fundamentalists with failing to recognize the significance of poetry, metaphor and symbol in the Bible. In other words, they are inept interpreters. The charge is astonishing. Fundamentalists (we speak in general) are, above all, people of the Bible, and their conscientious industry in exegesis cannot seriously be questioned. **Let the world of printed books bear witness to the expository thoroughness of fundamentalists!** ...Lurking behind (this assertion by Tidball & Stott) however, is a deeply serious issue which all believers should be concerned about. Over the years new evangelicals (intimidated by liberalism) have plunged into an increasingly ‘secular’ approach to Bible interpretation in which an obsessively technical analysis of the text has ousted the Bible’s own rules of interpretation (so well articulated at the time of the Reformation) ...Fundamentalists view the Bible as a divine book which must be carefully interpreted using its own rules, whereas new evangelicals increasingly teach procedures which owe their origin to liberal critics, and which obscure the pastoral purpose of the text.<sup>87</sup>

- d. **Are Women Preachers Biblical?** Prior to 1960, the overwhelming majority of Bible believers, both male and female, would have answered that question in the negative. However with the advent of the turbulent sixties, all kinds of previously held views and standards came tumbling down, particularly in Western countries. Today, to say that women can’t pastor (or that even homosexuals can’t pastor), is to

<sup>84</sup> Custer, op. cit., p. 82, underlining added.

<sup>85</sup> Ibid, p. 79.

<sup>86</sup> Ibid, p. 80.

<sup>87</sup> Masters, op. cit., pp. 14-15, emphasis added.

invite the wrath of the media and society in general down upon your head. Unfortunately, evangelicals, instead of staying true to the clear teaching of Scripture on the issue of female pastors and preachers, have caved in to the politically correct climate of today. They have tried extremely hard to reinterpret the Bible to fit the culture, instead of insisting that the culture be made to follow the Word of God. At this point I wish to give three short examples of reinterpreting Scripture to allow for women preachers (Note: A much more significant example, with an extensive rebuttal and refutation of women pastors and preachers, is included as an appendix to this paper, for those who wish more help on this topic).

- e. **Guest Speaker at a BUPNG (Baptist Union) church in Pt. Moresby, Papua New Guinea, 08 Dec. 1991.** I personally heard an expatriate missionary speaker at a Sunday evening service at a Baptist Union church in Papua New Guinea on the date mentioned. His sermon title and theme was: “The Role of Women in the Church.” His seven points were “Men & Women in... creation, in the fall, in the OT, in the NT, in Jesus’ teaching, in Paul’s teaching & on fire for God”.

He made it clear during his presentation of the first point that he felt that in Gen. 2:21-24 the creative order was *not* important, i.e. the fact that man was created first, he felt was unimportant and of no significance. He commented in regard to his third point (i.e. “Men & Women in the OT”) that “...*some laws in the OT were to enhance the subjugation of women*” (!) and added “...*I feel women were second class citizens in the Old Testament.*” During his point five (“Men and women in Jesus’ teaching”) while discussing Mt. 22:34-40 he stated that “...*laws that don’t agree with these principles, need to be revamped.*” (sic) Finally, during his final sermon point (i.e. “Men and women on fire for God”) he made the following statements:

*“Remember, the books we have in Scripture may not contain the main teaching of Paul (!)... He (Paul) was dealing with problems... We can’t say Scripture is the end... it is the means to the end.”* He then concluded by saying: “Who are we to dictate from 1-2 passages that certain gifts should be withheld from women?... *Experience shows that God gives to whom He wills ...we can’t live in a halfway house ... It is my belief that by the way we use these few verses (I Cor. 14 & I Tim. 2) we degrade women, and furthermore, we limit God and the way He wants to work. I can’t find the Scriptures that teach me to limit my wife and what ministries she can be involved in.*”<sup>88</sup> The above statements are a classic example of ignoring, reinterpreting, and overriding the clear teaching of Scripture and are an example of what I refer to, when I say that new evangelicals violate basic principles of biblical hermeneutics-under the guise of using modern skills and cultural sensitivity in interpreting Scripture.

- f. **Bethel Seminary.** Like Fuller, and others of its ilk, Bethel has no problem with training hundreds of women for ministry. They try to avoid a forthright statement about the issue by hiding behind the fact that they are not a church: “*Because the seminary is not a church, it does not ordain or make the decision of who shall be ordained... such decisions and actions are functions of the local church.*” However, they are clearly sympathetic to female pastoral leadership, since they eagerly train them, and boldly declare:

*“The seminary... recognizes that there are both men and women who sense a divine calling to professional ministry... Students come to us from a variety of churches, some that ordain women and some that do not. All academic programs at Bethel Seminary will continue, as in the past, to be open to all who meet the academic, moral, and spiritual requirements for admission. No person should be required to justify his or her presence in the seminary in terms of race, gender, or age... differences of opinion exist regarding the relative roles of men and women, discussions of such topics should be conducted openly and sensitively, with*

<sup>88</sup> From personal notes taken by the author who was there in person, 08 December, 1991, Pt. Moresby, Papua New Guinea, underlining added.

Christian respect for the person and convictions of others...”<sup>89</sup> The last sentence can be interpreted thusly: “You hadn’t better express dogmatic statements that women pastors are wrong, or you’re guilty of an unchristian lack of respect!”

- g. **J.I. Packer.** Packer gives a classic example of how a new evangelical reinterprets the Bible, disregarding the Bible’s clear statements—all the while making it sound not only acceptable, but downright intelligent:

*“Though all Paul’s commands being apostolic, carried the authority of the Lord whose ambassador Paul was, that does not rule out the possibility that some of them were ad hoc enactments (i.e. just for a specific purpose), responses to particular situations which would become dead letters if the situation changed.(!) It is arguable that the command that women should not teach but keep silent is a case in point: a (prudent) rule of thumb applying the creation pattern to a situation where converted pagan ladies, uneducated and brought up to think of themselves as inferior beings, had now discovered their dignity under God in Christ, and it was now going to their heads. In that case it is the principle and not the rule of thumb that has abiding authority(sic), and it is conceivable that under a different cultural background where Christian women were not under the same temptations to wildness, a relaxed rule could serve the principle equally well (sic).” THAT, my friend, is a masterful example of how to twist the clear, simple meaning of Scripture, in order to fit into the popular viewpoint of today’s unregenerate culture!<sup>90</sup>*

6. **A LOWERING OR ABANDONMENT OF MORAL STANDARDS** (e.g. in the church, mission, school, organization, etc).

- a. **Richard Quebedeaux** is an outspoken advocate for radical change in a downward direction by the newer new evangelicals. Regarding moral standards, consider the following statements from one of his best-selling books several decades ago titled, *“The Young Evangelicals”*:

*“...outmoded, culturally determined taboos and expectations (e.g. having to do with hair length, style of dress, acceptable music, art and recreation) lacking biblical justification conflict with and retard desirable development, progress, and freedom in the present...Jesus himself was happy to provide wine-and very good wine in quantity-for the marriage feast at Cana (sic)... Incidentally, gambling itself is considered a vice chiefly within the Anglo-Saxon tradition. Roman Catholics and Lutherans, for instance have never thought it to be wrong ...rock music in general is felt to be evil...But really, is it not merely a matter for the listener to sort the good from the bad and dwell on the former (sort of like digging through a rubbish bin to find a good scrap of food-mwe)... Just as we cannot insulate ourselves from every speck of dirt in literature and art, so we must accept some bad with the good in music ...The Young Evangelicals insist that many forms of cultural participation may indeed be legitimate for Christians-e.g., moderate drinking, card playing, social dancing, listening to rock music, and attendance at the theater-despite the fact that these have been traditionally banned by the majority of Evangelicals and Fundamentalists. In fact, they (newer evangelicals) feel that such activities can be understood as God’s good gifts for the use (not misuse) of his children.”<sup>91</sup>(!)*

Regarding marriage and the man-woman relationship “Nancy Hardesty, a Young Evangelical who (at the time taught) English at Trinity College (now **Trinity University/Divinity School/ Seminary**) ...Deerfield, Illinois, offers a fresh interpretation of the role of women in marriage in Pauline theology in *The Cross & The Flag*... ‘In Ephesians 5...Paul is not setting up a hierarchical relationship... Young couples today who seek a companionate, partnership marriage should not feel that they are disobeying God’s Word by not forcing the wife to submit or the

<sup>89</sup> Both quotes from: “*Women and Men*” on the Bethel Seminary website, April, 2003, underlining added.

<sup>90</sup> A much fuller treatment of Packer’s movement downhill, theologically speaking, can be found in “*Evangelicalism Divided*” by Iain Murray (Banner of Truth: Edinburgh, Scotland, 2000).

<sup>91</sup> “*The Young Evangelicals*,” by Richard Quebedeaux. Harper & Row Publishers: New York, 1974, pp. 130-33, underlining added.

husband to carry the entire load of decisions’... Hardesty also offers a new interpretation of the Pauline passages of Scripture in which the Apostle supposedly (sic) teaches silence on the part of women in the Church: ‘*The other question is whether or not women should keep silence in church as they are supposedly commanded in I Corinthians 14:34 and I Timothy 2:11. Both of these... are extremely difficult passages to interpret (Not really-mwe cf. Appendix 2)... in the service of Holy Communion... women were permitted to preach and prophesy.*’...*The Young Evangelicals believe that their churches should give equal representation to women on their governing boards, in the ministry... and in denominational and interdenominational hierarchies... Women’s liberation is here to stay, and once again Orthodoxy is dragging its feet.*”<sup>92</sup>

- b. **Wheaton College.** This school, though it had a wonderful past history, is today one of the leading lights of new evangelicalism, along with Fuller Theological Seminary and several other schools. In the 1950s some of the famous missionaries who were martyred by the Auca Indians in South America, were from Wheaton College. I believe if they were alive today, they would be shocked to see the lack of personal moral standards at that school now. Just this year the school changed its policies to allow on-campus dancing by the students and the drinking of alcohol by its faculty and graduate students. Here is the text of the newspaper report:

*“Wheaton College, an evangelical school that for years has held tightly to moral standards, is loosening up a bit, lifting an old rule against dancing and easing a ban on alcohol and smoking. For a school that counts Rev. Billy Graham among its graduates and has as its dictum ‘For Christ and His Kingdom’, the unanimous decision by the administration and board of trustees was a major policy shift... In a ‘Community Covenant’ formally unveiled Monday, college leaders said on-campus dances will have college sponsorship as long as students use caution and good judgment and avoid any behavior ‘which may be immodest, sinfully erotic or harmfully violent.’ Adult members of the campus community-including faculty, staff and graduate students-are asked to use ‘careful and loving discretion in any use of alcohol’, ‘but they’re asked not to drink when undergraduates are present. Previously, faculty were asked to sign a ‘Statement of Personal Responsibility’, pledging that they would not consume alcohol on or off campus. Many faculty and students praised the changes. Students are already talking about the possibilities-perhaps a formal military ball this spring with swing and ballroom dancing. And some faculty members went to a Mexican restaurant Monday and celebrated. **‘I’m sure some Margaritas were passed around’** said Gary Burge, a professor of New Testament and vice-chairman of the faculty (a Margarita is of course an alcoholic drink)...*Even though the new covenant allows students to dance anywhere-both on and off campus-many said they doubt students will flock to Chicago nightclubs...**

*“Tanya Oxley, vice president of the student body...said students had been pushing the administration for years to make the dance change, and most were thrilled it finally had been done. ‘It shows a lot about the administration that they are trusting students to make these choices and base all of it on the Bible, she said. In explaining the new rule through a letter on the school’s web site, President Duane Litfin said he wholeheartedly supported the board’s decision. That comes after saying in 1997 that contemporary social dancing was ‘very sensual...the kind of thing that doesn’t add to the Christian atmosphere on campus.’... The dancing and alcohol ban had been in existence since the school was founded in 1860, but the study committee found no clear Bible statement banning dancing or the moderate use of alcohol, which paved the way for the change. ‘Sometimes, lifestyle statements can be bound in a time and place,’ said Burge, a committee member. ‘We wanted to contemporize it.’”<sup>93</sup>*

- c. **New Evangelical “Moral Smokescreens.”** Peter Masters notes that the claim by evangelicals that “‘fundamentalists allow their beliefs to be uncritically influenced

<sup>92</sup> MacArthur, op. cit., pp. 112-114.

<sup>93</sup> Quotation source: Chicago Tribune, 20 Feb. 2003, Meg McSherry, Tribune staff reporter, cited in “Faith and Freedom,” March 2003, p. 9.

by their culture, whereas evangelicals realize that culture fashions belief' (?) ... **is really a justification for undermining long-established standards and practices in the churches** ... (It) puts the following lines of argument to us. Why should we stick to serious, objective worship, and use only a limited number of instruments such as an organ and piano? Why should we exclude dancing and acting from worship? Why should we distinguish between 'sacred' and 'secular' music? Why should we preach sermons as we do? Do we not realize that the way we do things is heavily influenced by culture? There is nothing special about it. Surely we must change, adapt, learn from the new culture, and so on.

This (thinking) ... is an attempt to rubbish godly ways of doing things established in the past, and to deny that these were ever derived from scriptural principles. It is an attempt to justify freedom to experiment, and to do whatever may appeal to us. Fundamentalists generally resist this new-evangelical insult to generations of past Christians. Fundamentalists attach no special authority to their traditions, but they respect them highly if they are clearly grounded in the Word. New evangelicals, however, are eager to discredit everything inherited from the past so that they may adopt forms and methods of worship that appeal to worldly minds... The new evangelical, too often, seems more interested in numbers than conversions. He does not appear to mind if his 'converts' dance and drink and continue to be party-goers, theatre-goers, career-worshippers, or followers of other worldly interests. Indeed, he employs most of these attractions in his worship and evangelism."<sup>94</sup>

- d. **The #1 Excuse New Evangelicals Use in Order to Get Churches, Missions, and Individuals to Lower Their Standards: "I'M UNDER GRACE!"** As stated earlier, Chuck Swindoll and others have loudly proclaimed that New Testament believers are "*under grace,*" and thus rules, policies, and standards, are "*joy-killers*" and examples of restrictive legalism. There are a number of theological problems with such statements:

**First** of all legalism, biblically speaking, refers to the belief that one can get to heaven by keeping a set of laws or rules. Such a belief is obviously false. But for churches, schools and mission agencies to have standards for dress and behaviour is *NOT* biblical legalism. No one in those organizations thinks that the following of standards required by such organisations will earn them a place in heaven. In fact, if you told them that, they would look at you as if you were crazy!

**Secondly**, while it is true that we are under grace (and we should thank God that we are!), **being under grace does not mean that one is free to do whatever one feels like doing.** Galatians 5:1 says that "*It was for freedom that Christ set us free; therefore keep standing firm and do not be subject again to a yoke of bondage.*" But one has wisely pointed out that just a few verses later we read:

"For you were called to freedom, brethren; only do not turn your freedom into an opportunity for the flesh"(5:13) ...Some Christians who wish to be free to do whatever they want and feel comfortable with, quote the last part of Romans 6:14 ("*...we are not under law but under grace*"). But to do so, without reading the context...grossly ignores the first phrase. Romans 6:14 says, 'For sin shall not have dominion over you: for ye are not under the law, but under grace.' **In the context, grace is not a license to do as you please, but rather the enabling to be free from the dominion of sin.** It is God's supernatural help, His supernatural enabling to help us do that which we cannot do in our own flesh ...Ephesians 3:7 refers to grace as the '*effectual working of His power.*' That's what grace is. It is the effectual working of God's power in our lives so that we can walk with Him and do right. Interestingly, Titus 2:11-12 says, '*For the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men, teaching us*'—All right, what does grace teach us?—'*that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world.*' What a statement! Grace then teaches a denial of ungodliness and a responsibility to maintain a standard of godliness according to the authority of God's Word. So grace is not an excuse to do what you

<sup>94</sup> Masters, op. cit., pp. 18-19, emphasis added.

want. It's not a license to sin; it is God's supernatural enabling to free us from the dominion of sin."<sup>95</sup>

- e. **A Jazz Version of "Stand Up, Stand Up for Jesus"?** Nearly a decade ago while traveling our family chose to attend an independent Baptist church in Ohio that has always had a reputation for being fundamental. I had not visited the church for a number of years, but the last time I was there the music had been worshipful and Christ-honoring. It came as a shock therefore to notice as we were finding our seats, that there was a "trap set" (a set of drums and cymbals such as a Rock group uses) up on the platform, along with several electric guitars and amplifiers. They had a "worship team" composed of a number of casually-dressed men and women (something commonplace now but quite unusual then) up front to lead the congregation. As the service began the musical background sounded like the music one hears in nightclubs, bars & rum shops.

**The low point** for us probably came when the song leader said that we were now going to sing "Stand Up, Stand Up for Jesus." But he remarked with a bit of an almost sinister smile on his face that it was going to be a "little different version." At that point he started snapping his fingers as he beat time with one hand and began the introduction, repeating: "Stand...Stand... Stand Up; Stand... Stand... Stand up; ...Stand up, stand up for Jesus..." to the accompaniment of cymbals and drums in a jazz style. I can't describe it in words, but we felt like we were in a nightclub. In my personal opinion it was a disgrace to Christ. Needless to say, we didn't sing. Unfortunately, under the banner of "grace," practices such as this, and things far worse are occurring weekly in churches, evangelistic rallies and Christian schools, all over the world ...and all, sadly, in the name of Christ.

- f. **"Dance Teams?"** Yes that's right, allegedly fundamental Christian universities now have "dance" teams that perform at chapel services, etc! Recently I viewed an article from Cornerstone University's official Internet website. The title was: "Student Organizes Fine Arts for Worship." It told of a female student who...

"...has been helping to implement new elements of worship on campus this year (2003). She commented: 'Cornerstone wants to recognize that God is the originator of fine arts... and we can use the gifts that He has given us with pure hearts, to present a beautiful incense of worship.'" The article continued: "Students may have been noticing some exciting changes in recent years with regard to chapel and fine arts. During the praise chapel on Sept. 19, 2003, the worship included a power point presentation, drama, poetry and dance. 'Dance is very tainted by the secular world,' Baker points out. 'It was originally something that God created to bring glory to Himself.'(?) ...Baker is following 'in the footsteps' of those who have created Cornerstone's first dance teams last spring and have presented the annual creative arts festival for the past several years, an event that includes many forms of display and performance arts. Baker, a member of the worship dance team last year, is now leading this group, one of five dance groups on campus this year. 'Dancing itself is not a sin; it is the impure motives that we harbor that bring dishonor to God,' Baker says. 'It's time for Christianity to reclaim dance and use it to bring God complete praise.'<sup>96</sup>

It is not my desire here to engage in a major discussion on dancing. However I would point out that Miss Baker's statement that "dance has been very tainted by the secular world" is reason enough, biblically speaking, to avoid it (e.g. "Abstain from all appearance of evil" - I Thess. 5:22; "Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him..." - I Jn. 2:15-17; Rom. 13:14; 14:22-23; I Cor. 8:9; Gal. 5:13; etc). Paul

---

<sup>95</sup> "A Heartbeat for Holiness," by John R. VanGelder. Preach the Word Ministries, Inc.:Woodridge, Illinois, 1996, pp. 17-18, emphasis and underlining added.

<sup>96</sup> Cornerstone University website, "News-Current News" p. 1, 10<sup>th</sup> October, 2003. Explanatory note: Cornerstone University was formerly known as Grand Rapids Baptist College, and was previously associated with the General Association of Regular Baptist Churches (GARBC), and considered a fundamentalist school. However they voluntarily severed connections with the GARBC several years ago. Further comments on CU are found later in this paper.



strongly warns believers against doing anything that will possibly cause a Christian to stumble (Rom. 14:13-15, 21).

I am also not personally aware of any place in Scripture where it says that God created dance to bring glory to Himself. (?) For those who would like more information on this subject, Bill Gothard and the Institute in Basic Life Principles has produced a brief but helpful study guide on dancing in Scripture. They contend that both *sensual* and *sincere* dancing was performed in Bible times-but that all dancing of either kind resulted either in God's judgment, or in unintended but costly tragedy and sorrow.<sup>97</sup> In addition they maintain that the references in Psalms 149 & 150 which appear to endorse dancing as a form of praise to God, may not even refer to dancing at all, since the word for *dance* that is found there (Heb. "*machol*") may possibly refer to simply a musical instrument (pictured). Their conclusion: "*There is no scriptural basis for either sincere or sensual dancing.*"<sup>98</sup>

Masters, writing in the Sword & Trowel has an interesting discussion about music and dance in the Church. He points out that part of the problem is due to the fact that many do not realize that there was a major difference between instruments and behaviour allowed to be used in the Temple (e.g. only four, out of all the instruments listed in Scripture were allowed to be played there), and those allowed for national and civic festivals. In other words, certain instruments and behaviours were allowed in festivities akin to parades and civic celebrations that were never allowed in the house of God!<sup>99</sup>

I would also point out that the CU student's statement that "*Dancing is not a sin; it is the impure motives that we harbor that bring dishonor to God*" sounds plausible-but in reality that statement is devoid of any real meaning. After all, if all that matters are a person's motives, one can justify almost any behaviour. To illustrate, I'm reminded of an incident that I heard about and which occurred about four decades ago in Minnesota, USA. A Lutheran pastor gave communion to a couple, which in and of itself, would not be newsworthy. The reason it made the news is that the couple took communion while they were both nude. The pastor justified it by saying, "*I felt that they were very devout, very sincere*" (i.e. their motives were pure!). Quite frankly, motives prove very little. You can't see motives. A well-known economist who makes no pretension of being a Christian has nonetheless wisely stated: "**Sincerity is the most overrated virtue today!**" A person may sincerely believe he can fly. But it still won't change the fact that if he jumps off a building we'll scrape his broken body off the sidewalk down below and take it to the morgue.

Finally, I question the CU student's statement, "*It's time for Christianity to reclaim dance and use it to bring God complete praise.*" I don't believe praise to God has been incomplete until now when dancing has begun entering the church. Nor do I believe that God is in need of anything, or that He's been frustrated up in heaven because He's been waiting for us to bring Him "*complete*" praise. I see nothing in Scripture that says God has been cheated out of part of the praise due Him because we haven't been dancing. In fact I'm quite unclear how watching a bunch of people, especially young women, twirl, spin, and prance in front of a congregation helps the audience to think of God and praise Him better...if at all! In light of the results of some of the dances in Scripture and the normal male reaction to women dancing and encouraging men to focus on them while they do so, I would suggest that the very opposite may easily be the case (e.g. Ex. 32:19-28; I Sam. 30:16; Job 21:11-15; Mt. 14:6-ff; II Sam. 6:14 cf. v. 20 & I Chron. 15:29 cf. Job 31:1; etc).

- g. **Is a Drop in Moral Standards (dress, music, etc.) in Churches, Denominations, Schools, & Missions the First Sign of Trouble?** A number of years ago a godly

---

<sup>97</sup> "*The Testimony of Scripture Regarding Dancing.*" Institute in Basic Life Principles: Oak Brook, Illinois, 1989.

<sup>98</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 4

<sup>99</sup> "*Worship in the Melting Pot-Brass, Strings & Percussion,*" by Dr. Peter Masters, Sword & Trowel. The Metropolitan Tabernacle: London, England, 1998, No. 4, pp. 5-8. A much more extensive discussion by Masters can be found in a book by the same title ("*Worship in the Melting Pot*", 148pp.), which has subsequently been published by the Metropolitan Tabernacle Bookshop.

pastor, Bryce Augsburger, commented: “**Churches and schools go liberal in practice before they go liberal in theology. Eventually doctrine is changed to fit the practice.** This is the sinister approach of new-evangelicalism. Dr. Charles Woodbridge was one of the first to detect this. He suggested in his famous message on new evangelicalism...that new evangelicalism started out as a new theological mood, developed into a causistical (i.e. subtle but false) method, continued into a neutralized message and has culminated in a decaying morality.”<sup>100</sup> There is a great deal of truth in the above statement. Certainly the belief that a drop in personal standards of morality and holiness in areas such as dress, music, speech, entertainment, etc., is an early sign of movement from a fundamentalist to a new evangelical position cannot be lightly discounted. We do well to take heed and observe carefully the moral standards of any school, church or denomination.

7. **SECULAR, WORLDLY PHILOSOPHIES & METHODOLOGIES.** New evangelical churches, schools and missions today also **demonstrate a huge reliance on secular thinking and methods in trying to do ministry.** A desire to use the “world” and its thinking is of course nothing new. It can be traced all the way back to New Testament times. Paul addressed this problem in the first four chapters of First Corinthians, where he clearly & boldly contrasted “*Man’s wisdom*” with “*God’s wisdom*” condemning the former in no uncertain terms. However today’s new evangelicals are completely enamored of the world, its techniques and its methodologies and use & incorporate them into their ministries every chance they get. I would submit that this is yet another, more recent, identifying mark of new evangelicalism.

I do not have the time or space to elaborate on this subject here, but have written extensive critiques elsewhere.<sup>101</sup> Let me simply say in passing, that new evangelical churches, missions and schools are completely overrun with, and enamored of, “*worldly wisdom.*” New evangelical mega-churches have huge membership numbers and use all of the latest “*cutting edge*” techniques to attract people (and make no mistake about it, they do work. At least as far as increasing numbers is concerned!). **But I don’t believe they are honouring to God.** In mission conferences, church growth conferences, pastors conferences, leadership training conferences, etc., one hears all the latest “buzz words”, e.g. “*change agent,*” “*dynamism,*” “*partnering,*” “*difference maker,*” “*strategies,*” “*reinventing organizations,*” “*innovative,*” “*situational leadership,*” “*mentoring,*” “*demographics,*” “*paradigm shifts,*” “*relevance,*” “*tools,*” and “*cutting-edge methodologies,*” etc.<sup>102</sup> We hear about the latest studies by church-growth experts, and how to determine and appeal to peoples “*needs.*” But something is missing. Please note, the Bible is not completely disregarded. It is simply no longer the center and the focus.

Thinking and practice in ministry, church planting, and mission work becomes based far more on the latest surveys, books, techniques, and advice of “*experts*” and “*consultants*”, instead of simply going to and relying upon the Word of God. It’s an undeniable fact that management techniques such as “*Situational Leadership®*” are based on the philosophies of unregenerate, secular psychologists such as Carl Rogers, as well as management experts such as Paul Hersey. Yet mission organizations and Christian ministries uncritically adopt and implement such methodologies organization-wide. The use of psychological personality testing is touted as an excellent way to help increase “*productivity*” and improve “*interpersonal relationships*” in churches, missions and schools. Yet the well-documented fact is such testing has been shown to be at best a waste of time, and at worst, counterproductive and completely unbiblical!

Worse yet, believers today, who think the Bible alone is sufficient, are looked down upon much like Paul once was. There is one major difference though: It was the unsaved world that snickered at Paul. Today many “*cutting edge*” Christian leaders would do so too.<sup>103</sup> While most would be too polite to call us “*fools*”, they would inwardly smirk and consider us naïve or simplistic. Those outside the fundamentalist camp would refer to us as

<sup>100</sup> Augsburger, op. cit., pp. 14-15.

<sup>101</sup> e.g. see my papers, “*A Biblical Critique of Situational Leadership/Lead Like Jesus*” (2005) & “*A Critique of Bobb Biehl’s Strategic Planning Methodology*” (2005)

<sup>102</sup> cf. Guinness, op. cit., pp. 74-78, emphasis added.

<sup>103</sup> Ibid, pp. 38.

“*unenlightened fundamentalists.*” My response is simple: Don’t worry. They said the same thing about Paul (I Cor. 1:18, 21-30; 2:1-6; etc)! He wasn’t shaken and we shouldn’t be either. Paul said: “*Be ye followers (imitators) of me*” (I Cor. 4:16). **The Christian ministry is NOT a profession, and the Church is not a business or corporation!** One has wisely stated:

*“If Jesus Christ is true, the church is more than just another human institution. He alone is her head. He is her sole source and single goal. His grace uniquely is her effective principle. What moves her is not finally interchangeable with the dynamics of even the closest of sister institutions... If Jesus Christ is the head of the church and hence the source and goal of its entire life, true growth is only possible in obedience to him. Conversely, if the church becomes detached from Jesus Christ and his word, it cannot truly grow, however active and successful it may seem to be. However spectacular its development, it will prove disappointing in the end ...The church of Christ is more than spiritual and theological, but never less. Only when first things are truly first, over even the best and most attractive of second things, will the church be free of idols, free to let God be God, free to be herself, and free to experience the growth that matters.”<sup>104</sup>*

**The job description of the pastor is not complicated:** preach the Word, pray, & shepherd the flock (Acts 2:42; 6:4; I Pet. 5:1-4; etc). And God’s blessing on our ministries is not dependent on how many years we’ve gone to Bible College and Seminary, or how many degrees we may have! As Martyn Lloyd-Jones observed regarding the great 18<sup>th</sup> century evangelist George Whitefield: “***You may be in the pulpit of Whitefield, you may have Whitefield’s knowledge, and even more than he had, for he was not a very learned man, but the secret of Whitefield was his God, and without Him we avail nothing.***”<sup>105</sup> May God help us to do the work of the ministry the way He desires it to be done: In total dependence on Him, His Word, and His Spirit!

F. **SOME NEW EVANGELICAL SCHOOLS, ORGANIZATIONS, INDIVIDUALS, ETC.** Before closing, I would like to list the names of a few schools and individuals (in addition to those previously mentioned) who are in the new evangelical camp. My purpose in doing so is *not* to make a school or person look bad, or to throw stones. Rather, it’s so my Papua New Guinean brethren might become aware of who some of the main “*players*” are—lest they unknowingly end up attending schools or working with individuals that they mistakenly thought were fundamental, but later find out are not-much to their embarrassment and chagrin.

1. **SCHOOLS.** “Donald Bloesch (himself a well known evangelical-*mwe*), in his penetrating analysis of the evangelical situation in his book ‘*The Future of Evangelical Christianity,*’ attempts to delineate the ‘*right-wingers*’ (more conservative) and the ‘*left-wingers*’ (more liberal) among the evangelicals. He sees at least two important issues which tend to divide them: (1) the nature of biblical inspiration and (2) the proper approach to biblical interpretation (see above) ...His candidates for the ‘left wing’ (more liberal) would be: **Fuller Theological Seminary, Gordon-Conwell Seminary, Bethel Theological Seminary, Regent College, Eastern Mennonite Seminary, Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary, (and) North Park Theological Seminary.**”<sup>106</sup> To this list I would add such schools as **BIOLA, Trinity International University & Trinity Divinity School, Westmont College, Columbia International University,** etc.

For example, a **BIOLA** senior vice-president published a book which advocates the position of theistic evolution (i.e. God used evolution as His method). They, like some other schools listed below, have had jazz & rock bands for years. BIOLA dropped their prohibition against dancing way back in 1988. Their 1988 revision of the student code (handbook) allowed students “...to decide for themselves whether to dance, drink, smoke or gamble off campus during vacation periods.” The head of their Department of Sociology stated from BIOLA’s chapel platform during a discussion of abortion issues that he was “*pro-choice*” (i.e. pro-abortion), and he even admitted in an official letter published by BIOLA’s president of the time, that he had “...*personally driven BIOLA girls to get abortions. I helped to pay for three BIOLA coeds (i.e. girls) to have*

<sup>104</sup> Ibid, p. 39, emphasis added.

<sup>105</sup> “*Knowing the Times,*” op. cit., p. 375.

<sup>106</sup> Pickering, quoting Bloesch, op. cit., p. 98, underlining added.

abortions...”<sup>107</sup> I do not know if he was sacked for saying that or not, but he did say in that same published interview: “*They could fire me, but I don’t think they will. If they fire me, they’re going to have to fire a lot of other people. I will continue to help girls get abortions as long as it is legally possible to do so.*”<sup>108</sup>(!)

2. **PUBLISHERS.** Please bear in mind that Bloesch is a new evangelical himself and was writing way back in 1988. Keep in mind too the fact that attempting to pinpoint the theological position of publishing companies can be very difficult since they publish titles on a wide range of subjects. Nor am I implying that one should not buy books published by these companies. It simply means that when you buy books from such publishers that you need to read them cautiously and not just uncritically believe everything you find in them! “Bloesch...gives a classification of Christian publishing houses. The ‘left wing’ (more liberal) is as follows: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Inter-Varsity Press, Fleming Revell, and Word Books. The ‘right wing’ (more conservative) would be represented by the following: Zondervan Publishing House, Thomas Nelson, Baker Book House, & Tyndale House Publishers.”<sup>109</sup> Please keep in mind that all of those listed are evangelical, not fundamental, so even the more conservative ‘right wing’ publishers may publish books with serious theological problems.
  
3. **ORGANISATIONS.** I don’t wish to take a lot of space here, but would simply mention a couple of unquestionably new evangelical Para-church organizations.
  - a. **Campus Crusade for Christ.** This is the largest ministry to college and university students in the world. Bill Bright, who recently passed away, founded this ministry. As is the case with so many other new evangelical individuals and organisations, they have done much good over the years. However their methodology, and even their message, has often been unbiblical. For instance, for decades Campus Crusade has employed and used Roman Catholics on their staff. Bill Bright unapologetically acknowledged such many years ago, stating: “*We do not attack the Roman Church. We believe that God is doing a mighty work in it, and will no doubt use millions of Roman Catholics to help evangelize the world.*”(sic)<sup>110</sup> Their famous evangelistic tract “*Four Spiritual Laws*” is terribly flawed theologically,<sup>111</sup> as is their general philosophy of ministry.<sup>112</sup> One of their earlier discipleship booklets on the Old Testament allowed for an evolutionary timetable, stating in the introduction: “*Keep in mind that we are going to cover a period of time that has been estimated to be from 4,000 to 400,000,000 years long. Naturally we shall have to be selective...*”<sup>113</sup> Their evangelistic campaigns and outreach programs (e.g. “*Explo,*” “*I Found It,*” etc) have always been totally ecumenical and contrary to Scripture have involved a wide range of apostate denominations (cf. II Cor. 6:14-7:1; II Jn. 7-11; Gal. 1:8-9; etc).
  
  - b. **Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship** In Papua New Guinea a number of other Commonwealth countries the university division of this Para-church ministry is known as Tertiary Students Christian Fellowship [TSCF]. I believe IVCF recently changed their name to something similar to the “International Fellowship of Evangelical Students” (IFES?). Similar biblical criticisms as those mentioned above regarding Campus Crusade would be applicable here, e.g. they are totally ecumenical in methodology, and include large numbers of charismatics, as well as members of apostate denominations in their crusades, rallies, and ministries. I’m

<sup>107</sup> Ashbrook, “*New Neutralism II*”, op. cit., pp. 97-99.

<sup>108</sup> Ibid, p. 99.

<sup>109</sup> Ibid, pp. 98-99.

<sup>110</sup> Paul Tassell, “*Is Campus Crusade Scriptural?*” Regular Baptist Press: Des Plaines, Illinois, 1972, p. 12.

<sup>111</sup> “The approach (of the Four Spiritual Laws booklet) is programmed to bring a person to a decision by agreement with the Four Spiritual Laws. There is no word of caution to the worker to see if there is any real conviction of sin. Decisions resulting must necessarily often be superficial. As Stuart Olyott has written: ‘*It is automatic to the point of being alarming.*’” (Tassell, Ibid, p. 4)

<sup>112</sup> For instance, for many years in their materials and leadership training sessions they have stated: “*The average person, if properly approached, is ready to commit his life to Christ.*” (e.g. “*Campus Crusade-It’s Message and Methods*”, Charles W. Dunn. Bob Jones University Press, Greenville, SC, 1980, p. 20). Actually the “average” unsaved person is “*dead in trespasses and sins...*” (Eph. 2:1), and Scripture tells us that “*...none seek after God.*” (Rom. 3:11).

<sup>113</sup> “*Highlights of the Old Testament,*” *Ten Basic Steps Toward Christian Maturity.* Campus Crusade for Christ: San Bernardino, California, 1968, p.2.

sorry to say that there seems to be almost no understanding of the biblical doctrine of separation in this organisation.

4. **INDIVIDUALS.** There are a number of other individuals that I have not previously mentioned, but who should be noted, since they are influential &/or well known. Many of us have some of their books in our libraries, etc. It does not mean we should throw their books out. But it does mean to read them with discernment. That God has used many of the men mentioned here or in previous pages, is undeniable. That is not the question. The question here is: Are they new evangelical? Do they cooperate in unbiblical ecumenical endeavors? The answer in virtually every case would appear to unquestionably be, “yes.” Consequently, should any of the previously mentioned new evangelicals, or the ones listed below ever come to our country, I believe we would want to avoid getting involved with them. Or if those men became connected with mission organisations, youth ministries, or churches here in PNG (perhaps a more likely scenario), I would think fundamentalists would need to seriously reconsider continuing to work with such organisations, in order to be obedient to the Scriptures.
- a. **Howard Hendricks.** He is affiliated with another new evangelical school called **Dallas Theological Seminary.** Billy Graham and a host of other new evangelicals have been warmly welcomed at DTS for decades.<sup>114</sup> Dr. Hendricks has appeared at, and continues to speak at schools, conferences, and venues that are thoroughly new evangelical or worse. Dallas personnel happily worked with Billy Graham at Lausanne II in Manila, and they regularly appear at Southern Baptist churches, work with the new evangelical Campus Crusade for Christ, etc. Dallas’ roster of speakers over the years is a regular “who’s who” listing of new evangelicals.
  - b. **Bruce Wilkinson.** Formerly the head of “*Walk through the Bible Ministries.*” He has become very well known for an extremely popular little book he has written called “*The Prayer of Jabez.*” Unfortunately this book, though it has sold millions of copies, is probably one of the best examples of terrible hermeneutics to be seen in the past several decades. In it Wilkinson takes an obscure little 27 word Old Testament prayer (he skips the last 6 words of it), and claims that this prayer-*out of all the prayers in the Bible*-is something akin to a magic formula that if you recite daily will guarantee God’s blessing on your life! Fortunately, like so many other passing Christian fads, interest in the book and prayer seems to have pretty much died away. But the book is a classic example of biblical misinterpretation and misapplication, and its astronomical sales were a sad commentary on how self-centered today’s Christians have become.<sup>115</sup>
  - c. **Warren Wiersbe.** Dr. Wiersbe is a well-known, highly-read Bible commentator and teacher, and he has written many helpful books. However he will speak almost anywhere, from new evangelical Southern Baptist schools and dead seminaries, to conservative colleges. As of 2002 he was connected with Cornerstone University in Grand Rapids, Michigan. “For a number of years (Dr. Wiersbe) wrote a column in Moody Monthly magazine, in which he revealed his fondness for quoting unbelievers such as Helmut Thielicke, Methodist Bishop Gerald Kennedy and blasphemous George Buttrick. He had the habit of quoting helpful sayings without pointing out that they came from harmful heroes. Dr. Wiersbe is a board member of the National Religious Broadcasters. In 1991 he was scheduled to speak... at Samford University. This is a Southern Baptist Convention school which is no bastion of fundamentalism...He was a main speaker at the 1991 N.A.E. Convention, along with Evangelist Luis Palau...”<sup>116</sup> At the same time he has appeared at such locations, he has also been serving as “*Writer-in-Residence*” and

---

<sup>114</sup> “(DTS) Vice-president, Dr. Wendell Johnson, represented the Seminary at Lausanne II in Manila. He gave an enthusiastic report in the Dallas Insider and mentioned that several Dallas alumni were participating in the afternoon sessions. He failed to mention that also participating were charismatics such as Vinson Synan, Jack Hayford and John Wimber; invited observers from the Vatican; positive thinking gurus such as Dr. Robert Schuller and professional ecumenicists such as Dr. J.I. Packer and Dr. John R.W. Stott. A few years ago that would have been considered strange territory for Dallas professors.” (Ashbrook, *New Neutralism II*, op. cit., p. 100).

<sup>115</sup> For a brief but well written antidote to it, see: “*I Just Wanted More Land-Jabez*”, by Gary Gilley. Xulon Press: Fairfax, Virginia, 2001, 105pp.

<sup>116</sup> Ashbrook, “*New Neutralism*”, op. cit., p. 75.

“Distinguished Professor of Preaching” at Cornerstone University/Grand Rapids Baptist Seminary.

- d. **Vernon Grounds.** He’s very old now, but is a well-known new evangelical speaker. He has been connected with a radical group called “*Evangelicals for Social Action*.” He has also written for “Ministry” magazine, a major Seventh Day Adventist publication.
- e. **David Hesselgrave.** Well known missiologist, who has been on the faculty of new evangelical Trinity Evangelical Divinity School & Seminary for decades. He has also taught at the Asia Theological Seminary which is connected with Billy Graham and his organisation.
- f. **Lee Ross.** Ross worked for the Georgia Southern Baptist Convention for a number of years, and is currently associated with “*The Center for FaithWalk Leadership*.” This is a new evangelical ministry that claims that the entire pattern for how to lead others is found in John 13 where Jesus washed the disciples feet along with one verse in Matthew (23:11). Ironically, the immediately preceding verse in that passage in Matthew contains Jesus’ admonition against having anyone call you “Leader” (Mt. 23:10). The board of *The Center for FaithWalk Leadership* is comprised of at least six new evangelicals as well as 22 or more businessmen, and several “motivational speakers/experts.”

One board member, **Laurie Beth Jones**, has written books such as “*Jesus CEO*” (i.e. *Jesus, Managing Director*), and “*Jesus in Blue Jeans*.” She states in her biographical sketch that her company is “...dedicated ‘to recognize, promote and inspire the divine connection in all of us’...” and she claims that Jesus “took a disorganized staff of twelve and built a thriving enterprise ... (and that her book) ...*Jesus CEO...details a profound and fresh approach to motivating and managing others.*”<sup>117</sup> These kinds of statements are typical examples of the unbiblical, new evangelical emphasis on secular management techniques and strategies which is currently sweeping through Christian missions and organisations. Her statements even indicate that she apparently believes in the New Age concept that God is in everyone already!<sup>118</sup> Consequently her philosophies would be acceptable only to New Agers and Mormons, so one has to wonder why this new evangelical leader and ministry have this woman on its board. Presumably they are comfortable with her unbiblical religious philosophy?

- g. **D.A. Carson.** Another faculty member at Trinity International University/Divinity School. He is a well known writer of a number of good books. However he too, in standard new evangelical tradition, does not observe or obey the biblical doctrine of separation (II Cor. 6; etc). He has spoken for Billy Graham at his “*COVE Conference Center*,” has written articles for the Sydney, Australia branch of the Anglican Church, etc (the Anglican Church of course has ordained a homosexual bishop, etc).
- h. **Chuck Swindoll.** Formerly the pastor of an Evangelical Free Church in California, he has more recently been the president of Dallas Theological Seminary. He and his church in California “supported” Billy Graham’s 1985 Los Angeles crusade, and he would have no problem cooperating with Graham, or any other new evangelical. As mentioned earlier, his book “*The Grace Awakening*” has opened the flood gates to a lack of moral standards and a lowering of behaviour among evangelicals.
- i. **Larry Moyer.** Not nearly as well known as most of the other names on this list, Moyer is the head of “*Evan-Tell*”, a Christian ministry. He has been an adjunct professor at Dallas Theological Seminary. “The Dallas Insider for October 1986,

---

<sup>117</sup> “*Higher Management*,” Laurie Beth Jones, Mach 1 Catalog, Chico, California, 2000, p. 14.

<sup>118</sup> “*Deep down, we know that we are made of stardust, and are willing to give up what we have on earth in order to approach the heavens from whence we came.*” Ibid, Mach 1, p. 15.

recorded the sentiments of ...Moyer, who said *that it was an honor to be invited and to participate in Dr. Billy Graham's Amsterdam '86.*"<sup>119</sup>

- j. **Norman Geisler.** Dr. Geisler is another excellent scholar who has written many fine books on apologetics, cults, religions and philosophy, yet he sees no problem with evangelicals and Roman Catholics working together.(!) Consider the following comment & information by the late Ernest Pickering:

"Norman Geisler, well-known Christian apologist, was interviewed concerning his views on Catholic-evangelical cooperation. He concludes that 'the differences are not as great as generally perceived and they are not as crucial. In my opinion, they don't involve heresy on either side of the fence.' He was asked the question 'Is there a growing awareness among our fellow evangelicals of the theological common ground between themselves and Catholics?' His answer: 'I would have to admit that more Evangelicals see the need to cooperate socially and ethically. That's good because it's forced evangelicals to reevaluate their relationship to Roman Catholics. But I see also a growing awareness of this doctrinal understanding. I had a conversation with a couple of noted evangelicals at the last Evangelical Theological Society meeting and they were in total agreement with what I am saying here.' This is a frightening statement indeed! Not only does one of the leading evangelical theologians feel we should be accepting of Roman Catholicism, but he has many 'buddies' who share his feelings. This bodes no good for thousands of young students as well as evangelical church members who will come under their influence. The perception will soon be widespread that we no longer need to oppose the heresies of Rome because they are not really 'heresies.' ...Geisler...who is a noted evangelical theologian, having taught at both Dallas Seminary and Liberty University (gives) His assessment of the relationship between evangelicals and Romanists (which) is summed up in the title given to an interview which he had on the subject: '*If we don't hang together, we're going to hang separately.*'"<sup>120</sup>

5. **SOME "QUESTIONABLE" SCHOOLS THAT WERE "DRIFTING" AS OF 2003.** Keep in mind Dr. Martyn Lloyd-Jones' warnings quoted earlier in this paper that:

*"...You must not assume that because the church (or mission, or school-mwe) started correctly, (that) she will continue so. She did not do so in the New Testament times; she has not done so since. Without being constantly reformed by the Word the church (or mission, or school) becomes something very different."*<sup>121</sup>

When I originally wrote this paper in 2003 I made the following statement:

I would like to list here three schools that started off as fundamentalist schools and which still claim to be so, but which appear to have shifted greatly, and could arguably be said to be heading down the road to new evangelicalism. I say this based on a) who they have had as chapel and graduation speakers for the past decade or more (*i.e. a repudiation of separation*); b) *a serious drop in moral standards* in areas such as dress, music, etc; c) *a sympathy for and cooperation with new evangelical churches, individuals and denominations (i.e. dialogue with new evangelicals who dialogue with liberals)*; d) an emphasis (perhaps overemphasis?) on *secular scholarship* by their faculty; e) acceptance of various new evangelical students, including charismatics, etc. I won't say much about these schools, but I believe I could provide sufficient documentation to establish the point.

In the ensuing eight years since I wrote this paper and the above paragraph, I can only add that my worst fears in regard to these schools has certainly come to pass. Cornerstone has had a number of Emerging Church leaders as well as female theologians & preachers speak in their chapel services as well as student forums. Neither Cedarville nor Liberty

<sup>119</sup> "*New Neutralism II*," by John E. Ashbrook. Here I Stand Books: Mentor, Ohio, 1992, 2002, p. 100.

<sup>120</sup> "*Holding Hands with the Pope-The Current Evangelical Ecumenical Craze*," by Ernest Pickering. Baptist World Mission: Decatur, Alabama, n.d. (c. 1994?), pp. 8, 10-11.

<sup>121</sup> Lloyd-Jones, *Knowing the Times*, "What Is an Evangelical?" op. cit., p. 315.

has become more biblical or conservative in the intervening years. In fact they have become much more connected to the Southern Baptist Convention!

Let me hasten to add here that I find no joy in mentioning these schools. In the case of one of them, a close personal friend is one of the board members. In regard to another, I was involved in a missions conference at that school many years ago and used to take my youth there while I was a youth pastor. Furthermore, I'm sure that there are other schools that are shifting in a similar fashion and could have been highlighted if I had information about them. However I do not. These are schools of which I do have some firsthand information and insight about, and which also have much more relevance and familiarity to Christians in Papua New Guinea.

- a. **Cornerstone University/Grand Rapids Baptist Seminary.** This school was originally affiliated with the G.A.R.B.C. However according to a GARBC pastor who is a personal friend and was in attendance at the annual meeting when the GARBC debated and then voted to change from the previous "Approval" system for schools<sup>122</sup> to the "Partnering" system<sup>123</sup> in the year 2000, Cornerstone stated in writing that essentially, they didn't care what the GARBC messengers decided, and that they would chart their own course! In retrospect, it does indeed appear that Cornerstone meant what they said about "charting their own course", i.e. doing whatever they felt like doing.<sup>124</sup> The school has had, and continues to have, questionable speakers & faculty members.<sup>125</sup> As noted earlier, they have a jazz band and several "dance teams", etc. Having recently obtained and looked over a copy of the "Partnering Agreement" that the GARBC asks schools to sign in order to qualify as a "partner," I have to wonder why Cornerstone would not (or could not?) sign such a simple statement of faith! It is not a doctrinally stringent statement. I would think that any school which is truly fundamentalist would have no problem signing it or agreeing to obey it.<sup>126</sup>

---

<sup>122</sup> For many decades the General Association of Regular Baptist Churches (GARBC), which is a group of fundamentalist independent Baptist churches, and its "Council of 18", would examine and officially "approve" on a yearly basis, schools that the GARBC felt reflected their beliefs, standards, and values. However in June 2000 they abolished their "Approval" system, choosing to go instead with a "Partnering" arrangement. In the new format, schools simply had to sign a basic doctrinal statement, called a "Partnering Agreement", in order to be considered a "partnering school" and thus be recommended and looked upon with favor by churches in this independent Baptist organization.

<sup>123</sup> Interestingly this change has produced less accountability by the schools to the GARBC, and appears to have aided in an erosion of standards on various campuses.

<sup>124</sup> Dr. Rex Rogers, whose academic degrees are reportedly in the social/political sciences (Ph.D. in Political Science from the University of Cincinnati), is the current president of Cornerstone University. He is reported to have stated at his hiring: "I'd like to establish (GRBC&S's) reputation as a solid academic institution. It is no longer a Bible college and we don't intend for it to be." (Grand Rapids Press, August, 1991). Dr. Rogers, "...in a 13 March, 1992 presentation to GRBC&S's Board (the school was then known as Grand Rapids Baptist College & Seminary), recommended a 'New Niche' to 'Broaden the student and supporting constituency to include all conservative evangelicals, eliminate vestiges of an 'anti-attitude,' 'negativism,' withdrawal and isolation; ... de-emphasize denominational walls; develop a Moody Bible Institute or Word of Life model..." (Quote from a personal email received 18 July, 2003 from a GARBC pastor, citing internet source www.rapidnet.com).

<sup>125</sup> Grand Rapids Baptist Seminary "...had Wheaton College Professor Arthur Holmes speak at a lecture series...(and placed) a full-page ad in the 20 May 96 *Christianity Today* for a Worldview conference, which (listed) Thomas Oden, Richard Middleton, and Brian Walsh as 'facilitators.' Oden is Professor of Theology and Ethics at Drew University, a liberal Methodist school, and a CT Contributing Editor. He is for female ordination, and very ecumenical... Walsh has also used neo-orthodox terms to deplore 'propositional theology' (i.e. verbal inerrancy, etc.), and Middleton has said 'Even the truth of the gospel...is a human construction.'... Speakers at Cornerstone College's 37<sup>th</sup> Annual Bible Conference (19-23 Feb. 96) included... Joseph Stowell, Ed Dobson, and Knute Larson (Larson derided fundamentalists in a March 94 address at the NAE [National Association of Evangelicals])..." (rapidnet.com; etc., cited in previously mentioned email).

<sup>126</sup> The parts of the questionnaire which presumably Cornerstone University (& Cedarville University?-see following point in text) has a problem with, are the following statements: "#19. *Have you read and do you concur with the enclosed article describing the GARBC position on separation?* #20. *Do you have a working relationship with any religious convention, association, or group which permits the presence of liberals or liberalism (modernists or apostates)?* #21. *Do you affirm the GARBC purpose statement? 'To maintain an Association of sovereign Bible-believing, Christ-honoring Baptist churches; to promote the spirit of evangelism; to spread the gospel; to advance Regular Baptist educational and missionary enterprises at home and abroad; to raise and maintain a testimony to the truth of the gospel and to the purity of the Church; to raise a standard of Biblical separation from worldliness, modernism and apostasy; to emphasize the Biblical teaching that a breakdown of divinely established lines between Bible believers and apostates is unscriptural and to be a voice repudiating cooperation with movements which attempt to unite true Bible believers and apostates in evangelistic and other cooperative spiritual efforts.'*" (GARBC Partnering Network Questionnaire, available online at www.garbc.org).



- b. **Cedarville University.** The inclusion of this school might come as a surprise to some. However there are a number of signs that give cause for genuine concern. For a decade or two their standards of music, dress, etc., have dropped rather dramatically. For years a string of “CCM”<sup>127</sup> musicians have entertained on the campus.<sup>128</sup> One writer commented: “We have a flyer (promotional brochure) for Cedarville’s ‘2002 Instrumental and Vocal Jazz Conference’ (15-16 Feb., 2002), featuring ‘a variety of jazz concerts, ‘clinics on drumming, improvising, jazz piano,’ and a festival and jam session. CU’s (Cedarville University’s) own jazz band and vocal jazz ensemble are listed...”<sup>129</sup> The speakers they have had for the past 20 years or so raise serious questions (e.g. nationally known Southern Baptists, various new evangelicals, etc).

An Ohio independent Baptist pastor in 2003 stated in a personal letter: “(Some) of their students come from Assembly of God churches, and in fact this last year they had Jim Cymbala (pastor of the “*Brooklyn Tabernacle*”) ... (on) the Brooklyn Tabernacle’s web site... under doctrine of the Holy Spirit they said: ‘*We believe the baptism of the Holy Spirit is for all believers as a definite endowment of power for service and is subsequent to, and separate from, conversion.*’”<sup>130</sup> Again let me emphasize that I do not doubt that some wonderful things have happened in the Brooklyn Tabernacle’s ministry. And Cymbala made some good observations in his book, “*Fresh Wind, Fresh Fire.*” However some of his statements and doctrinal positions are clearly incorrect biblically, nor do they agree with standard Baptist doctrinal statements.<sup>131</sup>

<sup>127</sup> “CCM” stands for “*Contemporary Christian Music*”, and represents the wide range of “*Christian*” musicians today who dress, sing, dance, produce, and play music & hold concerts which sound like, look like, and in every other way mimic the world’s music and it’s atmosphere (via Rock, Rap, Reggae, Heavy Metal, Punk, Torch, Disco, etc. -complete with disco lights, “fog” blowing out across the stage, extremely “theatrical” performances, screaming fans, etc). This is unquestionably the favorite type of music among Christian youth today. Whether it can be defended on biblical grounds however, is another matter entirely. The Bible contains over 500 verses of Scripture which refer to music or musical instruments, and which set down clear standards for acceptable music. Some of those biblical music standards include: 1) It must be completely different from the world (Ps. 40:3; Jas. 2:15-17; 4:4-5; etc), 2) It should be “good” musicologically, since music affects every human being in three ways: physically, mentally, and spiritually-cf. I Sam. 16:31. Good music will have the melody predominant, with rhythm & volume subdued, etc (Eph. 5:18; etc), 3) It must have solidly biblical lyrics (Mt. 12:36; Phil. 4:8-9; etc), 4) It must not be associated with evil, or with sinful individuals-cf. Rap, which is almost totally associated with rape & the utter degradation of women, the killing of police, etc.; Disco, which was originally popularized by the homosexual community; Reggae, which came out of the Rastafarian cult and promotes its beliefs; etc., (Rom. 12:2; II Cor. 6:14-18; 10:12; ; Eph. 5:11; I Thess. 5:22; II Tim. 3:13; I Jn. 2:15-17; Rev. 3:15-16), 5) It should not cause a brother to stumble spiritually (Rom. 14:1-21; I Cor. 6:12), 6) It should not employ the use of worldly techniques (“scooping” of notes, singing “on top” of microphones to give the feeling of being right in someone’s face, etc., (I Jn. 2:15-17; James 4:4-5); etc. And while the majority of the world may disagree, I would clearly state here that music is NOT “amoral”-i.e. has no effect or morality of its own. It does. Music alone-without any lyrics-affects people, animals, plants, etc. This is an undeniable, documentable fact, supported by secular, as well as Christian musicians, musicologists, communication experts, & sociologists. It should be further pointed out that “good” words do not clean up music that is bad either musicologically, or because of its association with evil. The reason that is so, is that media experts tell us that a person communicates 58% of their message through facial expression, posture and gestures; 39% through the sound (i.e. inflection) of the voice, and only 3% through the actual words used! (cf. Rom. 13:14; Prov. 23:7; Mt. 15:18-19; II Tim. 2:2; and many of the earlier references). For additional help on the subject of music from a conservative viewpoint, see: “Music in the Balance,” by Dr. Frank Garlock & Kurt Woetzel (Majesty Music: Greenville, South Carolina, 1992); “Worship in the Melting Pot,” by Dr. Peter Masters (Metropolitan Tabernacle: London, England, 2003) “The Battle for Christian Music,” by Tim Fisher (Sacred Music Services: Greenville, South Carolina, 1992); “Rock: Making Musical Choices,” by Richard Peck (Bob Jones University Press: Greenville, SC, 1985); etc. In addition, an excellent six tape video series is available by Dr. Frank Garlock: “The Language of Music.” This series covers the entire subject thoroughly and interestingly (Majesty Music: Greenville, SC, 1992).

<sup>128</sup> e.g. “*Larnelle Harris ... He is featured at Billy Graham crusades, at the Crystal Cathedral in Garden Grove, California, where Robert Schuller is pastor, and for the charismatic TBN network. Michael Card visited last December (Dec. 2002). He has produced an album with Roman Catholic monk John Michael Talbot and has described the reconciliation between Catholics and Protestants that has occurred because of the album...*” (OBF Visitor, Dan Greenfield, March, 2003, p. 3). Note: The primary issue here is not even the type of music being sung, but the unbiblical ecumenical connections involved.

<sup>129</sup> rapidnet.com statement, forwarded by a GARBC pastor in a personal email dated 18 July, 2003.

<sup>130</sup> Personal letter from a supporting church pastor in Ohio, dated 04 July, 2003.

<sup>131</sup> For example: “*Some have said, ‘The miracles, signs, and wonders of the book of Acts were temporary. They served to authenticate the apostles until such time as the New Testament could be written. Now we have the completed Word of God, which erases the need for supernatural happenings.’ My response is this: If we have a completed revelation in written form, are we seeing at least as much advance for God’s kingdom, as many people coming to Christ, as many victories over Satan as those poor fellows who had to get along with just the Old Testament? If not, why not? Are we missing something valuable that they felt was essential?’” (Jim Cymbala, *Fresh Wind, Fresh Fire*. Zondervan Publishing House: Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1997, p. 147.); “*The absent element is what is expressed in the final sentence of the prayer recorded in Acts 4: ‘Stretch out our hand to heal and perform miraculous signs and wonders’ (v.30). What gains unbelievers’ attention and stirs the heart is seeing the gospel expressed in power. It takes**

In June, 2003, the GARBC Council of 18 voted to withdraw Cedarville's "Partnering" status, due to the fact that Cedarville in November, 2002 "...entered into a partnering relationship with the State Convention of Southern Baptists in Ohio." (i.e. the SBC considers that Cedarville reflects SBC viewpoints and they are now actively encouraging their young people to attend there).<sup>132</sup> In addition, there are now Southern Baptists on the Cedarville Board.<sup>133</sup> Final action on Cedarville was delayed due to political maneuvering by Cedarville supporters with the GARBC Council of Eighteen's decision to cut Cedarville loose from the GARBC put on hold due to a motion "from the conference floor" at their June, 2003 national meeting. A final vote was postponed until the following year's National GARBC meeting (June, 2004), ostensibly to allow all the "Messengers" from the churches to read and evaluate the present "Partnering" agreement and its requirements.<sup>134</sup> In reality, it was merely a move to stall while Cedarville supporters tried to thwart the Council of Eighteen's decision and recommended action. Finally in 2004 the vote was taken and Cedarville was dropped from the list of GARBC "Approved Schools," and deservedly so.

A revealing glimpse of the lack of willingness by many GARBC pastors to address the Cedarville issue biblically was well illustrated by the following incident which occurred at the state level (the OARBC) when they met to discuss the Cedarville issue during their yearly statewide meeting:

The state division of the GARBC (the Ohio Association of Regular Baptist Churches-OARBC) met in October 2003, and one of their discussion sessions was in regard to the Cedarville situation. According to a GARBC pastor who was an eyewitness, a council of 18 member explained to the men in a logical way why he voted against Cedarville. This witness then described in an email to me his

---

*more than academic rigor to win the world for Christ. Correct doctrine alone isn't enough. Proclamation and teaching aren't enough. God must be invited to 'confirm the word with signs following' (see Heb. 2:4)... The apostles prayed for God to do supernatural things... There was power in this faith... What we are dealing with today is an Old Testament 'vow religion' comprised of endless repetitions and commands to do all the right things... (Ibid, pp. 138-139). Cymbala also obviously has no problem with female pastors and evangelists, since he tells the story of one helping him to cast a demon out of a woman one night at his church: "I noticed off to my right a visiting evangelist I knew. I said to her, 'Amy, it's good to see you here tonight. Would you come help me pray for this young lady?' As she moved out of her seat, the Holy Spirit came upon her, and she sensed the same anticipation. We were suddenly both on 'red alert' for some unknown reason... We finally managed to subdue her. Amy, the evangelist, began to pray fervently..."(Ibid, pp. 109-110). Let me be clear here: I am not at all questioning the reality of demon possession in individuals today. But I do have a biblical problem with female evangelists and pastors (See Appendix 2).-mwe.*

<sup>132</sup> David Warren, formerly a Cedarville professor, and presently (2003) the State Representative of the OARBC (Ohio Association of Regular Baptist Churches), and a member of the GARBC Council of 18 stated it thusly in a June, 2003 email to Ohio's Regular Baptist pastors: "...Perhaps the business item most noteworthy to Ohioans was the decision of the Council of 18 to cease the partnering arrangement with Cedarville University. However a motion to delay this action for one year was passed, until the messengers can review the terms of the partnering arrangement for themselves. Feel free to request a copy of the 'Partnering Arrangement' from the GARBC website if you desire. [www.garbc.org](http://www.garbc.org)." (from a personal email from an OARBC pastor, received 30 June, 2003-copy on file).

<sup>133</sup> "This (partnering relationship between Cedarville and the SBC) ...was formalized in 11/02 during the 49<sup>th</sup> annual session of the (Southern Baptist) state convention when SBC messengers overwhelmingly approved the agreement and committed to recommend Cedarville to all 'Southern Baptists as an accredited, quality, four-year university that embraces Southern Baptists.'... 'we're thrilled with the alliance with Cedarville,' said Jack Kwok (executive director of the Ohio convention). 'Cedarville is a quality Baptist school. They wholeheartedly embrace Southern Baptists. A significant number of our pastors are Cedarville graduates. We're looking to them as a resource for future church leaders. They embrace our theology, our polity and our missiology. We would recommend Cedarville not only to Ohio Baptists, but all Southern Baptists.' Cedarville president Paul Dixon likewise voiced excitement for 'growing a relationship with Southern Baptists.'" (Feb. 2003, quoted in a personal email from an Ohio GARBC pastor, July, 2003-copy on file).

<sup>134</sup> A subsequent email from David Warren, the OARBC State Representative, enlarged on the problem as he sees it: "The Council of 18's principal objection to partnering with Cedarville was Cedarville's recent connection with the Southern Baptist Convention (see following footnotes for more information on the SBC-mwe). The conservative resurgents in the SBC are looking for conservative colleges in which to educate their young people. The Ohio SBC has no colleges in Ohio. Since their state meeting Nov., 2002, Ohio Southern Baptists now call Cedarville a partner and recommend it as a place to send their students; also Cedarville can now advertise in SBC publications and at SBC conferences. Although there has been a remarkable resurgence in conservative theology in the SBC over the past twenty years, there is still a liberal presence, seen most notably in SBC colleges. Their seminaries are controlled by the conservative-led national organization; whereas, their colleges are controlled by the more liberal state organizations. Therein lies the point of contention for the Council of 18. It becomes an issue over separation..."(E-Minute from Dave Warren, forwarded to me in an email received 18 July, 2003-copy on file).

impressions of what happened next: “*After that...the next ten or so people got up and talked about a lot of things, such as how good the SBC<sup>135</sup> has become, how Cedarville has always loved the SBC, how we shouldn’t be in the approval business and we ought to demand that we don’t have a partnering document, and so on and so forth.*”<sup>136</sup> The final speaker was... another GARBC council of 18 member who told...why he had to vote against Cedarville. He said he listened to all of the issues in the council meeting for a whole day, and... **‘It comes down to (the fact that) we have this statement on doctrine and practice and Cedarville won’t sign it.’ He said it was similar to someone wanting to join your church and (yet) not wanting to sign the doctrinal statement.**”<sup>137</sup>

- c. **Liberty University.** For over 30 years the late Jerry Falwell was the head of this well known Baptist school. His church and school is now connected with the Virginia Southern Baptists in an official fashion. LU has for many years had a wide range of new evangelical speakers. I would say that standards of morality and enforcement of codes of conduct there would perhaps be the lowest of any of the three schools listed here. Falwell proudly & publicly stated that they have more Southern Baptist speakers in chapel at Liberty, than from any other group. “In the September 15, 1989, issue of *the Sword of the Lord* (Falwell) is quoted as saying: ‘*Forty percent of the Liberty University student body comes from SBC churches. Scores of SBC pastors send their children here. More SBC pastors speak here at Thomas Road Baptist Church and Liberty University than from any other fellowship of churches, and I personally speak for more SBC churches than any other one movement.*’”<sup>138</sup>

For those not familiar with the Southern Baptist Convention, they would be quite similar to Australian Baptists in position and practice i.e. they have absolutely no hesitation in working in unbiblical ecumenical efforts such as Billy Graham’s crusades. In fact Billy Graham *is* a Southern Baptist! As of 1985 it was estimated that Southern Baptist churches had ordained 250 women, at least a dozen or more serving as pastors. At that date (1985) women accounted “...for about 21 percent of the students in the six Southern Baptist seminaries.”<sup>139</sup> However according to a recent SBC book they have now officially stated in their policy statement that they do not support or sanction women as pastors.

---

<sup>135</sup> **SBC = Southern Baptist Convention.** Their doctrine is often basically ok but they take no stand in regard to ecclesiastical or personal separation; they would typically have lower standards in such areas as music, dress, etc.; they would practice ecumenical evangelism; they have a number of women in the SBC who are ordained (see comments above under Liberty University); some of their churches would be sympathetic to the charismatic movement; a number of their colleges have liberals and apostates teaching in them and are virtually indistinguishable from secular universities [e.g. Baylor University]; etc).

<sup>136</sup> In my opinion, these kinds of comments show either a lack of understanding of the doctrine of separation as contained in the GARBC doctrinal statement & the GARBC position paper on that subject, or an unwillingness to uphold them. In light of today’s dominant philosophy of postmodernism-where statements are relative and can be bent to fit the need of the moment, and where truth is redefined to fit any situation-such comments are a basis for serious concern, since they betray an unwitting, or perhaps even conscious acceptance of such unbiblical thinking. One leader of a GARBC mission board recently commented to me that, “...the idea that a GARBC school would be affiliating with a “*convention*” again, when the GARBC was deliberately formed to get out from under a convention type of denominational hierarchy due to the problems inherent in it, is amazing!”

<sup>137</sup> Personal email correspondence, 26 October, 2003.

<sup>138</sup> *New-Neutrality*, op. cit., p. 93.

<sup>139</sup> Beale, op. cit., pp. 177-179.

## V. CONCLUDING THOUGHTS.<sup>140</sup>

### A. SOME DANGERS I SAW FOR INDEPENDENT, FUNDAMENTAL BAPTISTS IN PAPUA NEW GUINEA IN 2003:

1. **DIVISION OVER MINOR, SECONDARY ISSUES (UNBIBLICAL SCHISM).** (cf. Rom. 16:17; I Cor. 1:10; 3:1-6; 11:18; 12:12-27 (esp. v. 25); Eph. 4:11-13; Titus 3:9-11; etc). It often seems that we independent Baptists make one of two mistakes: Either we don't separate over important issues about which we should separate, or we do separate over unimportant, secondary issues which we shouldn't separate over! Under the second category which is properly and biblically called "*schism*" or "*division*," I would like to list what I consider to be a few examples below:
  - a. **The "KJV only" issue.** Brethren, feel free to hold your personal viewpoint. But this issue is *NOT* worthy of splitting churches over!
  - b. **Insistence on rebaptism of individuals.** I refer here to people who have been saved and immersed after salvation-but who simply weren't baptized by a Baptist pastor, or even worse, by the "*right*" Baptist group. To insist that someone be baptised over again even though they have been baptised by immersion after salvation, &/or to separate from others who won't agree with you on that point, I believe is once again, unbiblical schism.
  - c. **Blind, unquestioning loyalty to a particular Baptist mission organisation- regardless of whether they are biblical or not!** May we never forget that our first loyalty must be to God and His Word, not to a mission organisation!
  - d. **Extreme dress standards** (e.g. separating from another fundamental, independent Baptist church simply because those men don't wear long sleeve shirts and button their collars all the way to the top, etc). Brethren, it's good and praiseworthy to maintain high standards of dress and I would say a loud "Amen" to that, and I believe God is pleased with that. However to insist that everyone must dress *exactly* the way you do, or cut their hair *exactly* the way you cut yours, is not a matter of biblical separation. And to do so is once again, to practice unbiblical schism in my opinion.
2. **AN OVEREMPHASIS AND PREOCCUPATION WITH MORE EDUCATION.**

There is a strong desire among many pastors in PNG at present, to go outside the country for further academic training. That is not wrong, in and of itself. But I see some special dangers in doing so:

  - a. The individual might end up inadvertently going to a new evangelical school and thus be spoiled theologically, lose their convictions in moral & ethical areas, etc.
  - b. The individual may end up less able to effectively minister than before, due to either 1) becoming too "*intellectual*" or, 2) because they become "*Westernized*" to the point that they no longer relate well to their home culture of PNG.
  - c. The individual can develop pride because of his academic achievement. I Cor. 8:1 warns that "*knowledge puffeth up...*"
  - d. The individual could lose sight of what makes a man an effective preacher and pastor. (I Cor. 1:25-2:13).

3. **UNKNOWING ACCEPTANCE OF WORLDLY, MAN-CENTERED PHILOSOPHIES & TECHNIQUES FOR MINISTRY** (See IV. E. 7 earlier in this paper).
4. **AN UNHEALTHY OVER-RELIANCE ON MISSIONS, MISSIONARIES, AND OUTSIDE SOURCES FOR FUNDING, EQUIPMENT, SUPPORT, ETC.**
5. **MOVING FROM A FUNDAMENTALIST TO A NEW EVANGELICAL POSITION.**

---

<sup>140</sup> Note: These are simply my personal thoughts after having spent 19 years in Papua New Guinea. Please receive them in the spirit in which they are given: a genuine heartfelt love for Christ and a desire to see the work of God among independent Baptists in PNG go forward with great power and blessing in the months & years ahead!

**B. SOME UNIQUE OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE INDEPENDENT BAPTISTS OF PNG:**

1. **FORM A UNITED BIBLICAL VOICE ON ISSUES OF CRITICAL IMPORTANCE IN PNG.** There is a genuine need for us to publish pamphlets and place informative articles and statements in newspapers, as well as on radio and television, addressing a host of important issues such as the following:
  - a. **Moral Issues** (e.g. HIV & the present crude, ungodly, and bankrupt “*safe sex*” messages; immoral clubs/discos in major centres; what’s wrong with wife bashing; what’s wrong with gambling; answering liquor proponents; etc.)
  - b. **Economic Issues** (e.g. A biblical viewpoint enunciated on economics and the advantages of the free enterprise system & the bankruptcy of socialism/communism; personal responsibility vs. blame shifting; the importance of a strong, biblical work ethic; etc.)
  - c. **Educational Issues** (Educational reform vs. Christian education; the worthlessness of secular psychology; creationism as a credible scientific alternative to the atheistic theory of evolution; naturalism/humanism vs. theism in the school system; etc)
2. **ENCOURAGE EACH OTHER & WORK TOGETHER BETTER.**
3. **HOLD YEARLY OR BI-YEARLY LARGE RALLIES WITH QUALITY SPEAKERS, ADDRESSING IMPORTANT TOPICS** (e.g. Evangelism; Christ’s second coming; Seminars on cults such as the SDA’s, Mormons, JW’s, Islam, etc; Solid teaching on the family and marriage; the dangers of the Charismatic movement; etc.)
4. **IMPROVE THE DISCIPLESHIP OF & THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION OF CHURCH MEMBERS.**
5. **HOLD PASTORAL TRAINING SESSIONS THAT REALLY TRAIN MEN-AND TRAIN THEM BIBLICALLY!** (e.g. “*How to improve our preaching,*” “*Effective youth ministry,*” “*The pastor: his marriage and family life,*” etc.)
6. **CREATE &/or EXPAND AUDIO/VISUAL CAPABILITIES** (for outreach, teaching, etc)

## APPENDIX 1

### SUMMARY OF THE MAIN MARKS OF NEW EVANGELICALISM

- **A REPUDIATION OF SEPARATION.\***
- **A SUMMONS TO SOCIAL INVOLVEMENT.\***
- **A DETERMINATION TO ENGAGE IN THEOLOGICAL DIALOGUE WITH LIBERALS.\***
- **AN OVEREMPHASIS ON SECULAR SCHOLARSHIP AND RECOGNITION.\***
- **A LOWERED VIEW REGARDING SCRIPTURE.**  
(e.g. Acceptance of Higher Critical methods & conclusions, etc)
- **ACCEPTANCE OF IDEAS LIKE EVOLUTION, UNIVERSALISM, etc.**  
(i.e. that people can get to heaven in other ways than believing in Jesus Christ).
- **ABANDONMENT OF THE DOCTRINE OF INERRANCY.**
- **“NICENESS” ELEVATED OVER TRUTH AND DOCTRINE.**
- **CHANGES IN BIBLE INTERPRETATION METHODS TO MAKE THE BIBLE FIT IN WITH THE WORLD’S THINKING.**
- **A DROP IN MORAL STANDARDS AND CONVICTIONS.**
- **USE OF WORLDLY PHILOSOPHIES AND METHODOLOGIES.**
- **“CONTEXTUALIZATION” i.e. ADAPTION OF SCRIPTURE TO FIT INTO EACH CULTURE.**

\* - denotes the original marks of new evangelicalism at its inception, as stated by Harold Ockenga in 1948.

#### IMPORTANT REMINDER:

**A PERSON’S POSITION ON THE “KJV ONLY” ISSUE HAS ABSOLUTELY NOTHING TO DO WITH WHETHER OR NOT SOMEONE IS NEW EVANGELICAL!**

\*\*\*\*\*

#### TYPICAL PATTERN THAT CHURCHES, SCHOOLS & MISSION ORGANISATIONS FOLLOW WHEN THEY MOVE FROM FUNDAMENTALISM TO NEW EVANGELICALISM:

##### 1<sup>ST</sup> SIGNS OF A SHIFT TOWARDS NEW EVANGELICALISM:

1. Individuals, churches or missions *begin involving themselves in more ecumenical activities,*
2. Around the same time *personal and organizational moral standards often begin to shift and decline,*
3. *A lack of desire to speak out against disobedient new evangelical and liberal church leaders appears,*
4. *More of a concern over being nice, rather than being right,* begins to surface,
5. This shift is often aided by the individual, church, or mission’s *involvement with more secular and civic-oriented organizations, thus breaking down the natural wall between believers and unbelievers* (i.e. dialogue with unbelievers),
6. *An expanding emphasis on winning recognition in the eyes of others through advanced academic degrees and scholarly attainments,*
7. *An increased sympathy for, and use of, secular philosophies and methodologies in doing ministry.*

**LATER TRENDS TOWARDS NEW EVANGELICALISM** (Usually the following changes—which are more drastic and obvious—will not surface until the mission, school or church has drifted farther away from a fundamentalist position):

1. *Abandonment of belief in the doctrine of inerrancy.*
2. *Major reinterpretations of Scripture in order to fit in with the world and its philosophies* begin to appear.
3. *Abandonment of other foundational doctrines* such as: the creation of the universe by the direct act of God; the everlasting nature of hell; the exclusive nature of salvation through Christ alone by faith alone; etc., often accompany the hermeneutical (Bible interpretation) shifts.
4. **Final result:** A total change of viewpoint on even such fundamental doctrines as salvation (i.e. “*What is a Christian?*”). For instance new evangelicals like Stott, Colson, Bright, etc., boldly and publicly maintain that Roman Catholics are just as much Christians as evangelicals. Yet the RCC way of salvation via good works [i.e. seven sacraments], is totally contrary to salvation by grace alone through faith alone—the position such men claim to believe).

## APPENDIX 2

### **AN EXAMPLE OF NEW EVANGELICAL HERMENEUTICS: REINTERPRETATING THE BIBLE TO JUSTIFY FEMALE PASTORS... ...WITH A BIBLICAL REBUTTAL & SUPPLEMENTARY QUOTES**

J. Oswald Sanders is a very well-known and highly respected missionary statesman. So it is disappointing to see him cave in to the pressures of today's society and exaggerate and reinterpret Bible verses in order to be able to claim that ministry-wise, women should be able to do everything that men do. But Sanders does so in a book he has written, and he does so in a very convincing way. I wonder how many of us can see the flaws in his arguments? If, after reading his statements you are having trouble refuting him, you will then understand how so many former fundamentalists have been pulled over into the new evangelical camp. I will quote him extensively, before briefly refuting his statements<sup>141</sup>:

*“(Regarding I Tim. 2:12) ...in the Greek there is a present active verb here which can be translated, ‘I am not presently permitting a woman to teach or to have authority over men.’ Paul was apparently prohibiting those who were not properly instructed from teaching (sic)... When existing conditions are taken into consideration, we see that the restrictions Paul made were reasonable and necessary. But are they equally applicable in the cultural milieu of our own times? ...If men alone are appointed to positions where these gifts may be exercised, is the purpose of the Spirit’s gifts being frustrated and the church being impoverished? ‘The Spirit of God has expressly endowed some women in both the Old and New Testaments with powers of leadership, as though to show that He reserves this right, even though the vast majority of leaders have been men.’ Both the Bible (Old and New Testaments) and various accounts of church history (past and present) provide examples of godly women exercising a fruitful ministry in prophecy, administration, evangelism, and teaching. Where there is a wooden adherence to Pauline prohibitions in today’s changed situation, sterility and frustration very often result. On the other hand, the undoubted spiritual release and fruitfulness that has followed the ministry of such women as Catherine Booth, Ruth Paxson, Henrietta Mears, Geraldine Howard Taylor, Isabel Kuhn, and many others has to be accounted for if the negative interpretation is the correct one...In 1885, the China Inland Mission opened centers on the populous Kwang Sin River that were conducted by single women. Thirty years later there was a complete chain of ten central stations, sixty outstations, over, 2,200 communicants, and large numbers of enquirers, pupils in schools, etc... Those ladies were still the only foreign missionaries alongside the native pastors, whom they had trained...*

*If it is objected, ‘But we must go by Scripture and not by experience,’ the objection is valid. But we must make sure that we have rightly interpreted Scripture... Priscilla... appears to have been more dynamic than her husband Aquila, but together they functioned as a husband-wife pastoral team... That she exercised a teaching ministry is explicitly cited in Scripture (Acts 18:26), for she and her husband took the eloquent Apollos to their home and thoroughly explained the way of God... Junias... was stated to be a woman by both Chrysostom and Theophylact. Ancient commentators concluded that Andronicus and Junias were a married couple...Although there is no absolute certainty, there are reasonable grounds for regarding Junias as an apostle in the limited sense (!)... In I Corinthians 14:3, he specifies (prophesying’s) nature and function... Would it not be strange for Paul to permit women to exercise the higher gift of prophecy, yet forbid the less important gift of teaching? ...All these scriptural passages, when taken together, comprise a good case for maintaining that the command to keep silence in the early church was not absolute... ‘That some women today have a gift for teaching and applying the Bible can hardly be denied...Prima facie, then, (it’s a fact then, that) God intends some women to teach and preach.’ ...In the light of what has been written, Paul appears to accord to women a satisfying, if not dominant role in the realms of prayer, teaching, evangelizing, and administration. As stated earlier, there is no scriptural precedent for women holding a dominant role in leadership or in theology. But in his administration of the universal church and the execution of the Great Commission, the Holy Spirit has given a much wider scope of ministry to women than is usually accorded to them in our churches.”<sup>142</sup>*

#### **REBUTTAL:**

1. His appeal to the verb tense and his retranslation (i.e. “*presently*”) in I Tim. 2:12 is forced and contrived. I consulted 15 different translations in two different languages. **NONE** of them gave a reading other than one which completely forbids women to teach or lead in the church! **Not one of them had a reading remotely resembling, or even hinting at Sanders’ rendering-even the most liberal paraphrases!** The translations I consulted ranged all the way from conservative “word for word” (formal correspondence) translations, such as the KJV, NKJV, NASV & ESV, to loose paraphrases such as The Living Bible, NT-Easy to Read Version, & The Amplified NT, as well as and “dynamic equivalence” versions like The NIV & The New English Bible. In addition, the wording in both existing Pidgin translations (*Buk Baibel*-PNG Bible Society & *King Jems Nupela*

<sup>141</sup> underlining added.

<sup>142</sup> “*Paul the Leader*,” by J. Oswald Sanders. Navpress: Colorado Springs, Colorado, 1984, pp. 165-171.

Testamen-Bearing Precious Seed Ministries) totally bar women from any pastoral/teaching ministry in the church, as do several other versions, including the Roman Catholic Challoner-Rheims Bible.<sup>143</sup> A comparison of the Greek via The Greek Interlinear Bible completely supports this viewpoint, transliterating the verse: “*but a woman to teach I do not allow, nor to exercise authority over man, but to be in quietness*”<sup>144</sup>

2. Sanders in his book lists some cultural absurdities saying that such practices explain why Paul forbade women from being leaders in the churches in NT times. But he then asks rhetorically, “*But are they (i.e. such restrictions) equally applicable in the cultural milieu of our own times?*” What’s he really saying? **That since our culture is different than the one that existed in NT times, consequently Paul’s command doesn’t apply to us today!** That argument is used simply to get rid of biblical commands or principles that Christians today don’t wish to obey. On the contrary, Paul never said, “*Because of our backward, first-century culture, women are not to preach.*”! The command was clear, and intended to be permanent.
3. **Sanders also says that if women can’t preach, then the purpose of the Spirit’s gifts is frustrated. It is NOT frustrated!** Women can and should teach and exercise their gifts-but in the right situations and to the correct audiences. Gifted women can speak to other women; can teach children and young people, etc. The wife of the recently retired senior pastor in one of our supporting churches in America has had a very fruitful ministry with and among women across the United States and even overseas, for more than four decades! But it is a ministry among women, not to men! She is using the gift the Spirit has given her, in a biblical way!
4. Sanders apparently realizes that **he is arguing for women in ministry on the basis of experience rather than Scripture**, and he acknowledges as much. In appealing to experience and anecdotal illustrations, he is no different in his reasoning than Mormons, Charismatics, Roman Catholics, and other religions and cults who justify themselves and their practices on the basis of results &/or experiences. It is an argument from pragmatism (i.e. whatever works must be ok) and is unbiblical. In Romans 3:8 Paul condemns such an “end justifies the means” philosophy. Instead, in another place he highly commended the Bereans for their practice of carefully checking his teaching to see if it was biblical or not (Acts 17:11). Please note that the Bereans didn’t determine if Paul was an apostle by what they saw, or whether or not it appeared that God was “*using*” Paul in a special way (i.e. it wasn’t based on whether or not people were getting healed, “*coming to Christ,*” etc). No, their basis for determining right and wrong was the Bible and the Bible alone! (cf. Isa. 8:20)
5. **Sanders also subtly chastises those who would appeal to Scripture as the final authority on this issue, implying that such individuals do not know how to interpret Scripture correctly** (“...*but we must make sure that we have rightly interpreted Scripture...*”). In actual fact, it appears that **he** is the one who is guilty of misinterpreting and misrepresenting Scripture! He labels Priscilla & Aquila a “*husband-wife pastoral team.*” However there is no biblical basis for such a statement. His comment that Priscilla “...*appears to be more dynamic than her husband...*” is without any genuine support. And the fact that the two of them sat Apollos down and privately straightened out some of his faulty theology, has absolutely no bearing on the issue of whether women can preach or pastor. If my wife and I were to hear a traveling evangelist preaching in the National Park in Goroka, and we noticed that a few of his statements were not quite correct biblically, we might feel led to invite him over to our house for lunch & have a private chat with him in order to give him some suggestions and personal criticisms. That would in NO way imply that my wife could be a preacher!
6. Concerning the need to follow good principles of Bible interpretation, it appears that **Sanders himself has not done his homework thoroughly, &/or is only giving partial information in regard to Junias** (Rom. 16:7). He states that since two early church writers said Junias was female, and he assumes Andronicus and Junias were a husband and wife team, therefore the issue is settled. Not so fast! Bible teacher Dr. Gil Rugh has pointed out that a group of college students did a computer search for the name “*Junias*” in all of the Greek documents existing from the 9<sup>th</sup> century B.C. up through the 5<sup>th</sup> century A.D. What they found was very interesting. The name Junias occurs only three times in all of that Greek literature, apart from the mention of the name in Romans 16! Two of those references state that Junias was a woman. The other one says he was a man! A fourth reference is found in a Latin (not Greek) manuscript containing the early church father Origen’s comments on Romans 16. In that manuscript Origen also states that Junias was a man. So two sources say Junias was a man and two say Junias was a woman! The obvious conclusion: We really don’t know! As for the statement that Andronicus and Junias were “...*outstanding among the apostles*”, Rugh points out that

<sup>143</sup> The translations I consulted were: The King James Version (KJV), The New King James Version (NKJV), The New American Standard Version (NASV), The English Standard Version (ESV), The New International Version (NIV), The Contemporary English Version (CEV), The Living Bible, The Amplified New Testament, The New Testament: Easy-to-Read Version, The New English Bible-NT, Buk Baibel, The King James Nupela Testamen, The Challoner-Rheims Version, The Interlinear Greek-English New Testament, & even the (JW) New World Translation of the Holy Scriptures.

<sup>144</sup> Interlinear Greek-English New Testament, Baker Book House: Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1978 reprint of 1897 edition.



can mean that either they were outstanding apostles, or that they were outstanding in the eyes of the apostles. There is nothing conclusive in that. In addition, most believers are aware that the term translated “*apostle*,” like the term *deacon*, is sometimes used in a general, sense and other times to refer to a specific office.<sup>145</sup> So that is inconclusive as well. As to who Andronicus and Junias were, some (especially feminists & advocates of women preachers) believe Andronicus and Junias were a husband and wife team like Priscilla and Aquila. But in Romans 16:12 we have two names used together in a similar fashion, both of whom are women. So obviously two people of the same sex could and sometimes were listed together. So Andronicus and Junias could have even been two men! We really don’t know.

7. **THE KEY POINT TO LEARN FROM ALL THIS:** “*If you’re going to build your doctrine of the role of a woman, you don’t build it on people like “Phoebe,” “Priscilla & Aquila,” “Junias,” etc. You don’t build your theology on passages that are (simply) giving a greeting to someone (especially someone) that we don’t even know if they are male or female!! Instead, we must go to the passages that address that subject, such as I Cor. 11 & 14; I Tim. 2; Titus 2; Eph. 5 & I Pet. 3.”*<sup>146</sup> Unfortunately feminists and their supporters do not spend much time in those passages, since they give no support to the idea that women are allowed to be pastors, preachers and evangelists!
8. **Sanders appeals to women in the Old & New Testaments who allegedly had “powers of leadership” -but none of those women were pastors, preachers, priests, or anything similar!** Deborah in the book of Judges worked alongside a weak leader named Barak-but that is a far cry from a woman in spiritual ministry! Please be reminded that **being a political leader in OT times was not equivalent in any way to being a leader in the church**-a spiritual body which didn’t come into existence until New Testament times! Being a political leader wasn’t even equal to being involved in spiritual ministry in Old Testament times, when worship centered first around the Tabernacle in the wilderness, then later at the Temple in Jerusalem. In fact, women were forbidden from serving as priests in Old Testament times (cf. Lev. 8-9; etc) viii) Sanders’ reference to I Cor. 14 likewise does not stand up under scrutiny, since in that context, women are forbidden both to speak in tongues and to prophesy (14:34).
9. No one denies “...*that some women have a gift for teaching and applying the Bible...*” Virtually everybody acknowledges that fact! That is a “*straw man*” argument. And to say that because some women are gifted in teaching God’s word that consequently they must serve as pastors and teachers is a “*non sequitur*” i.e. a conclusion which does not follow. It *especially* does not follow when all the major passages in the New Testament that deal with the role of women in both the church and the home directly oppose such a viewpoint! It is thus shown to be completely false!
10. Finally, Sanders seriously over-exaggerates the situation when he says “*Paul appears to accord to women a satisfying, if not dominant role in the realms of prayer, teaching, evangelizing, and administration.*”<sup>147</sup> Such a statement is patently false, as any serious examination of Scripture will reveal.

**Here I would like to include some comments on the subject of women preachers and pastors by two well-known pastors & Bible teachers: Dr. Gil Rugh and Dr. John MacArthur. I think the reader will find their comments extremely enlightening and helpful:**

**Dr. Gil Rugh, Pastor of Indian Hills Community Church, Lincoln, Nebraska:**<sup>148</sup>

*“...we do not realize our potential in glorifying God as He intended, unless we function as He intended us to function... Deborah and Huldah (in the OT) were prophetesses, but they were not allowed to be teachers of the people, because that was the role of the priests, and no women were allowed to be priests!*

*“...To be a “Christian feminist” is to deny and distort Scripture ... (in regard to the command for women to keep silent in church in I Cor. 14) they say there were arguments back and forth across the church aisle. They say it’s cultural. But*

<sup>145</sup> “*Apostolos* is, lit., one sent forth (*apo*, from, *stello*, to send). The word is used of the Lord Jesus to describe His relation to God, Heb. 3:1; see John 17:3. The twelve disciples chosen by the Lord...Paul... ‘The word has also a wider reference. In Acts 14:4, 14, it is used of Barnabas as well as of Paul; in Rom. 16:7 of Andronicus and Junias. In 2 Cor. 8:23 two unnamed brethren are called “apostles of the churches;” in Phil. 2:25 Ephaphroditus is referred to as “your apostle.” It is used in I Thess. 2:6 of Paul, Silas and Timothy, to define their relation to Christ.” (W.E. Vine, “*Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words*”. [Fleming H. Revell Company: Old Tappan, NJ, 1966 ed.], p. 63). Missionaries have often been referred to in sermons, etc., as “apostles” or “sent ones”, since they are sent out by local churches to other countries and peoples with the gospel.

<sup>146</sup> Information and quotes taken from a sermon on Romans 16 preached by Dr. Gil Rugh, pastor, Indian Hills Community Church, Lincoln, Nebraska. (Sound Words: Lincoln, Nebraska, 1990).

<sup>147</sup> Sanders, op. cit., p. 171.

<sup>148</sup> I personally transcribed the statements quoted here from a tape of a sermon preached by Dr. Rugh.

*Paul says (14:34), 'just as the law says!' Now we don't find a verse that has that law per se, but if we look at I Peter 3:5-6 Peter says that the Old Testament taught that godly women were to be quiet and submissive and then it gives Sarah as an example. Paul concludes then in 14:37 (by saying) 'if you're spiritual you'll do what I say!'*

*"...(regarding I Tim. 2:10 it says) 'she is to receive instruction with all submissiveness.' The twisting of the meaning of the words here (are) just that-twisting! (These) were not culturally-based teachings, but theological and creative (i.e. based on): a) the order of creation, & b) the fall (woman led in it)..."*

*"Someone may say, 'yeah, but in Titus 2:3 it says women are to teach what is good, so I Timothy 2 doesn't apply to us today!' But the first rule of Bible interpretation is, CONTEXT DETERMINES MEANING. Please note that that's not the end of the sentence (in Titus 2:3)! It says, 'older women are to...teach younger women... to love their husbands and children, etc. (In other words, it does not refer to women teaching and preaching at all!)..."*

*"OT priests could ONLY be men..."*

*"In I Corinthians 11 (it teaches that)...man does not originate from woman, but woman from man. The order of Genesis 2 is KEY, which is why feminists often reject Genesis chapter two! ... (this passage also makes clear that)...there should be a recognizable difference between a man's and a woman's hair style ...(Paul concludes in 11:16) ... 'this is the way it is. There is nothing to debate. All the churches practice this.' ...In conclusion, **we don't build our doctrine from the greetings in Romans 16.**"<sup>149</sup>*

**Dr. John MacArthur makes some excellent observations to Old & New Testament prophetesses, etc:**

**"IN THE OLD TESTAMENT..."**

*"...Although women shared spiritual equality with men in the Old Testament, they did not have the same role...They did not serve as leaders...Deborah was a judge who acted primarily in the role of an arbiter, not as an ongoing leader. That explains why she called on Barak when needing military leadership against the Canaanites (Judg. 4-5) Queen Athaliah was a usurper and not a legitimate ruler (2 Kings 11).*

***"There is no mention of women priests in the Old Testament. As far as we know, no woman wrote any portion of the Old Testament... They had no ongoing prophetic ministry...such as that of Elisha or Elijah.***

*"There are five women in the Old Testament who are referred to as prophetesses. Miriam (Ex. 15:20). Perhaps she is called a prophetess because she gives a brief revelation in verse 21. We know of no other occasion when she acted in the prophetic office ...Deborah is described as a prophetess in Judges 4:4 because she was used by God to give a direct revelation to Barak. We know of no other occasion when she engaged in ongoing prophetic work ...Huldah gave revelation from God to Hilkiah the priest and other men about the coming judgment on Jerusalem and Judah (2 Kings 22:14-22; 2 Chron. 34:22-28). There is no other recorded instance of her speaking as a prophetess ...Noadiah was a false prophetess who opposed the work of Nehemiah in rebuilding the walls of Jerusalem (Neh. 6:14) ...Isaiah's wife is called a prophetess in Isaiah 8:3 because she gives birth to a child whose name had prophetic meaning. There is no record of her speaking a prophecy. This passage (clearly) indicates that the word prophetess can be used in a general way..."*

**"IN THE NEW TESTAMENT..."**

*"... The spiritual equality of men and women is declared in Galatians 3:28... In the context of Galatians 3, the oneness spoken of here is the oneness of salvation. That is clear from verses 13-27. Paul's point is that all people-Jews and Gentiles, slaves and free men, men and women-have equal access to the salvation that is in Christ. **The passage has nothing to do with the role of women in the church, nor does it teach that all differences are eliminated among Christians.** A Jewish person did not cease to be Jewish when he became a Christian, and slaves did not automatically become free men. Some distinctions were retained... (Women) did not serve as leaders.*

***"There is no record in the New Testament of a woman apostle, pastor, teacher, evangelist, or elder. The New Testament does not record any sermon or teaching by a woman***

***"...(women) did not have an ongoing prophetic role. Some argue that the daughters of Philip prophesied (Acts 21:9). However, they are not referred to as prophets, nor is there any indication of how often they prophesied. They may have spoken on only one occasion, as Deborah and Miriam apparently did in the Old Testament. The New***

---

<sup>149</sup> Rugh, op. cit.

*Testament records other occasions when women spoke the word of God. **Mary**, the mother of Jesus speaks the Word of God in Luke 1:46-55.*

*“First Corinthians 11:5 says that women who prophesy are to have their heads covered. Acts 2:17 speaks of women prophesying. The Greek word translated ‘prophesy’ simply means ‘to speak forth’ or ‘to proclaim.’ There are times and places when women speak the word of God, but that is distinctly different from being identified as a pastor, teacher, elder, evangelist, or apostle.”<sup>150</sup>*

---

<sup>150</sup> “*God’s High Calling for Women*,” by Dr. John MacArthur, Jr. Moody Press: Chicago, Illinois, 1987, pp. 26-29.

## SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, Jay E. *The Big Umbrella and other Essays on Christian Counseling*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1972.
- Ashbrook, John E. *Axioms of Separation*. Mentor: Here I Stand Books, 1989?
- \_\_\_\_\_. *New Neutralism II*. Mentor: Here I Stand Books, 1992.
- Beale, David O. *In Pursuit of Purity, American Fundamentalism since 1850*. Greenville: Unusual Publications, 1986.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *S.B.C. – House on the Sand?* Greenville: Unusual Publications, 1985.
- Billingsley, Lloyd. *The Generation That Knew Not Josef*. Portland: Multnomah Press, 1985.
- Bobgan, Martin & Deidre. *Missions and Psychoheresy*. Santa Barbara: EastGate Publishers, n.d.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Prophets of Psychoheresy II*. Santa Barbara: EastGate Publishers, 1990.
- Chilton, David. *Productive Christians in an Age of Guilt Manipulators*. Tyler: Institute for Christian Economics, 1985.
- Custer, Stewart. *Does Inspiration Demand Inerrancy?* Nutley: The Craig Press, 1968.
- Cymbala, Jim. *Fresh Wind, Fresh Fire*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1997.
- Fisher, Tim. *The Battle for Christian Music*. Greenville: Sacred Music Services, 1992.
- Garlock, Frank & Kurt Woetzel. *Music in the Balance*. Greenville: Majesty Music, 1992.
- Gilley, Gary E. “*I Just Wanted More Land-Jabez.*” Fairfax: Xulon Press, 2001.
- Guinness, Os. *Dining with the Devil*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1993.
- Kilpatrick, William Kirk. *The Emperor’s New Clothes*. Westchester: Crossway Books, 1985.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Psychological Seduction*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1983.
- Lloyd-Jones, D. Martyn. *Knowing the Times*. Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1989.
- Lindsell, Harold. *The Battle for the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1976.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Free Enterprise: A Judeo-Christian Defense*. Wheaton: Tyndale House Publishers, 1982.
- MacArthur, John F. Jr. *Ashamed of the Gospel*. Wheaton: Crossway Books, 1993.
- Machen, J. Gresham. *Christianity and Liberalism*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1923.
- Masters, Peter. *Are We Fundamentalists?* London: Sword and Trowel, 1995.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Stand For the Truth*. London: Sword and Trowel, 1996, revised edition.
- Moritz, Fred. *Be Ye Holy*. Greenville: Bob Jones University Press, 1994.
- Murray, Iain H. *D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones-The Fight of Faith*. Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1990.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Evangelicalism Divided*. Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 2000.
- Rugh, Gil. *Psychology, The Trojan Horse*. Lincoln: Indian Hills Community Church, 1995.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Reversing the Reformation: The Catholic/Evangelical Accord Examined*. Lincoln: Indian Hills, 1994.

- Pickering, Ernest. *Biblical Separation-The Struggle for a Pure Church*. Schaumburg: Regular Baptist Press, 1979.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Tragedy of Compromise*. Greenville: Bob Jones University Press, 1994.
- Playfair, William L., M.D. *The Useful Lie*. Wheaton: Crossway Books, 1991.
- Quebedeaux, Richard. *The Young Evangelicals*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1974.
- Sanders, J. Oswald. *Paul the Leader*. Colorado Springs: NavPress, 1984.
- Schaeffer, Francis A. *The Great Evangelical Disaster*. Westchester: Crossway Books, 1984.
- Schaeffer, Franky. *Bad News for Modern Man*. Westchester: Crossway Books, 1984.
- Swindoll, Charles R. *The Grace Awakening*. Dallas: Word Publishing, 1990.
- Wells, David F. *No Place for Truth*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1993.
- Van Gelderen, John R. *A Heartbeat for Holiness*. Woodridge: Preach the Word Ministries, 1996.
- Vine, W. E. *Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words*. Old Tappan: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1966 ed.

## PERIODICALS AND PAMPHLETS

- Ashbrook, John E. "Separation from Apostasy." Columbus: Ohio Bible Fellowship, c. 1975
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Separation from Brethren." Columbus: Ohio Bible Fellowship, 1975.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Thirty Years of New Evangelicalism." Columbus: Ohio Bible Fellowship, c. 1976.
- CBF Exec. Council. "Staff Manual." Campus Bible Fellowship. Cleveland: Baptist Mid-Missions, 1981.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "GARBC Partnering Network Questionnaire." General Assoc. of Regular Baptist Churches, 2003.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Position of the General Association of Regular Baptist Churches on Separation." Schaumburg: General Association of Regular Baptist Churches, n.d.
- Gothard, Bill. "The Testimony of Scripture Regarding Dancing." Oak Brook: Institute in Basic Life Principles, 1989.
- Jackson, Paul R. "The Position, Attitudes, and Objectives of Biblical Separation." Schaumburg: General Association of Regular Baptist Churches, n.d.
- Masters, Peter. "Worship in the Melting Pot: Brass, Strings & Percussion." London: Sword & Trowel, 1998, No. 4.
- Mohr, L. Eugene. "Where Do New-Evangelicals Stand?" Christian Accent, 1976.
- Pickering, Ernest. "Holding Hands with the Pope." Decatur: Baptist World Mission, 1994.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Should Fundamentalists and Evangelicals Seek Closer Ties?" Baptist Bulletin reprint, n.d.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Should We Ever Separate From Christian Brethren?" Decatur: Baptist World Mission, n.d.
- Tassell, Paul N. "Information Bulletin on New Evangelicalism." Schaumburg: Regular Baptist Press, Sept., 1981.
- Tucker, Ruth. "Mormons Moving Into the Mainstream." The Christian Institute of Mormon Studies, 1991.
- Veith, Gene Edward. "Whose Mind Needs Opening?" Ashville: WORLD, 14 Oct., 2000.
- Wagner, Charles. "From the President." Northwest Focus, Tacoma: Northwest Baptist Seminary, 1980.