

106. SEPARATION FROM NEW EVANGELICAL ERRORS

Aim: To show that the Bible commands believers to separate from errors such as are in the New Evangelical movement in order to preserve the holiness and effectiveness of local churches.

We must warn believers to reject and separate from these errors.

Bible Reading:

a) "Now I beseech you, brethren, **mark** them which **cause divisions and offences contrary** to the **doctrine** which you have learned; and **AVOID them.**"

Romans 16:17.

What are we commanded to do about disobedient brethren? AVOID THEM! That is separation.

b) "Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye **WITHDRAW yourselves** from every brother that **walketh disorderly**, and not after the **tradition** which he received from us."

II Thessalonians 3:6

c) "**Proving** what is **acceptable unto the Lord**. And **have no fellowship** with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather **REPROVE** them."

Ephesians 5:10,11.

d) "I (Paul) **withstood** him (Peter) to the face because **he was to be blamed.**"

Galatians 2:11-13.

e) "If any man teach otherwise, and **consent not to wholesome words**, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the **doctrine which is according to godliness**; he is proud,...**FROM SUCH WITHDRAW THYSELF.**"

I Timothy 6:3-5.

Introduction: 'Speaking the truth in love' (Ephesians 4:15) is how we should approach people who hold wrong doctrinal positions. Many of us who hold true doctrines previously believed some false doctrines. We wanted people to tell us the truth in a kind way. We are all on a learning curve and we must be patient and loving to those who believe error. "The servant of the Lord must not strive; but be gentle unto all men, apt to teach, patient, in meekness instructing those that oppose themselves; if God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth." 2 Timothy 2:24,25.

This chapter teaches that:

a) **Pastors** should not affiliate their churches with other churches or groups that believe false doctrines.

b) **Individual believers** should not join or support churches that teach false doctrines. If you do, you will help them spread their errors and God will hold you accountable.

c) **God's work will grow faster** if we separate from churches teaching error and support a church that teaches true doctrines. If we join up with churches teaching error, numbers initially may appear larger, but multiplication of quality disciples will not take place and future growth will be of poorer quality.

d) We should **reprove (point out the errors of) those who believe false doctrines** so they may escape Satan's snare, bear fruit for Christ, and stop spreading error. Ephesians 5:11.

The New Evangelical disobeys God's command to separate from apostasy.

God says, 'Come out.' **New Evangelism** says, 'No, we will remain in a group with false doctrines, we will infiltrate it, we will associate with it, we will dialogue with it.'

If this be correct, then we have no defence against error.

Illustration 1: At the end of WWII my father, along with many fellow soldiers were told at the New Guinea airport to board one of two aeroplanes to fly them back to Australia. While

in the air, my father noticed that the other plane had changed course by a very small angle and was becoming further away until it passed out of sight. After several hours of flying, the plane on which my father was travelling safely landed at the Australian airport. The other plane which had drifted slightly off course was never seen again. It crashed in the sea, killing all those men on board.

What started as a small change in direction, later on resulted in the plane being hundreds of miles off course, running out of fuel and many men's death.

So it is with the New Evangelical movement which started in 1948 by Harold Ockenga who wanted to work with those having false doctrines. Today it has culminated in many false doctrines invading mainstream churches, so that many once-strong soul-winning fundamental churches have been polluted by error and worldliness, leading to splits and the death of a strong Bible-based testimony.

Illustration 2: Everybody has a fence around their home or farm, because it defines the borders of their property. If all boundary fences were torn down, things would go on fairly well for the generation who knew where the fences used to be. However, future generations, who never knew where the fence used to be, would have trouble and constant fights over what was the right boundary.

'Remove not the ancient landmark.' Proverbs 22:28.

New Evangelicalism's founding fathers (Harold Ockenga and Billy Graham) tore down the fences and **today's generation can't even remember where they were.**

We need to rebuild the fences, so that our churches know right from wrong, and are protected from the creeping influence of false doctrines. We pastors and workers must impress on our people the principles of separation from error.

Question 1: Is separation from error really that important?

What if we don't preach or train our people to separate from error?

Answer: Then II John 8 will result: "Look to yourselves, that we lose not those things which we have wrought; but that we receive a full reward."

If we fail to practise Biblical separation from error:

- 1) We will lose our **life's work**, that is strong Bible preaching fundamental churches; and
- 2) We will lose our **heavenly rewards.**

Question 2: Do we have to rebuke believers who hold error?

Can't we just keep quiet and love them?

Answer: When the apostle Peter defected in doctrine and practice by refusing to eat with Gentile believers fearing those of the circumcision, Paul said:

'I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed.' (Galatians 2:11-13). The sad result of Peter's **weakness** and **compromise with error** was that other Jews, as well as Barnabas **followed his example**. If Paul had not had the courage to publicly rebuke Peter, then Peter's error may have split the church for the next 2000 years. If we **condone error by our silence, we aid its spreading**. We must reprove believers who hold to error: "And have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather **reprove** them." (Ephesians 5:11).

It is wrong to treat apostate churches as if they are the same as fundamental churches. Some things, such as disagreements in politics, marriage and business, may be solved by compromise. On the other hand, there are some truths and convictions which cannot be compromised. **Martin Luther** refused to renounce his writings and said to his opponents: 'Here I stand, I can do no other.'

Athanasius, who successfully argued the complete deity of Christ against the Aryans who denied it, was warned by a colleague: 'The whole world is against you.'

Athanasius replied, 'Then I am against the whole world.'

He would not compromise on so crucial a matter.

Two areas in which we are to separate are:

- 1) Personal separation from the works of the flesh and yield to the filling of the Holy Spirit;
- 2) Separation as a **church** from disobedient brethren (I Corinthians 5:5-13), apostate churches and denominations holding or endorsing false doctrines (II John 7-11).

Separation is the doctrine which stands at the cross-roads between Fundamentalism and New Evangelicalism. Why?

'Know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump?' (I Corinthians 5:6).

I. WOLVES IN SHEEPS' CLOTHING: THE FUNDAMENTALIST-MODERNIST CONTROVERSY

Jesus warned us to: 'Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves.' (Matthew 7:15).

Paul warned 'that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock.' (Acts 20:29).

Wolves looking like sheep will creep in (Jude 4) with subtlety and stealth, to infiltrate churches, and hence would greatly impede the progress of the gospel. This is one of Satan's chief devices.

Poison from Europe (1600-1900). Unbelieving scholars in England and Europe, such as Voltaire, Rousseau, Kant, Darwin and the Jesuits, taught philosophies which undermined Biblical Christianity and led to the great apostasy which overwhelmed many churches.

For example, Evolution arose to try to explain away God's existence as Creator.

German philosophers, such as Hegel, tried to remove religious thought from being absolute to being tentative. Out of this came the movement known as modernism, now referred to as theological liberalism, the key beliefs being:

- 1) A rejection of Biblical inspiration and **inerrancy**.
- 2) A **tolerance of all views** within the religious community.
- 3) An emphasis on the superiority of **human experience** over the revealed word of God (Schleiermacher).
- 4) A denial of the absolute **Deity of Christ**.
- 5) Emphasising the dignity and **goodness of man**.
- 6) Rejecting the **sinfulness of man** and rejecting the necessity of the new birth.
- 7) Origin of all things by **evolution** rather than by creation.
- 8) Rejection of supernatural intervention of God in history, eg: **miracles, resurrection, providence,...**
- 9) Emphasis on the **social gospel**, that the main mission of the church is to correct social ills. They say that sin is socially caused by a bad environment and salvation involves correcting social problems. Established denominations and theological colleges took in these liberal views, claiming that because times have changed since Christ and that for Christianity to be successful, the gospel must change also. They claimed that the Gospel message must be changed to suit modern man. Because liberals gained control of decision making in denominations, they were able to quickly spread their doctrines, so that I Timothy 4:1 was fulfilled: "Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall **depart from the faith**, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils."

1. LIBERALISM CHALLENGED

God raised many warriors to defend the historic Christian faith, such as Schofield, and W.B.Riley who published 'the Fundamentals' in 1910, in which great Christian scholars

wrote articles on the inspiration of Scripture, resurrection of Christ, virgin birth of Christ, His blood atonement, etc.

People believing these truths became known as Fundamentalists.

In 1919, some fundamentalist leaders formed the World Christian Fundamentalist Association, with **W.B.Riley** as its first president.

Tremendous controversies took place as fundamentalists struggled to expose and oppose Bible-denying modernists who were sapping the life from churches.

J.Gresham Machen led the protest in the US Presbyterian Church against rising liberalism. The result was that Bible believing professors left Princeton Seminary to form another seminary. Many Baptist churches left the liberal Northern Baptist Convention to join the General Association of Regular Baptists (GARB).

J.Frank Norris challenged the apostasy in the Southern Baptist Convention, as did other men in Congregational and Methodist churches. Those men were ridiculed in the media, but they were true to Christ and His Word. They could say: 'I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith.' (II Timothy 4:7).

The Christian life is truly a fight. These men were fighting Fundamentalists.

2. DEVELOPING THE ART OF FENCE SITTING

The 1920s and 1930s saw many great battles between fundamentalism and modernism. The future of churches, colleges, seminaries and mission boards was at stake. Many Bible believers had poured their lives into churches and didn't want them to fall into the hands of the enemies of truth.

As the battle went on, some became weary of it, and did not want to be 'fighting fundamentalists.'

They thought it was time for a new approach, and out of this came 'New Evangelicalism.'

SIX FACTORS THAT CAUSED A RISE IN NEW EVANGELICALISM

1. A reaction against perceived negativism of some fundamentalists.

Early New Evangelical leaders greatly emphasised the claim that Fundamentalists were too much 'against' and not enough 'for.' Their plea was "let's be positive and not negative." This is not Biblical. Scripture is both positive and negative. It is **for** some things and **against** others. We must strive for that same balance.

2. A desire to be accepted by the scholarly world.

Many young Fundamentalist scholars were viewed as deficient intellectually because they believed the Bible, so they adjusted their views to please the intellectual unbelieving leaders of the day.

Paul had people facing the same temptation.

"Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ." (Colossians 2:8).

The desire to be intellectually respectable in the eyes of a Godless world, has ruined many a promising scholar. Why do believers think they need the support of unbelievers to do God's work?

3. The influence of training in liberal unbelieving colleges. A man generally reflects the philosophy of the schools he trained in. Many young Fundamentalist scholars studied in liberal colleges under unbelieving lecturers. They considered it a broadening experience and as a result many made shipwreck of their faith.

What some people feel is their mind broadening is only their conscience stretching.

'Cease my son, to hear the instruction that causeth to err from the words of knowledge.' (Proverbs 19:27).

4. **The spirit of the age** where dogmatism was becoming a hated concept. There was a call for openness to tolerate and accept many false viewpoints.
5. **Criticism that Fundamentalists lacked a concern for social action.** This resulted in New Evangelicals following a social gospel. The New Testament church did not organise social programs to alleviate suffering in the **unsaved** world. This is the task of government.
The New Testament church did, however, meet the social needs of **believers**. (Acts 4:32-37).
James 2:15 exhorts us to show our faith by helping fellow believers who are destitute of daily food.
6. **A growing ecumenical spirit which viewed Fundamentalists as too separatist.**
The ecumenical movement of 'let's get together' gained momentum in the 1950s and 60s. Evangelicals were influenced to welcome those holding to error. They forgot II John 10,11:
"If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed: For he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds."
They rejected the term 'fundamental' in favour of the term 'evangelical'.
The founding of Fuller Theological Seminary in California in 1947 as the first and leading New Evangelical college was a major milestone of the evangelical left wing. 1957 saw Billy Graham conduct his first ecumenical crusade in New York City.

3. LOOKING AT NEW EVANGELICALISM THROUGH SCRIPTURE

Accommodation is not taught in the New Testament. We are not to trim God's message or method to win a hearing for the message. We must not seek to conform God's Word to man's desires. We must not be 'conformed to this world.' (Romans 12:2).

Some think that an ecumenical spirit is brotherly and kind, and that love is more important than doctrine, appealing to John 17:11 where Jesus prayed that 'they may be one.' They criticise fundamentalists who oppose the ecumenical movement with the charge of 'sowing discord among the brethren' or continuing the 'sin of division.'

Answer: Jesus' prayer for all believers to be one has already been answered. Since we are all baptised by the Holy Spirit into the body of Christ (Galatians 3:27; I Corinthians 12:13), 'we are all one in Christ Jesus' (Galatians 3:28) having spiritual unity in the bride of Christ. It is not talking about organisational unity.

New Evangelicals' Unwillingness To Separate From Churches Holding False Doctrine.

Fundamentalists believe in complete separation from all churches or fellowships which tolerate false doctrine, unbelief or compromise with error. New Evangelicals on the other hand believe 'let us compromise doctrinal matters for the sake of evangelism.'

Question: Why do some people not obey the Biblical command in II Corinthians 6:14-18 to break fellowship with those who promote unbiblical positions?

Answer:

1. Taking a stand against unbelief can be costly.
If pastors left a denomination with false doctrines, they would lose many **friends** and their **retirement** money. For some this is too great a price to pay.
2. One's **prestige** and **influence** in denominational leadership would be lost if he separated to become an independent pastor. Are influence, respect and position more important than obeying God?

Wasn't **Noah** a preacher of righteousness who was only supported by seven people? Didn't **Jeremiah** get abused and imprisoned for rebuking the sinners of his day? Didn't **Paul** get beaten, hated and jailed for preaching against the Jews' view of Jesus? Didn't **John the Baptist** get imprisoned and beheaded for rebuking Herod's sins? Didn't **Jesus** rebuke the Pharisees, Sadducees and scribes, not fearing the consequences or seeking their acceptance?
Many New Evangelicals today honour Spurgeon, but few of them would have stood with him when he rebuked the Baptist Union for its apostasy and was excommunicated as a result.

3. New Evangelicals have a different concept of the purpose of the church from the Fundamentalists. Fundamentalists view the church as '**Donatist**,' which regards **holiness and doctrine** as more important than unity in local churches.
New Evangelicals view the church as '**Augustinian**,' which regards **unity** as more important than holiness and doctrine. If a church has **holiness** and sound **doctrine**, it will have **true unity**, which leads to quality outreach.
If a church has **external unity**, but **internal doctrinal divisions**, then the 'leaven will soon leaven the whole lump' (Galatians 5:9) and will hinder quality outreach.
4. New Evangelicals see the church's mission to **penetrate** the world with Christian values. Fundamentalists see the role of the church to **win** the world to **Christ** and to **disciple them** (Matthew 28:18-20). Satan will remain the political and religious head of this world's system until Christ returns to defeat him. (II Corinthians 4:3-5).
'For we **preach not ourselves**, but **Christ Jesus** the Lord . . .' (II Corinthians 4:5).
We don't preach ourselves as the agent of social change, but we preach Jesus Christ as the Saviour of the world. The early church never tried to reform social culture.
The Holy Spirit today is moving among the nations 'to take out of them a people for his name' (Acts 15:14), not to Christianise the nations.

New Evangelicals try to be good guys by **avoiding controversial subjects**. This dulls the cutting edge of Christianity. We must guard against civility and courtesy breeding timid preachers. The contemporary worldly attitude is against all absolutes, dogmatism and exclusiveness. This thinking has crept into the churches, so that now many churches defend homosexuality, evolution, abortion, feminism. How did these churches degenerate so far? By twisting the Word of God to the latest intellectual fashions of the world.
New Evangelicals have a burning desire to be accepted and recognised by the world, when the world despises the Word of God and has no intention of becoming Christian. This is pitiful and treasonous.

Question: What happens when people compromise sound doctrine?

Answer: Churches and Bible Colleges deteriorate spiritually.

Preachers seeking to be civil, de-emphasise the Bible's more offensive subjects such as accusations of heresy, sin, immorality, paganism, God's judgment, hell and intolerance of error. Did Jesus, Paul, and Peter seek to adjust their message to their worldly, unsaved hearers? No! Paul did not use flattering words (I Thessalonians 2:5).

4. NEW EVANGELICALS SEEK TO CAPTURE THEOLOGICAL COLLEGES

Generally a preacher is the product of the theological college he attended.
New Evangelicals, in order to spread their errors, had to capture theological colleges and seminaries, and thus mould the coming generation of leaders. Institutions that became New Evangelical were Wheaton College, Fuller Theological Seminary, Westminster Seminary, Talbot Seminary, etc. Each of these undermined the authority of Scripture, & denied the inerrancy and preservation of the Word of God.

The demise of Fuller Theological Seminary is a warning to all those who seek to change direction. How did this happen?

- 1) Fuller Seminary started with the goal of changing the direction and image of fundamentalism to seek to rescue the apostate denominations.
- 2) Its few Fundamentalist lecturers protested its change of direction.
- 3) Fundamentalists more and more began to reject the Seminary.
- 4) Faculty members conflicted over Biblical inspiration and inerrancy.
- 5) This led to the conservative faculty members resigning.
- 6) The Seminary then changed its doctrinal statement to accommodate those who denied Biblical inerrancy.

Lesson: Initial compromise grows with time. Vigilance, struggle, rebuking error and a certain militancy are required if we are to defend the 'faith once delivered to the saints.' Sadly, Bernard Ramm who as a young Fundamentalist wrote the helpful book '*Protestant Biblical Interpretation*', later on, in order to be academically acceptable, drifted to the point where he defended the theology of Karl Barth who denied the inerrancy of Scripture and other key doctrines.

To propagate thoughts required the printed page. New Evangelicals were quick to publish books which were filled with footnotes and quotes of liberal and Bible-denying writers, but were noticeably lacking in references to the writings of solid Biblical Fundamentalists. Why? They were trying to be modern and academically acceptable. They loved the praise of men more than the praise of God (John 12:43).

5. NEW EVANGELICALS INFILTRATE PARA-CHURCH ORGANISATIONS such as Bill Bright's Campus Crusade, Inter-Varsity Fellowship, Navigators, New Tribes Mission & World Vision.

- a) Campus Crusaders are taught not to use 'Christian jargon' such as repent, converted, blood of Christ, hell, sin, saved, apostate and baptism. They are not under the authority of any local church.
- b) Navigators rarely mention baptism, premillennial eschatology, or pastoral authority. Nor do they rebuke the errors of Calvinism, modern versions or infant sprinkling, in case they offend some of their members who believe such lies.
- c) New Tribes Mission's aim is to entice promising Christians away from being under the authority of their local church, to being under the authority of the New Tribes Mission denomination. They then tell the prospective missionary to ask local churches for money to pay their way to work overseas as a New Tribes missionary. When overseas, he is told that he must not ask a sinner to pray to ask Jesus Christ to be his Saviour (*Firm Foundations*, page 14). He must not present the Gospel until the natives have gone through a 2-5 year Old and New Testament Bible course called '*Firm Foundations*.' (*Brown Gold*, September 1995). Most natives don't stick out the 2-5 year course and hence never get a clear Gospel presentation.
The Apostles Peter and Paul never taught a 2-year Old Testament course to unbelievers, because 'they receive not the things of the Spirit of God' (and would have no spiritual discernment before conversion), but he preached the Gospel immediately to them, and then challenged them to call on Christ to save them.

Question: How should we evaluate New Evangelicalism in the light of Scripture?

Answer:

- 1) Accommodating God's Word to win a hearing is not taught in Scripture. We are not to trim God's message or methods, nor are we to seek to conform God's Word to suit man's desires. 'Be not conformed to this world.' (Romans 12:2).
- 2) While an ecumenical unity may seem brotherly and kind, it is contrary to God's Word.

- a) Ecumenists claim that love is more important than doctrine, appealing to John 17:11 where Jesus prayed that 'they may be one.' They criticise Christians who oppose the ecumenical movement, accusing them of not obeying this command, and of promoting the 'sin of division.' This prayer ("to be one") has already been answered by believers being one in the body of Christ. 'Ye are all one in Christ Jesus' (Galatians 3:28; I Corinthians 12:13). Jesus is not talking about **organisational unity** under the authority of the Pope or the World Council of Churches, but about **spiritual unity** under the authority of Jesus Christ. Paul warns against seeking organisational unity at the expense of doctrinal compromise in Romans 16:17: 'Mark them which **cause divisions** and **offences contrary** to the **doctrine** which ye have learned and **AVOID THEM.**'
- b) Ecumenists accuse Fundamentalists of 'sowing discord among the brethren' (Proverbs 6:19), yet ecumenists are the ones guilty of sowing discord among the brethren by joining up with 'false witnesses that speak lies' (Proverbs 6:19) in the form of Catholics, Charismatics, infant sprinklers, Bible deniers, ordainers of homosexual priests, etc, all of whom speak the lies of unbiblical doctrines. Fundamentalists haven't moved; it's the liberals who have moved.
- 3) Bible believing Christians reject the Charismatic influence in New Evangelicalism. New Evangelical founders were not charismatic, but they insisted that we should accept Charismatic doctrines as a viable option, rather than denounce them as error. This gave the Charismatic error a new-found respectability. Charismatics are dead wrong in their views of the Holy Spirit slaying people onto the floor, giving new revelations that don't come true, speaking in gibberish that is claimed as tongues, and healing people who remain ill.

We vehemently reject Charismatic theology and practice as contrary to Scripture and as one of the greatest deceptions to hit the churches in 2000 years.

Some Christians think that to rebuke Charismatic error is unloving, divisive and confrontational. We are doing just what Paul commands in Titus 1:13, 'Wherefore **rebuke** them **sharply**, that they may be sound in the faith.'

It is not loving God or man to allow error to be freely propagated.

'Ye that love the Lord, **hate evil.**' (Psalm 97:10).

'Speak thou the things which become **sound doctrine.**' (Titus 2:1).

'I hate every **false way.**' (Psalm 119:104).

'I hate and abhor **lying**, but thy law do I love.' (Psalm 119:163).

'The fear of the Lord is to hate **evil.**' (Proverbs 8:13).

We are against lying, evil and false doctrines. Aren't you?

New Evangelicalism has done great harm. It has weakened the Biblical foundations of many churches, by teaching them to accept and tolerate error and to work with those who hold false doctrines.

Billy Graham has been the chief promoter of this erroneous approach.

6. THE HISTORY OF and HERESIES ENDORSED BY BILLY GRAHAM

The New Evangelical movement grew due to the practice of 'ecumenical evangelism' where churches of widely differing doctrines **joined together to evangelise the lost.**

Bible believing Christians have always been concerned about evangelising the world.

Salvation by faith in Christ alone started the Reformation against Roman Catholicism's false gospel of salvation by sacraments.

Tragically, it was their interest in evangelism that caused many evangelicals to adopt a new method of evangelism (known as ecumenical crusades) which was contrary to God's Word. Billy Graham's ecumenical evangelistic crusades seemed so successful.

Who would ever be so unspiritual as to challenge an evangelist or his evangelism?

Billy Graham popularised the principles of New Evangelism.

In his early days, Billy Graham was a student at Bob Jones University and a great admirer of its founder. For a while, Graham preached in crusades sponsored by fundamental churches, and appeared to be a Fundamentalist.

But something happened to change Graham from being a Fundamentalist to become the leader of New Evangelicalism.

Some of Graham's actions began to alarm fundamentalist leaders. These included:

- 1) He publicly endorsed the **Revised Standard Version** of the Bible in his Pittsburgh Crusade before it had been released for examination. The RSV had been produced by unbelieving scholars under the control of the apostate National Council of Churches.
- 2) In Graham's **Japanese Crusade**, he appeared on the same platform as unbelieving liberals of the 'Kyodan' (like the apostate National Council of Churches). This caused great confusion because many missionaries had publicly opposed the apostate Kyodan, yet Graham endorsed it.
- 3) In his **British Crusades**, converts were advised to return to the Church of England with its so many Romish practices such as infant sprinkling, etc.
- 4) In his **Scottish Crusade**, he rejected the title 'Fundamentalist', believing it to show narrowness and bigotry.
- 5) In a letter to Tom Malone, defending his policy of co-operating with liberal unbelievers, he claimed that the doctrinal differences were not that serious. 'They differ from us on the inspiration of the Bible and on theories of the atonement.' (*Sword of Lord*, 17 May 1957, p 11). These surely are very key issues!
- 6) John R Rice wrote to Graham asking him, as a member of the Co-operating Board of '*Sword of the Lord*' magazine, if he could in good conscience continue to sign its doctrinal statement. It read: 'An Independent Christian Weekly, standing for the Verbal Inspiration of the Bible, the Deity of Christ, His Blood Atonement, Salvation by faith, New Testament soul-winning, and the Pre-Millennial Return of Christ. Opposes Modernism, Worldliness, and Formalism.'
Graham in replying, stated that he did not believe he could any longer agree to this doctrinal statement and submitted his resignation from the Board.
- 7) In 1951 some Fundamentalist pastors in New York City invited Graham to preach at their Crusade. He replied that he would not come **unless every Protestant church in the area was invited** and had representatives on the various campaign committees. The Fundamentalist pastors insisted that each church sign a fundamentalist doctrinal statement, to which Graham approved. However, some of the Executive Committee rejected this doctrinal statement and hence resigned. Graham then wrote a letter to the Committee insisting that 'the Committee unanimously endorse the program of an ecumenical spirit to be exhibited throughout the campaign' and should 'present an ecumenical spirit of love toward those of all stripes.'
(Source: *Billy Graham's letter to Executive Committee, New York Crusade*, 1951). Graham shortly thereafter rejected their invitation.
- 8) In 1957, Graham accepted a crusade invitation to **New York City** by the Protestant Council of Churches. Blatant left-wing unbelieving liberals were present, such as Henry Van Dusen, President of Union Theological Seminary in New York, whom Graham **praised as a great religious leader**.
(Source: *US News and World Report*, 27 Sept. 1957, p.25).
- 9) In 1961, Graham said the following about infant sprinkling: 'I still have some personal problems in this matter of infant baptism, but, **all of my children**, with the exception of the youngest, **were baptized as infants**...I do believe

that something happens at the baptism of an infant. We cannot fully understand the mysteries of God, but I believe a miracle can happen in these children so that they are **regenerated**, that is, **made Christian, through infant baptism**.' (W.Bockelman, 'A Lutheran Looks at Billy Graham', *Lutheran Standard*, 10 Oct 1961).

- 10) Graham endorsed Gerald Kennedy as chairman of his 1963 **Los Angeles Crusade**. Kennedy in '*God's Good News*', p.125, wrote: 'I believe the testimony of the New Testament, taken as a whole, is **against** the doctrine of the **deity of Jesus** although I think it bears overwhelming witness to the divinity of Jesus.' John 8:24 declares Kennedy to be unsaved. How can an unbeliever be qualified to lead an evangelistic crusade? What does this say about Billy Graham's judgment and theology?
- 11) In Graham's **Uruguay Crusade** of 1963, he endorsed the crusade's vice president as the pastor of the First Methodist Church of Montevideo, who openly held **evolutionary** views and believed that the god of the Buddhists was the same as the Biblical God. (*Baptist Bible Tribune*, 8 March 1963).
- 12) In 1967, Graham received the **degree of Doctorate of Humane Letters** from the **Roman Catholic Belmont Abbey College** in North Carolina, a school which teaches prayer to Mary and popery. Graham said that he "knew of no greater honour than to be presented with this degree." He also said that "the gospel that built this school and the gospel that brings me here tonight is still the way to salvation." (*The Gastonian Gazette*, 22 Nov., 1967). How confusing! Everyone knows that Roman Catholicism preaches a different gospel to Protestants, except Billy Graham! God curses Rome's false gospel. (Galatians 1:6-9).
- 13) In September 8-13, 1969, Graham sponsored at his headquarters in Minneapolis, Minnesota, the US Congress on Evangelism, where 92 denominations were represented. **Two Roman Catholics appeared on the program**. Also, Ralph Abernathy, president of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference said: 'We are all sons and daughters of the most high Lord - we are all brothers. Take the Gospel of Jesus Christ into the alleys and byways. Tell all of God's children, "you are somebody; you are all worth something; you are God's children".'
(Source: Merle Hull, '*US Congress on Evangelism*', *Baptist Bulletin*, Nov. 1969, p.11). What a heretic! He obviously doesn't believe John 1:12 or Galatians 3:26: 'Ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus.'
If everyone is already a child of God, why have a Congress on Evangelism?
Did Graham rebuke Abernathy? Not likely.
- 14) **Catholic Support**: Regarding the Crusade in **Manila**, Philippines in 1977, Graham commented: 'We have received marvellous support from the Catholic Church.'
(*Christianity Today*, 31 Dec. 1977, p.37). No wonder Rome supported Graham when he sent his converts back to fill Catholic church pews, & because he gave Roman Catholicism much-needed respectability in Protestant eyes. Billy Graham hence split Protestant opposition to Roman Catholicism. Just what the devil wanted.
- 15) **Praises religious freedom in Communist Hungary**. In the 1977 **Budapest Crusade**, he praised the religious freedom he found. He said nothing in defence of those Christians in Communist jails for their faith.
- 16) **Gave credibility to Charismatics**. Graham has given credibility to the Charismatic movement.
He said: 'By and large, it has been a positive force in the lives of many people'.
(Source: *Christianity Today*, 17 July 1991, p.23). But is it Biblical? No!
- 17) **Not speaking up for Russian imprisoned Christians**. In 1982, while he was preaching in the Moscow Baptist Church, a young lady unfurled a banner which read: 'We have more than 150 prisoners for the work of the Gospel.' Graham ignored it and

later said that in the US, people are imprisoned for creating disturbances. What a discouragement Graham was to the thousands of courageous Christians in Soviet concentration camps because of their loyalty to Jesus Christ and the Gospel. What a blow to them to hear that the world's leading evangelist declared that there was religious freedom in Russia. Why did Graham say nothing to defend them? God tells us: 'Remember them that are in bonds, as bound with them.....' (Hebrews 13:3). Graham forgot them. *Time Magazine* said, 'Yet, throughout the week, Graham seemed oblivious to the precarious role of religion in a country that endorses atheism and outlaws public evangelism. The (registered) Baptists who heard Graham's Gospel can hold worship services, but they cannot preach the Word of God in public or bring up their children with religious instruction.'

(Source: *Time*, M.S.Evans, 'The Brainwashing of Billy Graham,' 5 June 1982, p.7). The unregistered Baptist leaders were sent to concentration camps, while their churches had to meet in secret. Graham should have shown more courage. For the sake of open doors, he compromised again. M.S.Evans of *Time* was correct when he said, 'Graham's trip was a mindless, stunning propaganda triumph for the Soviets.' The early Apostles who were imprisoned said, 'We ought to obey God rather than men.' (Acts 5:29) Did Graham denounce the apostate practices of the Russian Orthodox Church? No. He did not rebuke them as Jeremiah would have. Jesus rebuked the 'scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites' (Matt. 23:13-14). Graham instead made positive smooth statements that would soothe but not convict.

7. EFFECTS OF BILLY GRAHAM'S COMPROMISING WITH ERROR

Billy Graham's toleration of false doctrines and unwillingness to offend are now accepted by many evangelicals. He said, 'in the proclamation of the Gospel there is flexibility of fellowship.'

(Source: Open letter from Billy Graham, "Separation of Fellowship").

Never does Graham rebuke the apostasy of the World Council of Churches (WCC) or the NCC. The Bible commands faithful preachers of God to openly combat teachers of error:

"Them that sin **rebuke before all**, that others also may fearwithout preferring one before another.' (I Timothy 5:20,21).

'reprove, **rebuke**, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine.' (II Timothy 4:2).

'**rebuke** them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith.' (Titus 1:13).

'**rebuke** with all authority.' (Titus 2:15).

(I

Timothy 1:20.

Paul was bold enough to identify by name Hymenaeus and Alexander who made shipwreck of the faith

John, the Apostle of love, wrote against Diotrophes, the proud dictator &condemned his action. 3John 9.

When God commissioned **Jeremiah**, He told him to '**root out**, and to **pull down**, and to **destroy**, and to **throw down**, to build, and to plant.' (Jeremiah 1:10).

Here are four negatives and two positives to be accomplished before we can have revival.

KEY: Error must be demolished. Thorn-infested ground must be cleared before we can progress in building truth and having revival. **Destruction of wrong** must precede **building the right**.

Due to the efforts of Billy Graham, many feel that apostasy and false doctrines are not the enemies our forefathers saw them to be. Today, Billy tells us that liberals are not so bad. This idea came from Graham's crusades, where unbelievers and fundamentalists mixed readily.

Doubtless, Graham has done much to build the ecumenical church and to give it prestige.

The gap between unbelieving liberals and Fundamentalism is unbridgable. On one side is the true church, the Bride of Christ, and on the other is the Harlot Church of Revelation chapter 17. These cannot be joined.

Graham tells impressionable young church leaders to put away your doctrinal differences as not important. But God says that doctrine is important as seen in these 20 passages: (Acts 2:42.

'They continued steadfastly in the **apostles' doctrine** and fellowship, in breaking of bread, in prayers.'

'Ye have filled Jerusalem with your **doctrine**.' (Acts 5:28).

'Ye have **obeyed** from the heart that form of **doctrine** which was delivered you.' (Romans 6:17).

'Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the **doctrine** which ye have learned, and avoid them. For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ.....and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple.' (Romans 16:17,18).

'that thou mightest charge some that they teach no other **doctrine**.' (I Timothy 1:3).

'if there be any other thing that is contrary to **sound doctrine**.' (I Timothy 1:10).

'a good minister of Jesus Christ, nourished up in the words of faith and of good **doctrine**.' (I Tim. 4:6).

'give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to **doctrine**.' (I Timothy 4:13).

'Take heed unto thyself, and unto the **doctrine**; continue in them: for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself (from error), and them that hear thee.' (I Timothy 4:16).

'Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honour, especially they who labour in the Word and **doctrine**.' (I Timothy 5:17).

'If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the **doctrine** which is according to godliness..from such **withdraw** thyself.' (I Tim.6:3-5)

'But thou hast fully known my **doctrine**.' (II Timothy 3:10).

'All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for **doctrine**.' (II Timothy 3:16).

"Reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long-suffering and **doctrine**."

For the time will come when they will not endure sound **doctrine**;" (II Timothy 4:2,3).

"Holding fast the faithful word as he hath been taught, that he may be able by sound **doctrine** both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers." (Titus 1:9).

"But speak thou the things which become sound **doctrine**:" (Titus 2:1).

"In **doctrine** showing uncorruptness, gravity, sincerity." (Titus 2:7).

"That they may adorn the **doctrine** of God our Saviour in all things." (Titus 2:10).

"Be not carried about with diverse and strange **doctrines**:" (Hebrews 13:9).

II. ERRORS OF NEW EVANGELICALISM TO AVOID

How do you recognize a New Evangelical church?

How do you tell if a church is slipping into the errors of New Evangelicalism?

If you see the following errors in a church, you can be sure that you are dealing with a church which has succumbed to New Evangelical errors. In most cases they are not aware that these errors spring from New Evangelicalism. In each case they have accepted these false doctrines without asking the question, 'Is it Biblical?' Consider these errors:

1. **Disbelief in the Inerrancy of Scripture**

New Evangelicals say that 'yes the Bible is inspired, but it is not inerrant.' What they mean by this is that they consider the Bible to be inspired and/or infallible, but they think it contains errors in 'non-crucial' areas such as geography, history and numerology, but

that it is still reliable (infallible) when it comes to major doctrines.

What caused them to retreat from 'inerrancy'?

- a) It was their belief that **evolution** is true and hence they felt that the Genesis Creation in six days seemed unscientific.
- b) The introduction of the **erroneous Westcott and Hort new Greek text** of the New Testament. This sought to put away the Received Text of the New Testament on which the KJV is based (representing over 98% of the New Testament manuscripts). They replaced it with a Greek text based on the corrupt Vaticanus and Sinaiticus manuscripts (on which most modern Bible versions are based).

Many New Evangelicals are Charismatics who do not need an inerrant Bible because they claim to have inerrant gifts of prophecy as God communicates to them outside of the Bible. They do not see the Bible as God's Final Revelation for this age. Charismatics thus betray an ignorance of I Corinthians 13:8-13; 14:21-23 and of historic, orthodox Christianity. When the age of the apostles ceased, so did prophecy, tongues, knowledge and other sign gifts cease. (See page 482-500).

2. **Modern Bible Versions.**

New Evangelicals do not have an inerrant Bible when they use and promote modern Bible versions which omit thousands of words. A church which uses modern versions, reveals an unawareness of these omissions. Churches that use modern versions reveal a knowing or unknowing preference for a corrupt minority text which changes with every new edition. Modern versions attack the doctrines of inerrancy and preservation of Scripture. The NIV's Greek NT omits 2544 Greek words. This is a serious problem.

3. **Toleration of Error**

Evangelicals want to be accepted by everybody. Sin is rarely rebuked. Rare is a call for repentance. The attitude is, 'Let's not offend anyone by rebuking their false doctrines.' God says, 'Speaking the truth in love.' (Ephesians 4:15). New Evangelicals are afraid to speak the truth to those holding error. They just want to be nice and say nothing that might offend. The tolerant, nice, cowardly, inoffensive approach avoids mentioning the Gospel's potentially convicting aspects such as:

- a) an ingrained, inherited sinful nature;
- b) sinful conduct such as fornication, adultery, sodomy, lying, etc.
- c) unbelievers being 'punished with everlasting destruction' in hell. (II Thessalonians 1:8,9);
- d) declaring all non-Biblical religions as false;
- e) charging heretics with heresy. (The word 'heresy' has vanished from inter-religious dialogue);
- f) publicly rebuking the errors of Roman Catholicism.

Notice how the Bible speaks the truth:

- a) **Jesus** wasn't nice to the Pharisees when he said, 'Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites.' (Matthew 23:14). The NIV omits this verse.
- b) **Stephen** rebuked the entire Sanhedrin: 'Ye stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost.' (Acts 7:51).
- c) **Paul** rebuked Peter: 'I withstood him (Peter) to the face, because he was to be blamed.' (Gal. 2:11).
Paul rebuked those preaching a false gospel, saying 'let him be accursed.' (Galatians 1:9).
- d) **Peter** rebuked Simon's heresy: 'Thy money perish with thee.' (Acts 8:20).

Early Christians did not seek to make everyone happy and comfortable as do modern New Evangelicals. They spoke the truth in love, but clearly and forcefully.

Their attitude was: 'If I yet pleased men, I should not be the servant of Christ.' (Galatians 1:10).

4. **Non-confronting Accommodation.**

This is seeking to adapt the Word of God to **conform to modern ideas**.

Question: Why has this happened?

Answer: Many modern New Evangelicals have become embarrassed to be seen holding ideas that are rejected by the unbelieving world, eg: Six-day creation; KJV; not-so-modern hymns; inerrant Bible, etc. They dislike being sneered at by unbelievers. Early New Evangelicals disliked being isolated in society. They wanted their articles and books to be recognized and published by respectable companies, and to be regarded as authentic scholars. They wanted to make the 'faith of our fathers' acceptable to the ungodly world. This is **pride of intellect**. God says, 'Be not conformed to this world...' (Rom 12:2). 'Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world.' (I John 2:15-17). 'Because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you.' (John 15:19).

We all love people to admire us, but this must not be at the expense of God's disapproval. New Evangelicals do not want to be confronters, but want to build bridges with unbelieving liberals. This compromise on small matters, leads to compromise on larger matters.

5. **Evangelical Feminism**

Radical feminism since 1970, has been accepted by a spiritually blind, unsaved world as well as by New Evangelicals. Evangelical feminists believe that most theology has been written out of a male's experience of God. They believe that the Bible does not teach what it has been assumed to teach about the subordinate role of women in the church and society. They claim that Paul is wrong when he demands a submissive role of women to their husbands. They think that orthodox theology was thought up by males and reflects a masculine bias. They believe that ordination of women is desirable.

Question: How is it that none of the great Bible teachers in the last 2000 years have discovered these new 'truths' such as female ordination?

Answer: It is because feminism has become popular in the world and hence some New Evangelicals want to bring this worldly teaching into the church.

The rise of Evangelical feminism coincides with the rise of worldly feminism.

I Timothy 2:9-15 and Ephesians 5:21-33 teach that women should submit to their own husbands, and that they ought not to teach men, nor usurp authority over men.

The Bible does not teach that women are inferior to men, but that a woman is a helper suitable for a man (Genesis 2:18), not as the NKJV says, 'comparable to man.' Christian women must display a 'meek and quiet spirit, which is in the sight of God of great price.' (I Peter 3:4). Saved women are to be 'discreet, chaste, keepers at home, good, obedient to their own husbands.' (Titus 2:5).

'I will therefore that the younger woman marry, bear children, guide the house,...' (I Timothy 5:14).

6. **Less Emphasis on Doctrine**

The teaching of sound doctrine is less popular today. New Evangelicals consider doctrine to be:

- 1) too divisive;
- 2) not practical enough, and
- 3) not helping to promote evangelical unity.

New Evangelicals seek to restructure preaching from a God-centred, doctrinal approach to a man-centred approach. New Evangelicals seek to minimise doctrine by pointing us to emphasise other things, such as:

- 1) **Loving Jesus.** A charismatic pastor once said, 'What we need to do is just forget all this doctrine stuff, and just love Jesus.' This sounds really spiritual, but once we seek to answer the question 'Who is Jesus?', we have entered the realm of doctrine.
- 2) **Cultivating the Inner Life.** One cannot have spiritual growth without 'growing in grace, and in the knowledge (doctrine) of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.' (II Peter 3:18).
'Knowledge' involves an increasing grasp of doctrinal truth.
- 3) **Loving Others.** To them this means a toleration of error and accepting of all who call themselves evangelicals. This weak attitude allowed charismatic teachings to spread through many churches unopposed. Many Christian leaders, such as Charles Swindoll, will say things like, 'I am not a charismatic personally, but the charismatic movement has done a lot of good and we ought not to condemn it. We should love the brethren.' So, in the name of 'love', all manner of false teaching is condoned. The NIV teaches this toleration of error by its mistranslation of Romans 14:1, reversing the KJV's "not to doubtful disputations" to, 'Accept him whose faith is weak, **without passing judgment** on disputable matters.' Luther wisely rebukes this error in *This We Believe*, p.76:
'Doctrine is not ours but God's...Therefore we may not yield or change even one tittle of it. Accursed be the love which is preserved to the detriment of doctrine.....If doctrine becomes wobbly in one part, it must necessarily become wobbly altogether. When that happens, love cannot help us.'

Charismatics say, "'Spirit baptism' unites, and other doctrinal differences can be overlooked."

Paul never downplayed doctrine while pretending to practise love. He commanded sound doctrine to be taught. See 20 scriptures showing the importance of doctrine.

'Give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine.' (I Timothy 4:13).

7. Contemporary Christian Music, so loved by New Evangelicals today, is witness to the theological deterioration in the church. Shallow theology leads to people accepting shallow Christian music. God-centred doctrinal songs have been replaced by man-centred, experiential songs. Loud worldly rock music has been brought into churches, with a 'Christian' label and a few Christian words thrown in.

New Evangelicals claim that 'you can't reach the young people unless you employ their favourite music styles.' Pastors and church leaders felt they had to compete with worldly rock music to attract teens. What happened to the power of the Gospel of Christ to convert sinners (Romans 1:16)?

They made God a commodity for self-gratification.

CCM fits with the self-centred culture of today where people focus on 'meeting their needs.' Christian music must be firmly anchored in theology taught in the Bible. 'I will sing with the understanding also.' (I Corinthians 14:15). Much CCM is upbeat, shallow and suitable for dancing, but not suitable for serious God-centred thought.

8. Psychology replacing **Solid Bible Teaching.**

Many New Evangelicals do not desire doctrinal instruction from the Word of God, but rather discussions on 'how to' meet life's problems. They aim for psychological wholeness more than doctrinal correctness. One well-known New Evangelical Baptist Union pastor, in a message, declared that he had hypnotised a criminal to discover childhood problems that caused his unlawful adult behaviour. Did Paul hypnotise his converts? God's answer to the troubled soul is 'Thou wilt keep him in **perfect peace**, whose mind is stayed on thee: because he **trusteth in thee**.' (Isaiah 26:3).

'**Great peace** have they which **love thy law**; and nothing shall offend them.' (Psalm

119:165).

Solid Bible preaching is becoming less popular, and is being replaced by pulpit psychology.

9. Theological Colleges that Poison Students' Minds.

New Evangelicalism was thought up by professors of some evangelical theological colleges. They twisted the thinking of many impressionable youngsters. Many Bible Colleges that were built by old-time fundamentalists fell prey to New Evangelicalism. How did this happen?

- 1) Many purportedly Christian colleges and seminaries are far more interested in employing lecturers with prestigious **academic credentials**, than in employing soul-winning lecturers with sound doctrinal commitment.
- 2) Those doctrinally unsound lecturers **teach their errors to their students** who often end up being more doctrinally unsound than their lecturers.
- 3) The students take up their lecturers' anti-Christian world views and **teach them to their church members**. This often results in church splits or in multiplying apostate churches. Paul in II Timothy 2:2 was greatly concerned that sound doctrine be passed from generation to generation. Timothy, in turn, had to ensure that sound doctrines were preserved intact and passed on by his disciples. Along with deterioration in doctrinal convictions came a deterioration in standards of conduct in the colleges. Many Bible Colleges provide a 'smorgasbord' education where the lecturer gives the students all viewpoints and the students are free to choose whatever view they like. Colleges adopt this view for **monetary reasons** because they wish to draw students (and hence their fees) from as many churches of varying doctrines as possible in order to keep the College doors open. For example, they will teach various views of baptism, prophecy, spiritual gifts, human origins, etc, without saying which view is right or wrong, for fear of losing some students or supporting churches. Often, high standards of conduct have been criticised as 'legalism', so some colleges scrap all the rules in order to cultivate 'maturity' in the students. In reality, scrapping rules cultivates immaturity, lack of discipline, and a rebellious attitude toward authority.

10. Acceptance of Evolution or Theistic Evolution

Many New Evangelicals reject the literal six-day Creation 6000 years ago. They try to reconcile Biblical truth with evolutionary ideas. A student at a New Evangelical Baptist Union College asked me what were the differences between his Baptist Union and my Independent Baptist position. My first reply was that we believed in a literal six-day creation 6000 years ago. His stunned response was, 'Really?'

Evolutionists seek to explain the universe without the agency of God. New Evangelicals were embarrassed that Creation was looked down upon by some scientists, so they sought ways to harmonise the views of unbelieving scientists with the Bible. Many New Evangelicals say that the first eleven chapters of Genesis teach theological truth, but not scientific truth. But surely one category of truth will never contradict another category of truth.

We reject evolution as 'science falsely so called' (I Timothy 6:20), because it is based on unprovable assumptions. No man can observe the origin of life in the past. True science deals with what can be observed. Evolutionary scientists are willingly ignorant of, and have deliberately rejected Creation by God and Noah's worldwide flood. (II Peter 3:15).

11. The Social Gospel

This means changing the Gospel from 'salvation from sin and hell' to 'salvation from social ills.' They misinterpret the leaven parable (Matthew 13:33) to claim that the church should be 'leaven for society', whereas leaven is always a symbol of evil. (Matthew 16:6,12). The Gospel is defined in I Corinthians 15:1-4 and this does not include any social action. Due to the churches' evangelistic efforts, many social ills are lessened. Neither Christ nor the Apostles endeavoured to rid unconverted society of its ills. James 2:15-17, Romans 15:26

and Acts 11:27-30 each show a Biblical precedent for believers to help other believers who are 'naked' or 'destitute of daily food' or in life-threatening situations, but not for the world in general. Our main thrust must be to win souls, baptise and teach God's Word to all nations. Fundamentalists who major on soul-winning have done more to relieve human suffering as a secondary emphasis, than have many liberals done by a primary social gospel emphasis. Fundamentalists, by soul winning, have started more malaria clinics, Christian schools, deaf ministries, prison ministries, and rescue missions, than have New Evangelicals by a primary social gospel emphasis. Many Fundamentalists have greatly helped sinners by leading them to eternal life in Christ. They then become better citizens after salvation, who then are well-equipped to help others.

12. Refusal to Preach Against Roman Catholic Errors.

The Roman Catholic church teaches the false doctrines of salvation by infant sprinkling, good works needed to enter heaven, repetition of Christ's sacrifice in every mass, the impossibility of knowing that one is going to heaven, the need to venerate Mary, confirmation, and many other heresies. In spite of this, many New Evangelicals follow Billy Graham's lead in not rebuking Roman Catholic errors. For example:

Example 1: The Baptist Union Theological College in Sydney, along with the Executive Committee of the Baptist Union of NSW, without the knowledge of the majority of NSW Baptists, incorporated 'The Sydney College of Divinity' on 15 September 1983. This comprised six (6) member institutions as follows:

| Member Institutions | Denomination |
|--|--------------------|
| Baptist Theological College | Baptist |
| Catholic Institute of Sydney | Roman Catholic |
| Churches of Christ Theological College | Churches of Christ |
| St Paul's National Seminary | Roman Catholic |
| Union Theological Institute | Roman Catholic |
| United Theological College | Uniting Church |

The Chairman of the SCD's Council was a Catholic priest (J. P. Hill).

The *Articles of Association* state that one of the powers and duties of the SCD's Academic Board is 'facilitating the **exchange of lecturers** between institutions, and the **undertaking of courses** by students in Member Institutions **other than** the institution in which the students are enrolled.' (*Section 44, Subsection (X), p 12*). The SCD had its first graduation of students on 7 June 1985 at 8 pm in Pitt Street Uniting Church, Sydney. That evening, 30 RCs, one Church of Christ, and 10 Uniting Church students received their degrees.

(Source: 'Triumph or Tragedy?' J O Hogg, Stanmore Baptist Church, NSW, September 1985).

Question: How could any Baptist lecturer preach against Roman Catholic errors when he has already agreed to work with Roman Catholic priests in the SCD?

Example 2: When Billy Graham preached in Roman Catholic churches in Poland, he was warmly welcomed by their leaders.

Example 3: Cuthbert Allen, the Executive Vice President of Belmont Abbey College, Belmont, North Carolina, USA (the Roman Catholic school that bestowed an honorary doctorate on Billy Graham), said of the evangelist:

'I would state that he could bring Catholics and Protestants together in a healthy ecumenical spirit. Billy Graham is preaching a moral and evangelical theology most acceptable to Catholics.' (Letter to Julius Taylor).

Billy Graham continues to populate Catholic churches with his converts, rather than calling them away from idols and false doctrines, and into true New Testament churches.

A confused Catholic (in the 1960s) wrote to Billy Graham, expressing his concern about errors in the Catholic church. Graham responded in the *Chattanooga Free Press*: 'Above all don't pull out of the church! Stay in, stay close to the Lord, and use these experiences as an opportunity to help your church be what God intends and what the world needs.' (M Watt, 'Mission England: Is it Scriptural', *Bible League Quarterly*, Jan-March 1984, p 36).

Question: How can Billy Graham, as a Gospel evangelist, Biblically justify telling a believer in Christ to remain in an apostate church which denies the very truths that he is trying to preach? If one who is seeking to lead people into the light cannot distinguish light from darkness, how confused will be his leadership! How terrible an example he is to suggest that all the Protestant world should follow his lead!

'Woe to them that call evil good, and good evil, that put darkness for light, and light for darkness.' (Isaiah 5:20).

Example 4: Notice what Japheth Peres testified after his conversion at age 14 at Billy Graham's New York Crusade. Having told the counsellor that he was a Catholic, Billy instructed the converts to go back to the church from which they had come:

'Since Billy Graham sent me to the Catholic Church, I was under the impression that it was the right church.....What did I gain from the Billy Graham Crusade? I gained about a year and a half of darkness and ignorance of the Bible, because Billy Graham sent me to the Catholic Church.' (*Baptist Examiner*, 16 May 1964, p.1).

13. Ecumenical Co-operation and the World Council of Churches.

New Evangelicals aimed to infiltrate the apostate denominations with bright young Bible-believers who would 'turn things around.' Billy Graham helped to popularise the 'infiltration' approach, and many young evangelicals followed him with their own ecumenical evangelistic crusades by working with a variety of unbelievers. Young New Evangelicals promoted co-operation with the apostate World Council of Churches (WCC). Evangelicals should not assist or be in the WCC. The WCC is a wicked, pro-Communist, anti-God organisation which true Christians should avoid and expose, because of the following errors:

- 1) The WCC **donates money** given by its member churches to guerrilla organisations and Peoples Liberation armies controlled by **Communists** to buy guns to murder people in its fight against racism. '*Ecumenical Press Service*', 9 September 1971, lists WCC grants to these Communist revolutionary organisations:

| | |
|---|-----------|
| People's Movement for the Liberation of Angola | \$ 25,000 |
| The Revolutionary Government of Angola in Exile | \$ 7,500 |
| South West African People's Organisation | \$25,000 |
| Zimbabwe Liberation Movement, Rhodesia | \$10,000 |
| Mozambique Institute of Frelimo | \$20,000 |
| Malcolm X Liberation University | \$ 7,500 |
| Bolivian Project in Aid of Indian Liberation | \$12,500 |
- 2) 'The WCC **does nothing to assist black Christians of Southern Sudan**, for years slaughtered by the troops of the Muslim Government at Khartoum. In 1967, Baptists in Soviet Russia appealed to the WCC for aid, sending proof that more than 200 Baptists were in Soviet prison camps due to deliberate persecution. The WCC has done nothing to intervene in favour of these Christians.' (*Christian Beacon*, 15 July 1971, p.8).
- 3) **Invitation to Rome:** At Uppsala in 1968 the WCC issued an open invitation to the Roman Catholic Church to join it. (*Courier Mail*, 20 July 1968).
- 4) **Denial of Bible Doctrine and Authority:** The WCC Control Committee, meeting in Addis Ababa (Ethiopia) in January 1971 stated: 'Because Christians cannot claim to have monopoly of truth, we need to meet men

of other faiths . . .’ (S J Samartha, *Christian Beacon*, 28 January 1971, p.8). This contradicts Christ’s exclusive claim, ‘I am the way, the truth and the life, no man cometh unto the Father but by me.’ (John 14:6). Also, Henry Van Dusan, a top WCC leader, officially sponsored the building of a Temple of Understanding in Washington DC, representing the ‘six rays of hope’ - Islam, Judaism, Hinduism, Confucianism, Buddhism and Christianity. (*Christian Beacon*, 25 July 1968, p.1).

5) **Humanist and Social Gospel**

6) **The Revised Standard Version** was produced under the auspices of the National Council of Churches (NCC) in the USA. The RSV changed many texts on the deity and virgin birth of Christ. The RSV opened the door to a flood of other Bible perversions. *The US Congressional Record* (March 3, 1960, p. 3981) stated that of the 95 people who translated the RSV, 25 had records of support for Communist causes. In the RSV preface they say of the Bible: ‘It is **a** record of God’s dealing with men.’ They should have said: ‘It is **the** record.....’ This change takes away from the Bible being the unique Word of God.

7) **Redefining Missions.** WCC mission policy is summarised by G.A.Taylor in the *Presbyterian Journal* (10 February 1960):

‘The radical theologian does not believe that anyone is actually “outside.” All are inside.....The churches’ task is no longer to go outside” and bring lost sheep in.’ (Source: *The Coming World Church*, p. 38, Back to the Bible Broadcast).

Because of this attitude, traditional missionary activity has suffered a sharp decline in WCC associated bodies as a whole.

8) **Sexual Permissiveness.** Dr William Cole prepared a pamphlet for the WCC, entitled, ‘*Called to Responsible Freedom - the Meaning of Sex in the Christian Life*’ for singles, where he writes:

‘You have got to make up your own mind what your standards of conduct are going to be. There just aren’t any rules; you do whatever strikes your fancy.’

Here the WCC blatantly opposes God’s Biblical standards of morality, by endorsing fornication. God has given us His rules, yet Cole says there are none. God’s rule is no sex outside marriage.

Conclusion: Get out of your church if it is a part of the WCC.

14. Co-operation with Charismatics

New Evangelicals accepted fellowship with Pentecostals. Later the Charismatic movement became assimilated into the New Evangelical movement. The Charismatic movement changed evangelicalism to become more experiential, so that experience became more important than doctrine.

New Evangelical churches, while not always charismatic themselves, work with Charismatics and refuse to speak against them. The compromising Charles Swindoll summarizes this attitude in defending his concept of grace: ‘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? 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 pot-shots at them.’ (*The Grace Awakening*, C Swindoll, p 188). His trumpet gives an uncertain sound.

Question: Are Charismatic teachings Biblical?

Answer: If yes, then we should all adopt them. If no, then we must oppose them. The issue is not whether the charismatic Christians are nice people, but whether the Bible teaches that the gift of tongues and other charismatic sign gifts are still operative for the church

today? If they are not for today, then faithful Bible teachers must speak up against false charismatic doctrines being spread abroad and infecting many people.

Paul constantly refuted false doctrines, as he told Timothy to ‘In meekness instructing those that oppose themselves.’ (II Timothy 2:25). Because Charismatics are wrong on sign gifts, then those who better understand Scripture should tell them they are wrong, show them why, and seek to win them to a more Biblical position. It is not a mark of Christian love and grace to quietly ignore errors that are spreading.

15. Tolerating Various Views on Christ’s Return and Being Committed to None.

New Evangelicals tolerate various false views on eschatology (Christ’s return), such as Postmillennialism and Amillennialism. Up until the 1950s, most fundamentalists, taking a literal view of prophecy were Premillennialists. This is clearly the correct view by taking Revelation 19,20,21 at literal chronological face value.

One New Evangelical theology professor, when asked what scheme of theology he taught, said, ‘I teach them all and, when I get to the end of the course, the students don’t know what I believe.’ He felt that this was very clever, yet Jesus, on the other hand, ‘Taught them as one having authority, and not as the scribes.’ (Matthew 7:29).

Christ spoke plainly and with authority; not as the scribes who quoted what many scholars were thinking. The scribes avoided dogmatism on disputed or controversial points, while Christ fearlessly spoke the truth.

16. Departing from Dispensationalism as being too negative a view of human failure at the end of each age.

New Evangelicals disliked Dispensationalism, because it offered too pessimistic a view of world and church history. Dispensationalism taught that there would be a growing apostasy in the churches, for which there was no remedy but separation.

‘When the Son of Man cometh, shall He find faith on the earth?’ (Luke 18:8).

New Evangelicals were not separatist, and hence resisted these dispensational conclusions.

New Evangelicals opposed the view of the church as a refuge in a ruined culture.

17. Scholarship

New Evangelicals desired to be accepted by the unsaved scholarly world. Budding New Evangelical scholars disliked the scholarly world of unbelievers and modernists, rejecting their own works. You would surely expect unconverted teachers of error to reject fundamentalist scholars who are loyal to the inerrancy of Scripture and are intellectually submitted to the authority of God’s Word. The Word of God, through Jeremiah, was certainly a scholarly work, having been produced by the Holy Spirit, yet it was rejected and cut to ribbons by the king’s knife. (Jeremiah 36:23-24).

Bible truth is always foolishness to the unbeliever, especially to the educated unbeliever:

‘For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness . . .’ (I Corinthians 1:18).

‘The world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe.’ (v.21). Paul did not attempt to proclaim God’s Word in the enticing words of man’s wisdom, but in the power of the Holy Spirit. (I Corinthians 2:4).

New Evangelicals view Fundamentalists as anti-intellectual, because Fundamentalists were rightly suspicious of colleges who were opposed to Bible truth. The intellectual world is mostly under Satan’s control. Fundamentalists see the intellectual ungodly world as:

‘Having the understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them, because of the blindness of their heart.’ (Ephesians 4:18).

Many of those who seek intellectual respectability and acceptance have become the church’s worst enemies. If an ungodly intellectual does not accept the proof of the Bible as divinely inspired on the basis of its fulfilled prophecies, they are intellectually dishonest and God’s people should not bother trying to please them.

We must submit our minds to God and His Word, 'bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ.' (II Corinthians 10:5). God has given us minds to be used for His glory, so we must 'gird up the loins of your mind.' (I Peter 1:13).

We must study God's Word to show ourselves approved unto God (II Timothy 2:15), not study the works of heretics and unbelievers in order to please them.

18. Meaningful Conversation with Liberal Theologians

The New Evangelical problem here is that they do not recognize theological liberals as lost souls, groping in spiritual darkness, 'wells without water, clouds that are carried with a tempest: to whom the mist of darkness is reserved forever.' (II Peter 2:17).

Many New Evangelicals view unbelieving false teachers (liberals) as misguided but well-meaning Christians who need our love and fellowship. These liberals are blatantly rebelling against God and the authority of His Word.

God tells us: 'from such turn away.' (II Timothy 3:5).

'A man that is an heretic, after the first and second admonition, reject.' (Titus 3:10).

New Evangelicals are not heeding these warnings.

New Evangelicals say, 'Let us compromise doctrinal matters for the sake of evangelism.'

God says "No". 'From such turn away.' (II Timothy 3:5).

19. Dislike for Publicly Criticising the Theology of Other Evangelicals

Church marketing supporters say that, to build successful growing churches, we must not criticise the views of fellow believers.

For example, it is unpopular to criticize Charismatic theology.

New Evangelicals have erected a large umbrella where a great range of churches of various convictions can feel comfortable in their error. The church growth movement advises their followers to downplay 'denominational distinctives' which appear divisive, such as the method of **baptism**, **charismatic** teachings, views of **eschatology**, **eternal security**, **Bible versions**, and **church organisation**.

20. Antagonism Towards Fundamentalists

One Fundamentalist preacher observed that New Evangelicals are always preaching love toward liberals, unbelievers and heretics with their many false doctrines, but that they hate the Fundamentalists with a passion. Why? Because Fundamentalists tell them where they depart from Scripture.

Most Christians are totally unaware of the profoundly disturbing and deteriorating changes that have occurred in evangelicalism over the last 50 years.

Fundamentalists are accused of being such things as "Legalists" - because we have high standards of Biblical behaviour. A legalist is one who adds works to faith for salvation, something no true Fundamentalist would ever do. They accuse Fundamentalists of burdening God's people with ridiculous and impossible rules which stunt their spiritual growth. Rules are to protect God's people from the devil's traps, not to restrict our fun. Paul says "Warn them that are unruly." I Thessalonians 5:14.

Many people are attracted to New Evangelical churches because they carry chips on their shoulders against the Fundamentalist churches in which they were raised.

21. Ecumenical Evangelism

The effect of Billy Graham's ecumenical evangelistic crusades was to develop a pragmatic attitude which said, 'Whatever tactics result in the salvation of souls, are acceptable.'

Whenever someone challenged this ecumenical philosophy, its defenders often replied, 'But people are being saved! How can you be against soul winning?'

Hence was encouraged the unbiblical practice of uniting liberals and Bible believers in the cause of evangelism. Many have blindly followed this practice.

Billy Graham's practice of ecumenical evangelism can be likened to a fruitgrower hiring someone to go and pick the fruit in his orchard. The fruitpicker bulldozes down every tree in the orchard, then picks the fruit off the branches, and proudly hands the fruit to the orchard owner. Sure he picked the fruit, but he ruined the harvest for years to come. Billy Graham picked the fruit of souls, but by uniting liberals, evangelicals and Roman Catholics he broke down the walls separating truth from error, so that few know or will speak up against error for years to come.

This same principle governs those who would tell us how to build churches. They recommend loud rock music in God's sanctuaries, because 'It fills our churches and reaches people.' As yeast puffs up bread, so the leaven of false doctrine often quickly inflates a church in size. Don't mistake this for God-sanctioned growth. It is not striving lawfully.

Billy Graham's policy of sending new converts to liberal churches has been defended by some Baptists who think that it helps to evangelise members of the apostate churches.

Question 1: How can Baptists who profess to believe in regenerate church membership, defend the practice of sending new converts to churches which do not practise regenerate church membership, but whose membership is based on unsaved babies being sprinkled with water?

Answer: A believer does not join a church in order to evangelise its members. One joins a church to:

- a) worship God with other true believers;
- b) be taught correct Bible doctrines, and
- c) go out and evangelise the lost.

Question 2: If Billy Graham is not a liberal, why do liberals support his crusades?

Answer:

- a) Because Graham does not rebuke and expose their errors as the old time evangelists did, but he applauds and honours them as worthy spiritual guides;
- b) Because Graham fills the liberals' churches for them with his new converts.

The British liberal, Leslie Weatherhead, said: 'I do not personally agree with some of Billy Graham's theology.....but Billy Graham is helping to fill our churches for us. We can teach people theology when we have got someone to teach.'

(**Source:** *City Temple Tidings*, quoted in *Banner of Truth*, May-June 1966, p.2).

He is saying, 'My liberal theology is so empty of power that it can't fill churches, so we have to rely on evangelical theology that does fill churches. Billy Graham can fill my church with new converts, then I'll poison them with my false doctrines.'

Shame on you Billy Graham, shame for sending sheep (new converts) to the wolves!

This compromising of Graham's has spread everywhere. His attitude is, 'Do anything to get crowds and fill the churches.' God says, 'Yet is he not crowned, except he strive lawfully.' (II Timothy 2:5).

We must build churches according to God's rules, lawfully.

Seven Bible Principles that Disprove Ecumenical Evangelism

1) We must not fellowship with liberals in order to win them to Christ.

This means don't co-operate with liberals in a religious context to achieve spiritual results. Just being nice to liberals won't save them, only the Gospel will (Romans 1:16). God is more concerned about preserving the holiness and purity of His church, than He is about results. Holiness involves separation from evil and error. Paul commands us to turn away from those who have a form of godliness, but who deny the power (of the Gospel and the Bible). (II Timothy 3:5). The Graham plan denies that we should turn away from error, but seeks to join with them to do God's work.

Billy Graham defends himself as follows:

'The stress of the New Testament is upon fellowship rather than separation. The call is not so much to come out, as to come together.' ('*Fellowship and Separation*', *Decision*, August 1961, p.14).

Answer: New Testament fellowship is always among born again believers, not between believers and unbelievers. Many religious leaders that Graham fellowships with are committed unbelievers. But Graham persists in spreading the myth that they are Christians with different views on some matters.

2) **We must not honour false teachers as true Christian leaders.**

When Graham first launched his ecumenical 1957 New York Crusade, he described the sponsoring committee as 'Godly men who are seeking to reach New York's population with the testimony of the risen Christ.' (**Source:** *Herald of His Coming*, 28 November 1956, p.8).

One Committee member was James Bonnell who did not even believe in the bodily resurrection of Christ. (**Source:** *Supplementary Statement of James Bennett*, 1954).

How can one promote the 'testimony of the risen Christ' when one does not even believe in the 'risen Christ'? Paul called false teachers who denied the faith 'men of corrupt minds, reprobate concerning the faith.' (II Timothy 3:8). Paul would never have had them lead his evangelistic campaigns. They are lost souls needing to be saved.

3) **We must not disobey the Scriptures in order to win souls for Christ.**

Many New Evangelicals feel that they can disobey Bible principles to get people saved. Their attitude is that the end (salvation of souls) justifies the means (co-operation with unbelievers).

Note: The main business of Christians is not to win souls. The main business of Christians is to do the will of God. But we must win souls within the context of Biblical principles.

Example: King Saul lost the kingdom because he justified disobeying God's command to **destroy the Amalekites' animals**, so that he could obey God's other command about the required **animal sacrifices**. (I Samuel 15:2,3).

Saul disobeyed God by substituting a good thing in place of the best thing, namely total obedience to God. Samuel's rebuke applies to us today: 'Hath the Lord as great delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of the Lord? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams. For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry.' (I Samuel 15:22,23). Billy Graham and his followers have justified their disobeying God's commands against working with apostates, with the excuse that they are winning souls to Christ. This thinking is against the principle stated by Samuel, that:

"sacrifices were good, only when done according to the will of God.

But sacrifices done contrary to God's will were not acceptable."

Key: So it is with evangelism. The Bible commands both evangelism and obedience to God.

We cannot evangelise in a way that disobeys God.

4) **We must not disobey the Scriptures with the excuse that we are showing God's love.**

Many New Evangelicals have a wrong definition of love.

They say that: 'The badge of discipleship is not orthodoxy (sound doctrine), but love.'

They claim that Fundamentalists are harsh, separatist, and abrasive, while they themselves are loving. Their wrong definition of love says: 'Overlook false doctrines and embrace almost everyone who claims to be a Christian. Don't criticise or condemn, just go along for the sake of peace.'

Jesus tells us that **love** and **obedience** walk together:

a) 'If ye **love** me, **keep my commandments**.' (John 14:15).

b) 'He that hath my commandments and **keepeth** them, he it is that **loveth** me.' (John 14:21).

c) 'If a man **love me**, he will **keep my words**.' (John 14:23).

God warns us to 'have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather prove them.' (Eph. 5:11). Preachers of false doctrines spread works of darkness because they keep people in spiritual darkness. To fellowship with them is to disobey Ephesians 5:11 and is **unloving** toward God.

5) **We must not seek to please false teachers in order to preach the Gospel to their people.**

One of Billy Graham's main defences is that many people from liberal churches hear the Gospel because their pastors and churches co-operate in the crusades.

This 'end justifies the means' methodology was not that of the early apostles when Paul, Peter and Stephen preached against the Judaizers.

'If I yet pleased men, I should not be the servant of Christ.' (Galatians 1:10).

Men pleasers, such as Billy Graham, do not rebuke those preaching a false gospel such as salvation by infant sprinkling. Men may approve, but God does not.

Key: Billy Graham's sending his converts to churches holding false doctrines helps these false churches to grow in error by providing them with labourers to spread their errors. These labourers would be spreading truth if they were sent to sound churches.

6) **We must not Condone False Doctrine as if it were of Little Importance.**

The Roman Catholic Church teaches many heresies contrary to the Word of God, yet Billy Graham condones and encourages Catholic leaders to work with his crusades. Charismatics teach false doctrines, such as new revelations, false healings, gibberish disguised as tongues, thinking that sign gifts are still operable today. Billy Graham endorses them as reliable Christians. John, the Apostle of love, was not only concerned about showing love to God and man, but also about **rejecting error**. He said: 'Try the spirits whether they be of God.' (I John 4:1).

'The spirit of truth, and the spirit of error.' (I John 4:6).

'He that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds.' (II John 11).

Billy Graham rejects God's Word in order to expand his empire. Resist this temptation.

7) **Sound doctrine is more important than fellowship. True fellowship is based on sound doctrine.**

Doctrine has fallen on hard times. Many Christians consider key doctrines as unimportant issues, preferring to seek a false unity with unbelievers.

Question: What was the first thing that the Jerusalem church continued steadfastly in? 'the Apostles' **doctrine**, fellowship, in breaking of bread, and in prayers.' (Acts 2:42).

Paul charged Titus to 'speak thou the things that become **sound doctrine**.' (Titus 2:1).

Sound doctrine is doctrine that is not contaminated with error.

Conclusion: Ecumenical evangelism is contrary to God's program and principles. It is an attempt to unite that which should not be united. 'Can two walk together except they be agreed?' (Amos 3:3). 'What fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what fellowship hath light with darkness?' (II Corinthians 6:14).

God has separated light from darkness; truth from error; and no-one, not even in the cause of evangelism, should try to take down those divinely erected barriers.

22. **Loose Standards**

New Evangelicals advocate a more permissive, freer moral lifestyle than has been commonly accepted among Godly Christians. Traditionally, Godly Christians regarded as wrong such things as smoking, drinking alcohol, dancing, theatre going, gambling, petting and pre-marital sex. Many New Evangelicals, however, reacting against what they consider

excessive legalism, have allowed such practices. If we take a stand against these issues, we are called legalists. Paul speaks of the 'truth which is after godliness.' (Titus 1:1). Truth leads to Godliness. There is a powerful and vital connection between one's theology (the truth) and one's lifestyle (Godliness). Compromise in theological areas has led to compromise in lifestyles as well.

23. Marketing the Church to Give the Unsaved Community What They Want

Some churches try to find what the community wants and they then adjust their ministry to the community's demands. The Apostles never surveyed the pagans in order to see what kind of church to build, as has Bill Hybels of Willow Creek Community Church. They followed God's pattern, not the pagans' self-centred demands.

Question: What do spiritually blind, rebellious unbelievers know about the proper nature of a church? Nothing. The kind of church desired by the average unbeliever may be the opposite to what the New Testament requires:

- a) The unsaved person wants a church that will make him feel good, but God wants a church that will make the person feel the heavy guilt of his sins so that he will repent.
- b) The unsaved person likes contemporary rock music, but God likes music that exalts Jesus Christ.
- c) The unsaved person wants a church with few standards or requirements, but God wants a church that calls people to selfless, sacrificial service. God does not invite the unsaved to critique His Church because they are 'haters of God,...proud,...and without understanding.' (Romans 1:30-31).

God's will for the local church's message, methods, and organisation is revealed in the New Testament. These revelations are not open to debate or correction by those with no spiritual discernment.

Many churches downplay the importance of commitment and obedience, achieving growth by compromising their convictions. 'Woe to them that go down to Egypt for help.' (Isaiah 31:1).

God rebuked Israel for leaning on the arm of the flesh instead of on the arm of the Lord. Many churches today fall into the same trap.

Many pastors preach man-centred sermons and not God-centred sermons, thinking that God-centred sermons are not practical enough. This is a serious error that strikes at the heart of Biblical theology.

Question: Is the Bible a God-centred book or a man-centred book? Was God's main purpose in revealing Himself to man, to bring honour to Himself, or to bring comfort to man? We must challenge people to salvation and to discipleship.

Question: Pastors, are you building a church that is honouring to God and is according to the Bible? Pastors must take care how they build, as I Corinthians 3:5-17 describes how to build a church. All pastors and church planters must give account to God for what kind of church they built. 'The fire shall try every man's work **of what sort** it is.' (I Cor. 3:13). The quality of each church will be tested and pastors will be rewarded according to the quality of the church ('of what sort it is') and not necessarily quantity (numerical size). The 'marketing concept' of giving unbelievers what they want, is not found in Scripture. The Apostles and early Christians simply preached the Gospel in the filling of the Spirit and God 'added to the church daily such as should be saved.' (Acts 2:47).

24. Church Entertainment

Jesus said, 'Feed my sheep', not 'entertain my goats.' We live in an entertainment mad world where television has taught people to expect a thrill a minute. Many today believe that church meetings should entertain unbelievers, so that Christ is more palatable to them. The New Testament reveals an absence of entertainment in church worship and evangelisation. They emphasised what people need, not what they want. The early Christians met to

worship, pray, fellowship, be edified, and scattered to evangelise.

Many 20th Century Christians have become God's demanding little brats whose emotions must be entertained with amusing programs and the best the world has to offer. The *Wall Street Journal*, 13 May 1991, describes the program of the Second Baptist Church of Houston, Texas, as 'a Broadway-style show with a religious message. They offer as much activities and entertainment as they do religion.

In the place of hymns, teenagers sway and clap at "Solid Rock".

Biblically speaking, New Testament churches were marked by the Apostles' doctrine, fellowship, breaking of bread, prayers (Acts 2:42), preaching (Acts 20:9), singing (Ephesians 5:19), giving (I Corinthians 16:2), baptizing (I Corinthians 1:14-16), observing the Lord's Table (I Corinthians 11:20-34), and encouraging one another (Acts 14:22). The church's ministry is to be spiritual and instructive, not a sports or entertainment club.

Note: Some churches' growth is not always a result of evangelising the lost, but by rearranging the saints, playing musical churches, with people moving around to more exciting and larger churches.

Question: What has led to the rise in consumer religion and worldly church growth schemes?

- 1) The break-up of the monopoly of large denominations on religious life.
- 2) The glorification of success.
- 3) The vast commercialisation of our culture.
- 4) The effort of Christians to influence and imitate the culture.
- 5) The abandonment of God-centred theology in favour of an expedient, man-centred theology.

Question: What is wrong with the worldly church growth movement?

- 1) It uses worldly methods which give only short-term results.
- 2) Principles of business are revered more than doctrine.
- 3) They are not separated from those holding false doctrine. In order to gain more numbers, they will join up with Charismatics and with others holding to error.
- 4) They seek to make people feel comfortable with themselves by non-threatening messages, so that they accept Christianity as an affirming influence.
- 5) It defines success mainly by numbers of people attending.

25. Forsaking Preaching for Sharing

New Evangelicalism has had a bad effect on authoritative preaching, replacing strong preaching with 'sharing ideas', and 'observations.' This is humanism in preaching. Modernists consider negative preaching to be a cardinal sin. They want the hearers to feel comfortable about themselves. Strong preaching, like a torchlight searched out the sins in people's lives, causing them to repent and forsake them. An example of wrong modernist preaching is how Robert Schuller of Crystal Cathedral learned from Norman Vincent Peale that we should avoid making people feel guilty (by rebuking sin), but rather make them feel good about themselves, and tell them how to succeed in life. This will draw quite a crowd. Much New Evangelical preaching today is centred on psychological themes such as: meeting a person's emotional needs; helping individuals achieve self-esteem; child rearing; solving relationship problems; how to do this or that, etc.

They will be less inclined to preach on sin, holiness, doctrine, premillennial prophecy, separation from error, soul winning, missions, etc.

The Bible was written to reveal the thoughts of God and to direct man away from himself and towards the Lord. Many preachers today emphasise 'my needs' rather than focusing us on **God's person** explicated from Scripture.

When 'preaching' is changed to 'sharing', one's attention is immediately diverted from **God's revelation** to **man's perception**. Older style preaching used words such as 'ought', 'should' and 'must', but today many people don't want God telling them what to do. They just want God and preachers to help them solve their practical problems.

For centuries Christians have found the answers to life's deepest problems by applying great Biblical truths about God and His works. Preachers, declaring the mind and purpose of God from Scripture, have met human needs as people submitted to God and to His Word.

Preachers must first begin with an exposition of what God says, then make application of it to man's personal needs.

One of the chief errors of New Evangelicals is their tendency to magnify experience over knowledge, so that experience judges knowledge, and sound teaching is neglected. Charismatics have led the way in this thinking and have sought to influence evangelicalism to be more experience based.

This is why so-called 'Christian rock music' is popular, because many people want to 'feel' something rather than 'learn' something. New Evangelical preachers rarely tell people what is wrong with the Catholic church, or 5-point Calvinism, or infant sprinkling, or charismatic errors, or Amillennialism. That would be too negative, confrontational and divisive. There are far too many 'trumpets giving uncertain sounds' (I Corinthians 14:8) in pulpits today. How then can believers prepare themselves to do battle when they don't know **who** or **what** is the enemy?

If someone is teaching error, a pastor or teacher should speak words of correction to them. Strong religious convictions are not popular today. Let us not be conformed to this world, but let us present our bodies as a living sacrifice to do and speak God's will and words. (Romans 12:1,2).

Hence, New Evangelical preaching can be summarised as follows:

- i) Neglecting to **warn against false doctrine**;
- ii) occupation with **psychology**;
- iii) '**sharing ideas**' instead of authoritative doctrinal preaching;
- iv) preaching on **issues**, instead of reasoned Bible exposition;
- v) preaching **what people want** (man-centred), instead of what they need (God-centred);
- vi) retreat from **dogmatism** of 'thus saith the Lord'.

Question: What are Biblical guidelines for preaching?

- 1) A preacher must be fully committed to the **inspiration** and **inerrancy** of the **Bible**. Much weak preaching is due to weak commitment to Biblical inerrancy. If a preacher doubts the Bible's inerrancy, he won't be able to preach it with authority and power.
- 2) A preacher must **preach expositively** as stated in Nehemiah 8:8: 'So they **read** in the book of the law of God distinctly, and **gave the sense**, and **caused them to understand** the reading.'

Hence the **three elements** of expository preaching are:

- a) What does the passage **say**? Read it and give its background.
- b) What does the passage **mean**? Correctly interpret it by applying rules of grammar, context, history and theology.
- c) What does it tell **me** to do? **Apply** it so people can live it and obey it.

Benefits of expository preaching are:

- a) It **holds the preacher to the text**, emphasising the inspiration of God's Word;
- b) It keeps the preacher from getting **side-tracked** into error;
- c) It helps the preacher to **cover many subjects** within the passage, rather than him concentrating on his favourite subjects;

- d) It produces **spiritual maturity** and **depth of Christian living** in the congregation if consistently practised over a long period of time.

Those who would preach like Jesus did, must be definite, clear, decisive and settled, as a herald (**Greek:** kerox (preacher) in II Timothy 1:11) conveyed the official messages of kings, princes, magistrates and military commanders (*Thayers Lexicon*).

- 3) A preacher must boldly **preach** against error: 'Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine.' 2 Timothy 4:2.

Jesus, Paul, Peter, Isaiah, Jeremiah and other preachers all rebuked the errors of the day. God is opposed to preachers who 'speak a vision of their own heart, and not out of the mouth of the Lord.' (Jeremiah 23:16).

They are 'prophets of the deceit of their own heart.' (Jeremiah 23:26). Many modern New Evangelicals would not rebuke error as Isaiah said of Israel: 'Ah sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity, a seed of evildoers, children that are corrupters.' (Isaiah 1:4).

Note: Our aim is to 'speak the truth in love' (Ephesians 4:15). Some preachers in their zeal to take a stand, become mean, rude, nasty, insulting and arrogant in their pulpit ministry, harp on petty issues, and fail to feed the flock of God. God is entirely against arrogance such as this. **Only a Spirit-filled preacher who loves God, the Bible and people can display this right balance.** Because of the lack of sound doctrinal preaching (Titus 1:9) many believers are weak and tossed to and fro with every wind of doctrine.

Warning to Pastors: Before you approve any Bible college for your church members, ask the College who the lecturers are and from where did they receive their theological training. Don't let your people attend a college where its lecturers studied at New Evangelical colleges. They will poison your students minds and turn them against you and what you believe.

A good minister of Jesus Christ will nourish up his people in the words of faith and good doctrine.

(I Timothy 4:6). Pastors, are you doing this properly?

26. Failure To Discipline False Teachers

Many Baptist churches and unions of churches continue to honour and give equal recognition to pastors who teach blatant errors. A Sydney Baptist Union church was quite happy to tolerate two of its pastors who publicly stated their belief in evolution. Such men ought to be put out of the pastorate, because they are calling Jesus a liar in Mark 10:6 when He declared that humans were created by God, "But from the beginning of the creation God made them male and female." God says in Romans 16:17 to 'avoid them' and not to honour them as good Bible teachers.

Many denominations give equal recognition and honour to all pastors alike, regardless of their theological views. This is wrong to honour false teachers.

27. Acceptance and Fellowship with Para-church Organisations

Almost every para-church organisation has been infiltrated by New Evangelical errors. How can this be? Because of money and their need to draw students or workers from as wide a belief system as possible. Because they are not a church, they don't have people who give weekly offerings, so they must entice people from churches to come and work with them. This weakens local churches because such people are no longer under the authority of a local church, but are under the authority of a non-church organisation.

Para-church organisations, in widening their net to gain supporters, must go easy on error, in case they offend their supporters who hold false doctrines.

Consider the following example: Two New Tribes Mission families were being supported financially by a local church to go to the mission field. After a few years it became known that they were not presenting the Gospel until after a 2-5 year Bible course, nor were they

challenging sinners to pray to God to call on Christ to save them (Romans 10:13; Acts 2:21). When their supporting church pastor corrected them and told them to submit to their sending church's authority on these matters, they both refused and resigned from their local church in favour of staying loyal to the New Tribes Mission denomination.

Hence, it is a foolish waste of time, money and effort for a sound local church to support people who are not loyal to nor under the authority of the supporting or sending churches. Another bad effect of supporting para-church workers who are not fully loyal to your local church is that when you cut their support (because you discover that they are teaching error) this may lead to a split in your church when some people oppose you cutting the support of such "nice" people.

The attitude of para-church organisations is, 'The local church can do the hard work of winning the lost to Christ, then spend several years training them, then as soon as the convert is strong enough to be a worker to put something back into the church that helped him, the para-church group entices him to come and work with them. Their attitude is "You have minimal future in your church; come to us and we'll help you do something really big for God."'

Para-church groups do not have pastors, deacons, Lord's Supper, baptisms, a long term church membership, weekly offerings, independence of each local group, nor do they have doctrinal correctness (especially they are weak on or never mention the local church).

Note: Ask para-church organisations the question: 'Which local church's authority are you under?' They will reply, 'None, just our para-church headquarters.' They hence are working outside of Jesus Christ's plan when He said, 'I will build my church.' (Matthew 16:18). Para-church groups always believe in the false Roman Catholic idea of the universal church. This is wrong because:

- The universal church has never met and will not meet until after the rapture.
- How can you have an assembly that has never assembled?
- Most Bible references of "ekklesia" are to local assemblies. A few refer to the church as an institution (like the family). None refer to the universal church (except Hebrews 12:23 which takes place in heaven. This is the only place where the universal church meets).
- Although para-church groups believe in the universal church, they always ask local churches for money to finance their activities.

Conclusion: Avoid New Evangelical errors and expose them in your preaching, otherwise you will lose your people to New Evangelical churches or to para church organisations.

Notice four downward steps in compromise:

- Toleration of error;
- Co-operation with error;
- Contamination by error;
- Capitulation to error.

Which step are you and your church at today?

New evangelical philosophy has infected much of Christendom, that so very few Christians see the dangerous consequences. The downward path is best illustrated by the following.

Where are you on this slide?

The Christian recognises the error

He tolerates the error

He excuses the error

He defends the error

He condones the error

He embraces the error.

Questions To Ask Pastors Or People To See How New Evangelical They Are:

Q1: Do you believe that the Bible today is **without errors**?

Q2: Do you believe in six-day creation 6000 years ago, rather than **evolution**?

Q3: Does your Pastor preach against the errors of the **Roman Catholic Church**?

Q4: Does your Pastor and church use only the **King James Version Bible** (or a foreign language equivalent based on the received text)?

Q5: Does your Pastor believe and preach **premillennial truths**?

Q6: Does your Pastor preach against **Charismatic errors**?

Q7: Does your denomination or church forbid **ordination of female pastors**?

Q8: Does your church support **overseas mission** soul winning, church planting projects?

Q9: Does your church reject and keep separate from the **World Council of Churches**?

Q10: Does your Pastor refuse to **fellowship** with those holding false doctrines?

Q11: Does your church or Pastor baptise adults by full immersion, rather than by **sprinkling water** on babies?

Q12: Does your church refuse to **join evangelistic crusades** with other churches which believe error?

Q13: Does your church forbid **rock music** bands?

Q14: Does your Pastor **preach separation from worldliness**, Charismatics and other errors?

Q15: Does your church have a weekly soul winning **visitation program**?

Q16: Does the **Pastor** regularly lead people to Christ?

Q17: Does your local church possess and own the **church property title deeds** (rather than the denomination having them?) If the denomination owns them they can put you out at any time they please. They control your local church. This is wrong.

Q18: Did the theological college where your pastor was trained, teach the above truths?

Q19: Does the **theological college** recommended by your pastor for students to attend, teach the above truths?

Q20: Is this college loyal to and in **full doctrinal agreement** with your local church?

Answers: The above questions should all have been answered with a YES, in order to be Biblically sound. Any NO answers indicate areas of New Evangelical error.

What did your church score out of a possible 20 correct answers?

III. BIBLE RULES ABOUT SEPARATION FOR ALL CHRISTIANS

RULE 1: The Bible forbids us to fellowship with unbelief (Ephesians 5:11a).

'And have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them.'

II John 7-11 states that Christian fellowship should not be extended to religious unbelievers and apostates. 'If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed.'

Many people in John's day called themselves Christians but did not hold the doctrine of Christ as set forth in Hebrews 6:1,2, (this being: repentance from dead works to be saved; faith towards Christ (who is God) for salvation; baptism with the Holy Spirit **at** salvation, and baptism in water **after** salvation; laying on of hands to set men apart for a ministry; resurrection of the dead; and eternal judgment in the lake of fire).

The Bible tells us to have nothing to do with those who don't hold the doctrine of Christ. 'Whosoever transgresseth and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God.' (II John 9).

This is a very serious statement showing how important God sees this matter.

Definition of Apostasy: A 'falling away' or a 'defection from truth' in Greek (646).

Apostasy means a departure from spiritual truth by individuals, churches or organisations which once possessed the truth.

The first two areas of apostasy are:

1. Departure from the inerrancy and inspiration of the Bible.
2. Disbelieving the Deity of Christ.

RULE 2: The Bible Commands us to Reprove Apostasy (Ephesians 5:11b).

One thing that irritates and upsets apostasy is the **criticism of apostasy**.

'Why be negative?' 'Why criticise apostasy?' 'Why not just be positive?'

Because Ephesians 5:11 says: 'And have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather **reprove them**.' The Greek word for 'reprove' means 'to oppose', 'to show to be guilty.'

We are to **separate** from apostasy, and then to **expose it**.

Unbiblical apostasy always masquerades in respectable garments such as:

It claims to be spreading Christian love;

It claims to eliminate prejudice (eg: WCC fighting racism);

It claims to bring people together in unity;

It claims to be crusading for peace;

It claims to be cleaning up man's environment (by a social gospel).

It never unveils itself as hateful, ugly unbelief with a veneer of humanistic good works. God has given us the job of unveiling it and exposing it as error.

The spirit of today is 'don't be negative', but God commands us to reprove apostasy.

If you knew the bridge was washed out, your first responsibility is to avoid driving into the ravine, and your second responsibility is to warn others to avoid the danger.

RULE 3: The Bible commands us to purge unbelief if we can.

The Corinthian Church had a clear case of immorality. Most of the church was moral, but they had ignored one man's fornication, which corrupted their fellowship. If we tolerate immorality or unbelief, it will usually build a sympathetic following.

Note: God did not command the Corinthians believers to leave the church in order to separate from the man. Instead, He commanded the believers to purge the church of the unrepentant man.

I Corinthians 5:1,2,6,7 describes the situation: 'It is reported commonly that there is fornication among you . . . ye have not rather mourned, that he that hath done this deed might be **taken away from you** . . . Know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump? Purge out therefore the old leaven.'

Key: Church discipline is God's provision for keeping a church **pure morally and pure doctrinally**.

Question: Why do we have apostate churches and denominations today?

Answer: Because church discipline is rarely practised.

Result: Unbelief flooded into the theological colleges, flowed into the pulpits and trickled into the pews. Churches and denominations failed to stem the tide by failing to purge unbelief and false doctrine. The failure to practise Biblical discipline will always lead to the need for separation from such churches or denominations.

Example: When Robert Ketcham could not purge the modernism out of the Pittsburgh Baptist Association, he became a separatist.

Question Can you clean up your apostate church?

Answer: The Bible commands us to purge unbelief. But this is no longer possible in 95% of apostate churches. No person can possibly clean up the National Council of Churches. Its theological colleges are apostate, its denominational hierarchy is apostate, and its

connections are apostate. Fortunately, the sincere believer who seeks to purge the apostasy, will usually be put out by the apostasy and will end up a separatist.

RULE 4: God commands Believers not to be yoked together in Spiritual Endeavour with Unbelievers. (II Corinthians 6:14-18).

'Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness? and what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel? what agreement hath the temple of God with idols? for ye are the temple of the living God, as God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people.' (II Corinthians 6:14-18).

'Thou shalt not plow with an ox and an ass together.' (Deuteronomy 22:10).

The yoke was an instrument that joined two animals together in an endeavour. An ox is a reliable, hard-working, strong animal that is a willing worker. He well pictures a believer. An ass is a stubborn, unreliable animal that is difficult to work with, and uncooperative, who often wants to go his own way. He well pictures an unbeliever. God forbids both animals ploughing together. God also forbids believers and unbelievers allying together. This is because the unbeliever is not submissive to God's rules, but he makes his own rules as he sees fit, to the detriment of the believer.

You may be yoked with an unbeliever to produce a report at work, or to build your boundary fence, but you must not yoke with an unbeliever in any spiritual endeavour, even a money-making spiritual endeavour.

This passage (II Cor. 6:14-18) talks about righteousness, light, faith and the temple of God. These are spiritual or religious things. 'Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers.' (v.14).

'Come out from among them and be ye separate.' (v.17). Biblical separation is God's preventative medicine to protect us from the cancer of apostasy. **Separation** is to the whole ministry of the Word of God and the service of Jesus Christ what sterilisation and sanitation are to surgery.' (Paul Jackson).

Objection: Some sincere believer may say, 'I am the only testimony in this apostate church.'

Human reason says to you, 'I must stay, for if I leave, there will be no witness left in this church.'

Answer: Notice that your human reason is opposite to God's clear command in II Corinthians 6:14-18. God says, 'Come out from among them and be ye separate.'

If the lump is already leavened with error, you'll never change it. Nobody ever has in all of Christian history. You remaining in an apostate church encourages it to spread error.

Objection: But if I leave a secure, well-paid position in an apostate denomination, who will pay my salary to support my family?

Answer: God will. Trust Him as He promised: 'Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing: and I will receive you, and **will be a Father unto you**, and ye shall be **my sons and daughters**, saith the Lord Almighty.' (II Corinthians 6:17,18).

Separation from Disobedient brethren.

The non-separatist Dallas Theological Seminary desired to cease reprovng apostasy. This characterises the decline of every fundamentalist group because it tolerates and gives respectability to error, which then spreads through the group.

Question: Is it ever right to separate from individual believers? **Answer:** (See Rule 5).

RULE 5: The Bible Commands us to Separate from Disobedient Brethren.

Question 1: What is **Biblical Fundamentalism**?

Answer: 'Biblical Fundamentalism is the militant belief and proclamation of the basic doctrines of Christianity. This leads to Biblically separating from those who reject them.' (Source: "Axioms of Separation", John Ashbrook, Mentor, Ohio).

Note: There are three keys to this definition:

- (a) Militant belief - these basic doctrines are held as strong convictions;
- (b) Proclamation - these doctrines are not only believed, but taught to congregations and preached to the lost;
- (c) Separation - a man is not a true fundamentalist unless he practises separation where necessary.

Question 2: What is **New Evangelicalism**?

Answer: Harold Ockenga, its founder and First President of Fuller Theological Seminary, defines it:

'New Evangelicalism was born in 1948 in connection with a convocation address which I gave in the Civic Auditorium in Pasadena. While reaffirming the theological view of fundamentalism, this address repudiated its **ecclesiology** and its **social theory**. The ringing call for a **repudiation of separatism** and the summons to **social involvement** received a hearty response from many evangelicalsIt differed from fundamentalism in its **repudiation of separation** and its determination to engage itself in the **theological dialogue** of the day.'

This tells us that New Evangelicalism differs from Fundamentalism in three ways:

- (1) It repudiates separation;
- (2) It summons Christians to social involvement with the world. This traces back to the modernist Social Gospel.
- (3) It shows a determination to engage in theological dialogue with liberals and unbelievers. It says, 'We will not come out from apostates, but we will sit down and talk with them.'

Key: "Separation from apostasy" is the fork in the road between fundamentalism and new evangelicalism.

- a) Fundamentalism says 'Be not unequally yoked', 'Come out from among them', 'Be ye separate', 'Touch not the unclean thing', 'Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness.'
- b) New Evangelicals say, 'stay in', 'associate', 'infiltrate' and 'dialogue' with error.

Question: Which set of words is Biblical? Clearly the first.

Biblically, New Evangelicalism seems easily defeated, but overwhelmingly it has won the hearts of the 'Christian Public.'

Many Fundamental Colleges, publishers and churches of the 1940s are now mostly New Evangelical. New Evangelicalism has captured the mass of professing Christians with:

- (1) its appeal to man's intellect;
- (2) its offer of a non-controversial road;
- (3) its adjustment to the world's lifestyle, and
- (4) its use of the rich and famous.

Objection: Some say, 'We should not separate from other believers, because we will all be together in heaven.'

Answer: The difference between heaven and now is that in heaven we'll see sin as God sees it, and there will be repentance where we have been in error. When repentance takes place in heaven, there will be no trouble being together in heaven. But if that same repentance were to take place on earth right now, we'd maintain fellowship on earth. The one who divides the body of Christ is not the Fundamentalist who insists on obeying

the Bible, but the New Evangelical who insists on fellowshipping out of bounds with those in error.

Note these five key **commands** in Scripture:

- (1) 'let him be unto thee as a **heathen** man and a publican.' (Matthew 16:18).
- (2) '**Not to keep company**, if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, covetous, idolater, railer, drunkard, extortioner.' (I Corinthians 5:11).
- (3) 'If any man teach otherwise . . . from such **withdraw thyself**.' (I Timothy 6:3-5).
- (4) '**withdraw yourselves** from every brother that walketh disorderly.' (II Thessalonians 3:6).
- (5) 'Mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned and **avoid** them.' (Romans 16:17).

Question: What is God's command about disobedient brethren?

Answer: Avoid them, withdraw yourselves from them, not to keep company, let him be as a heathen. In other words, separation.

**RULE 6: God's Work done in God's Way Produces only Good Results.
God's Work done in Man's Way Produces Good and Bad Results.**

Religious magazines constantly tell us about the good done by New Evangelicalism. We read about thousands of decisions at Billy Graham's or Luis Palau's latest ecumenical crusade. Is New Evangelicalism now the official channel of God's blessing? Three observations need to be made:

- (1) **God never calls us to judge obedience by results**.
God never commanded us to co-operate with apostasy and then evaluate the results. God says, 'Come out . . . and be separate . . . touch not the unclean thing.'
- (2) If something is to be measured by results, **we must evaluate all the results**.
Question: What are other results of New Evangelical compromise?
 - i) When New Evangelicals breach the Biblical principle of separation, the **line between belief and unbelief is obscured**. For example, **before** Billy Graham's 1957 New York Crusade, the religious people of New York clearly knew which churches were fundamental Bible believing and which were not. After the crusade, that line was erased. People were then not sure which were sound churches. **Erasing that line was not good, but evil**.
 - ii) Because **unbelieving churches** co-operated with the Crusade, they **now have Billy Graham's stamp of approval**, and hence are now recognized as true churches. This results in spiritually hungry Christians being turned back into these modernistic churches. They starved in these churches before their conversion, and they have been pointed back to these churches to starve some more after their conversion, when they could be winning souls and bearing much fruit in a sound church. **Pointing Christians to churches with error is not good, but evil**.
 - iii) **Spiritual babes are left on the doorsteps of unbelieving churches**.
Do you believe in abandoning babies on doorsteps to starve? Then how can you defend Billy Graham openly returning new converts to blind Catholic churches or apostate Protestant churches to be fed false doctrine? That is not good, but is evil.
 - iv) **People are weaned from service in their local churches**. Who wants to sing in a volunteer choir of 10 when they have sung with 2500 under a world famous director? Your local church of 100 looks very small compared with 50,000 at a crusade meeting. The New Testament emphasizes the local church, not the ecumenical crusade. Where is an ecumenical crusade in the New Testament?

- v) Pointing new Christians to churches with error **kills multiplication** of soul-winning Christians and **aids multiplication of error**. **It stops these new believers from becoming strong soul-winners** and it stops them from becoming **multipliers of disciples**. This is a most serious failure because we never see what might have been.

(3) **Results alone do not mean that something is the will of God**. For example, in Numbers 20, when Moses angrily struck the rock in order to fetch water, he had great results of God opening the rock to supply water that quenched the thirst of millions of people. However, because Moses disobeyed God's command to 'speak to the Rock' (not strike the rock as he did), God forbid Moses entering the promised land. The good results did not justify the wrong way in which the thing was done. Great loss resulted. In navigation, a small deviation in course would lead a ship hundreds of miles from its intended destination. In 1948, when Harold Ockenga set a new course for New Evangelicalism, he did not intend to make much of a course correction. He just intended to reject separation, add social involvement and win over some liberals. But this small deviation has sent many people to unite with apostasy.

It has multiplied apostasy rather than multiplying soul-winners and true disciples. Satan is always inviting fundamentalists to co-operate, join, associate, stay in and dialogue with error.

Key: We must separate from disobedient brethren who continue in toleration of unbelief.

Why should we endorse believers who bring leaven into our churches, and break down the fences between truth and error by their endorsing of men who hold false doctrines? Henry Crowell, who built the Quaker Oats Company, sums it up well:

'Workers and leaders must be intolerant of unbelievers in church office.

Faith must not support men in authority who, though they themselves are Bible believers, are tolerant of others in positions of trust & authority who do not so believe. The battle against the leaven was being lost in Christendom today because of tolerance toward believers who were tolerant toward unbelievers.'

Key: One ability every Christian needs is the ability to say 'NO' to error.

Satan is building his ugly one-world-church.

He aims to attach every church to this ecumenical monstrosity.

a) He started with the World Council of Churches.

b) To this he has tied in the Roman Catholic Church.

c) Also the Charismatic churches have been attached with the cement of the false tongues experience. If a Catholic priest speaks in tongues, Charismatics call him brother.

d) He has added New Evangelical churches with the cement of toleration of error.

e) Now he is adding heathen religions using the trick of praying for world peace.

f) The devil is applying pressure for your church to join this hideous ecumenical harlot. The only thing that will stop churches from being swept into Satan's counterfeit church is our ability to say 'NO'. Four rules on this are:

RULE 7: Don't Affiliate Your Church with any Church, Mission, Movement or Evangelistic Effort Which Does not Fully Believe the Inerrant Bible.

Beware of the 'Good Cause Syndrome.' Many groups will want your church to join them in promoting a good cause, such as opposition to pornography, abortion, communism, racism, etc. These are good causes that you may agree with, but, if you join up, it will ally you with Catholic priests, apostates and Charismatics.

Question: Why not join apostates to support a good cause?

Answer:

- 1) These groups want your support, but they don't want your Gospel or doctrines;

- 2) Compromise ties your tongue so that you cannot rebuke their errors;

- 3) You will teach your people not to rebuke error but to tolerate it for any reason.

Example 1: In II Chronicles 18, Godless Ahab trapped Godly Jehoshaphat with the 'good cause' trick. The Syrians held the border town of Ramoth-gilead. For the safety of both Israel and Judah, that town needed to be taken. On the basis of that good cause, Jehoshaphat joined with Ahab. Jehoshaphat could see that Ahab's false prophets were not men of God. When Micaiah, a true prophet, spoke God's words, Jehoshaphat was so bound up by compromise that he stood with Ahab instead of with godly Micaiah and he almost got killed in the battle. When King Jehoshaphat returned home to Jerusalem, God sent Jehu the prophet to rebuke the king: 'Shouldst thou help the ungodly, and love them that hate the Lord? therefore is wrath upon thee from the Lord.' (II Chronicles 19:2). Jehoshaphat said 'Yes' when he should have said 'No' to Ahab.

Example 2: In Ezra 4:1-4, when Zerubbabel was building the temple of God, their adversaries offered to help them. Building the temple was a good cause and help was needed. The adversaries claimed to worship God in some sense, but Zerubbabel correctly saw that they did not fully believe the Bible, so he declined their offer.

'Now when the **adversaries** of Judah and Benjamin heard that the children of the captivity builded the temple unto the Lord God of Israel; then they came to Zerubbabel, and to the chief of the fathers, and said unto them, **Let us build with you; for we seek your God, as ye do;** and we do sacrifice unto him since the days of Esarhaddon king of Assur, which brought us up hither. But Zerubbabel and Jeshua, and the rest of the chief of the fathers of Israel, said unto them, **Ye have nothing to do with us** to build an house unto our God; but **we ourselves together will build** unto the Lord God of Israel, as King Cyrus the king of Persia hath commanded us. Then the people of the land **weakened** the hands of the people of Judah, and **troubled them in building**.'

Zerubbabel's 'No' caused his enemies to trouble him, but it kept God's hand of blessing on the work. If you contract with an unsaved builder (who doesn't care about the gospel) to build your church, he can stop the job for any reason, demand extra money, sue you in court and send you bankrupt from interest and legal fees. No other builder will be willing to complete the job for fear of them being sued at a later date for the first builder's possible defective workmanship.

Note: 'Evangelism is the soft underbelly of fundamentalism.'

The line which has trapped more fundamental pastors into ecumenical evangelism is:

'Brother, this is for the cause of souls.' Don't allow any cause, even evangelism, to get you to disobey God's commands.

Note: You can be for or against a cause without joining anything.

You don't need to join a society to fight abortion. If you are uncertain about any invitation, say, 'Let me think about it for a while.' That will let you check it with the Bible and by prayer.

Key: Keep your church pure, so God can use you and it.

RULE 8: Do not Affiliate Your Church with Any Church, Mission, Movement or Evangelistic Effort which does not Practise Biblical Separation.

Missions and other groups will come to your church, seeking your monetary support. Some groups will seem to have good policies, but they will not declare themselves to be separatists. Actively reproving apostasy is a part of Biblical separation. If a group will not reprove false doctrine, it will lead to the assembling of a mixed multitude.

Example 1: Church growth seminars, counselling seminars, etc will draw their people from a wide range of churches. They will not separate from apostasy or false doctrines. The

fundamentalist at such a meeting will be seated next to Catholics, Charismatics or apostates. Why does that crowd feel comfortable together?

Because it has been quietly agreed that for the sake of their work, they will not reprove error or apostasy, and that Ephesians 5:11 will not be practised.

Example 2: Groups which preach indiscriminately in fundamental, modernistic and charismatic churches are saying to the whole community that: 'Fundamental churches and modernistic churches are about the same . . . they support the same things.' Examples include moral majority, Christian political parties.

Question: Why should we not join groups such as Moral Majority or Promise Keepers?

Answer: Because they will not practise Biblical separation.

Every fundamentalist knows that we are a minority. You can't practise Biblical separation and build a majority. The world's way is always to win with a majority.

Think. Can you think of any place in Scripture where God used a majority? Truth is usually in the minority in this evil world. The battles in Scripture were always won by an obedient minority (so God would get the glory, not man), and not by a diverse majority.

RULE 9: You Cannot Preserve a Position Without Crusading for it.

Some fundamentalists want to take a stand quietly, without being offensive. They do not want to talk much about apostasy and separation. They do not want to be outspoken fundamentalists in the front line of the battle. 'Be positive' is their watchword.

Trying to take a stand, while remaining all positive, is the half-way house between Fundamentalism and New Evangelicalism.

Not being outspoken always leads to the weaker position, not the stronger one.

Many churches have become New Evangelical while trying to be silent fundamentalists.

Groups such as Billy Graham, Christianity Today, Fuller Seminary, Wheaton College, National Association of Evangelicals, and many Christian bookshops, have made a massive blitz to sell the Christian world on New Evangelicalism.

Fundamentalism met this blitz with a great silence. Many Bible believing churches were stolen by vocal New Evangelicalism. Early fundamentalists were fighters, and namers of names: 'Tell (Herod) that fox.' (Luke 13:32). They identified liberals. They quoted their false doctrines. They reprovved their apostasy.

New Evangelicals criticised fundamentalists for being too unkind to liberals, saying it was wrong to name names. (But Jesus often did. Check it!) Under pressure of this criticism, many of the fighting tigers of Fundamentalism have turned into the pussy cats of quiet Fundamentalism. Many a quiet Fundamentalist now purrs on the hearth of New Evangelicalism.

The last 40 years show that you can't preserve a position without crusading for it.

RULE 10: When in Doubt, Don't Join.

Every Christian ought to be a member of a Bible believing church. If there are none in your neighbourhood, you should start one. If you don't have perfect peace about joining some church or group, don't join. You'll never have to apologise for what you don't join. Ask the 20 test questions to see if the church or group passes every area of Bible truth before you decide to join it.

RULE 11: What Separation is Not.

Separation is not the Answer to Every Disagreement Between Brethren.

The traits God uses to make separatists strong (eg: reprovving error) must be controlled, or separation can turn to fragmentation. Notice 3 areas where separation is not the answer:

(1) **Personal Disagreement.** Believers should not separate over personal differences. The answer is face-to-face talking, confession, forgiveness, prayer and forgetting according

to Matthew 18:15-19. If pastors and people will settle their problems Biblically, they can have a long and fruitful ministry in the one church. Some pastors and people who can't resolve their problems, change churches every few years. Both the offender and the offended have an equal obligation to find one another and get things right.

(2) **Be patient with other believers as we all learn by making mistakes.**

Don't separate from believers for every mistake or differing decision they make. If a man dogmatically holds to error, it is time to separate. Please remember that we have all held wrong beliefs in the past which we would not hold today. We are all learning and growing. Show love to those who may not have come as far as you have on some issues, and help them to see the truth on these issues.

'In meeekness instructing those that oppose themselves; if God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth.' (II Timothy 2:25).

(3) **Difference in standards.** Some churches have minor differences in standards that do not contradict any Biblical principles. We should love and fellowship with them, in spite of these minor differences.

Conclusion: When we obey the Bible, we enjoy victory. New Evangelicalism takes God's Word and mixes it with human reason and modern culture.

The enemies of the Gospel today are actively seeking the support of the Lord's people.

These doctrine-free, false prophets of ecumenicalism invite us to co-operate, share pulpits, join campaigns, support good causes and reach communities with them.

The New Evangelicals have heeded their siren songs and gone over to dialogue.

The Fundamentalist, as the prophet of old, must see them as the devil's invitations.

Faithful pastors have never dialogued with wolves.

Note: If we cease speaking against error, this will cut us off from the fellowship of strong Christians who are fighting for the truth.

The unnamed prophet of I Kings 13:18 believed a lie because the lie came from a friend. I Kings 13 has three characters in it:

King **Jeroboam** (representing the liberal apostate crowd of today),

the **unnamed prophet** (representing the Fundamentalists of today), and

the **old backslidden compromising prophet** (representing New Evangelicalism who have decided to ignore and disobey God's command to separate from error).

Question: Would a brother lie to us?

Answer: Yes, many believers who intend to follow some unbiblical conduct say to us: 'We have prayed about this and we know the Spirit of the Lord led us to join this ecumenical crusade, etc.'

How do we know this is a lie? Rule 12 is the answer.

RULE 12: The **Spirit of God** has never led any Christian Contrary to the Word of God.

The New Evangelical comes to us as a brother, but his philosophy of ministry ignores God's commands such as: 'avoid them', 'withdraw yourselves', 'be ye separate.'

When he tells us that the Spirit of God has led him in this New Evangelical direction,

he is **lying** because the Spirit of God has never led one Christian contrary to God's Word.

Key: The most dangerous deviation is the one closest to your own position. New Evangelicalism sprang out of Fundamentalism. Jerry Falwell has swallowed the lie of New Evangelicalism by deciding that there is really no difference between fundamentalist and new evangelicals. This has led many to follow his path into compromise with error.

Question: Is it right to speak approving words about disobedient brethren from your pulpit? Is it right to allow the cream of your young people to be educated in New Evangelical Theological colleges and to be used in their enterprises? No.

Question: Why was God so severe on the young prophet, but did not discipline the old prophet for lying and causing the young prophet's downfall? **Answer:** (See Rule 13).

RULE 13: God is most Severe on those whom he is Using at the Moment.

God was not using the old prophet, but the young prophet was God's man of the hour, being used so greatly against Jeroboam. God had to treat his disobedience very seriously. The Bible believing, separated, fundamental church is God's instrument for today, but sadly, we are seeing some decline:

- a) Some fundamental churches are becoming more New Evangelical.
- b) Many fundamentalist meetings have less protest against error.
- c) Many fundamentalists are more tolerant of New Evangelical speakers.
- d) Some Fundamentalist's desire for souls and growth have opened the door to New Evangelical methods.
- e) Some Fundamentalist's music has more New Evangelical notes.
- f) Many Fundamentalists have adopted the silent stand and allowed vocal New Evangelicals to spread its message unrebuked.

God does not have to use Fundamentalists. If we forsake His truth, God can leave us lying in the middle of the road between the lion and the ass.

When Ockenga led the way in dialoguing with apostates and religious unbelievers, he led the movement away from the Word of God. You can't dialogue with religious unbelievers and open the Bible to say, 'Thus saith the Lord'. New Evangelicals took their movement away from allegiance to the Bible. Fundamentalists can put their finger on a Bible text and say, 'This is it. God said it, that settles it'. You can't say this if you work with liberals.

Many pastors have failed to impress these 13 principles on their people.

Question: What do we lose if we do not practise these Biblical principles of separation?

Answer: John's answer in II John 8 is that we lose our life's work, 'those things which we have wrought.' 'Look to yourselves, that we lose not those things which we have wrought; but that we receive a full reward.'

Many great fundamental churches have not taught their people these principles and they have now become New Evangelical churches overcome by much error, and are well on their way to reuniting with apostasy from which they once separated.

Teaching and practising these 13 principles is the only way to keep from losing your life's work in this generation or the next. If the fences are allowed to be torn down, the next generation will not know where they should be. Let us re-dig the wells of truth that have been filled in by the New Evangelicals (Genesis 26:17-25).

Source: '*Axioms of Separation*' by John Ashbrook, (with permission) 8686 Hilltop Drive, Mentor, Ohio 44060.