In September of 1999, Baptist College of Ministry will begin its first year with a full academic program, supervised student housing, and food service. Dr. Ed Nelson will be preaching the Inaugural Service on Sunday evening, September 5th.

- Training LEADERS for the Local Church
- Preparing LADIES for Church and Home Ministry
- Equipping LAYMEN for the Work of the Ministry

Bachelor of Arts and Associate of Ministry degree programs available.

FACILITIES
Plans are in place for the construction of dormitories and a dedicated academic building. The beautiful and spacious facilities of Falls Baptist Church meet all immediate needs for educational space.

LEADERSHIP
Baptist College of Ministry is under the capable pastoral leadership of Dr. Wayne Van Gelderen, with Mr. Dave Schlagel serving as Dean of the college. We are especially excited that God has recently led Evangelist Jim Van Gelderen, Director of Minutemen Ministries, to assume leadership as Vice President.

If your desire is to serve God wholeheartedly and to live a life separated unto Him, Baptist College of Ministry may be the place where God would have you receive your training.

FACULTY
In addition to resident teachers, the Baptist College of Ministry faculty includes visiting pastors and leaders who bring with them a wealth of diverse experiences and a “fresh” perspective.

Further information is available by calling or writing: N69 W12703 Appleton Avenue • Menomonee Falls, WI 53051 (414) 251-7051, ext. 34 • e-mail: collegeofministry@juno.com
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I have just finished reading the latest issue [Jan./Feb.] of Frontline and have come away disappointed. . . . I am finding less and less difference between the evangelical church and the Fundamentalist. We continue to point our fingers at the same issues, issues that we have talked about for years and are comfortable with, and cry “separate,” such as music, books, TV, and entertainment. . . . But no one is tackling the harder issues in regard to women in fear that they will step on toes—women as homemakers, dressing with modesty, etc. The church argues that culture has changed, that we need two incomes, that women can be modest and still dress like men. Where is separation on these issues? If we can use these arguments in regards to these passages why not use the arguments in all issues? The church has been deceived and women especially. We have left our homes and children in day care in search of mammon and no one says a word. Shame on you.

Shannon C. Blain
Jaffrey, NH

I just read your article on movies and TV by Jim Van Gelderen [Jan./Feb. 1999], and I don’t believe I’ve ever read anything else on the subject that struck me so deep. . . . I am also going to read it to my children. Thank you for a message so filled with truth there is no mistake about what every Christian should do. God bless your magazine!

Sara Beltran
Fresno, CA

Thank you for Frontline. Your magazine is a genuine blessing here on the mission field where fellowship and encouraging literature is scarce. However, in your Nov./Dec ’98 issue, I was disappointed to see such blatant compromise on page 17. Since when do Fundamentalists promote Roman Catholic art and culture? In my Bible, only devils had stork wings and Jude clearly said that Michael asked the Lord to rebuke Satan. Are you trying to convey to your readers that Roman Catholic apostasy is “okay” as long as it is in art form and has the untouchable “Bob Jones” name behind it? While worldly, unbiblical music is wrong, is worldly, unbiblical art just fine? Perhaps Romans 16:17–18 is to be applied only when the offender is outside of our camp?

Jeff Williams
Blenheim, NEW ZEALAND

The three issues I’ve received have really blessed my heart! I especially praise God for your keeping Christians informed of what the enemy is up to. Your Jan./Feb. 1999 issue article, “Dad Was Right,” is a case at hand. . . . My prayers go with you, that God will richly bless your much-needed Frontline endeavors.

Robert W. Browne
Georgiana, AL

SUBSCRIPTION INFORMATION

Subscription prices for Frontline Magazine are $16.95 for one year, $30.95 for two years, and $44.95 for three years. Call us toll-free at 800–376–6856 or write to Frontline Magazine, 500 West Lee Road, Taylors, SC 29687. Visa and MasterCard are accepted.
Behind the Lines

The 20th-Century Deception: “The Lie Becomes Truth”

The 20th century will be known in church history as “The Age of Change.” The 20th century will be known as an era when (1) Biblical thinking was changed to psychological thinking, (2) Christ-centeredness was changed to self-centeredness, (3) the needs of others were changed to our own personal needs, (4) mental attitudes changed to become feelings, (5) humility and favor with God were changed to self-esteem, (6) sacrifice and service were changed for a “health-and-welfare Christianity,” and (7) faithfulness and loyalty changed to convenience.

The end result in the church has been an acceptance—no, an embracing of the world’s philosophy. Society rather than the Scriptures sets our standards, while “public opinion” has become our standard-bearer.

“Service, faithfulness, loyalty, giving of time, involvement, sacrifice, dedication, full surrender”—these words are not found in the average Christian’s vocabulary today. Instead, the average Christian contemplating church membership asks, “How can your church meet my needs?” or “How can your ministry support me?” or “What do you have to offer me?” and “I want to join your church, but I don’t want to get involved.”

“Truth” has become a lie. Whatever can be supported by “public opinion” is what’s right. Consider how we have allowed ourselves to be deceived:

• Sodomy is merely an “alternative lifestyle.”
• Drunkenness is now “alcoholism”—a sickness one inherits or a disability toward which one has a genetic pre-

disposition.
• Adultery is merely an “affair,” or is described as “seeing someone else.”
• Lying is just a “fib”; and it’s okay to lie anyway, especially if it’s about “private sexual matters.”
• Murder and killing innocent babies is “abortion of a fetus”—a woman’s right, a choice, performed over 3,000 times a day in the United States of America.
• The Lord’s Day is now a holiday.

Christians have changed from being a spiritual force in the world to being the objects of jokes in the bar-
rooms. No one has time for the church today. Because of apostasy and liberalism, the church has lost the influence it once had in society. In the not-too-distant past, the church was so influential that there was no need for a divorced man to consider running for public office. Stores and industry were closed to honor the Lord’s Day. In the late 1920s, America “went dry”—selling liquor was a crime, because of the church’s influence. A decade or so ago, a politician lost his bid for the White House, all because of a “one-night stand” and a picture that betrayed the secret.

Just a few years ago, the influence of the church could be seen in every facet of our social and public life. The true meanings of Thanksgiving, Christmas, and Easter were taught in our public schools. The Bible lay on teachers’ desks and was read daily in our public schools. State and federal buildings were adorned with Scripture verses engraved in the marble facade, reminding our leaders and citizens that God is the Author of liberty and justice.

But now we are gripped by the influence of the National Education Association, the American Civil Liberties Union, and the liberal news media. The church has lost its influence. Now the world and society set the agenda for the church! Everyone works or shops on the Lord’s Day. We’ve lost that holy fear and reverence, the awe of standing on holy ground. The Lord’s Day has become a day of pleasure and recreation.

Things have changed over the last 40 years. We must return to the Old Testament “landmarks” and reclaim the heritage of our fathers. We don’t need as a substitute for personal holiness the cultish “personal preference” fad (disguised as “Biblical standards”) that is creeping into Fundamentalism. We need Biblical sanctification in our daily living. What America needs is an old-fashioned, Holy Ghost, sin-convicting revival! Don’t be afraid of the word holiness, “without which no man shall see the Lord” (Heb. 12:14). Oh, God, baptize us with Holy Ghost fire, in purity and power!

Has the world changed? Yes! It has become more bold and cunning in its approach. Has the church changed? Yes! We have surrendered many “ancient landmarks,” and we must take back some “holy beachheads.” How can this be accomplished? By allowing the Bible to speak; by preaching in the power
Have fundamental churches changed? Just look at our prayer meetings, our soul-winning efforts, our dress, the movies and videos that our people allow in their homes. Society has taken over, and the preacher now makes his entrance dressed in blue jeans and a leather jacket, roaring in on a motorcycle while the music and the crowds sing “Born to Be Wild.” God help us!

Give ear, O my people, to my law: incline your ears to the words of my mouth. I will open my mouth in a parable: I will utter dark sayings of old: Which we have heard and known, and our fathers have told us. We will not hide them from their children, shewing to the generation to come the praises of the Lord, and his strength, and his wonderful works that he hath done. For he established a testimony in Jacob, and appointed a law in Israel, which he commanded our fathers, that they should make them known to their children: That the generation to come might know them, even the children which should be born; who should arise and declare them to their children: That they might set their hope in God, and not forget the works of God, but keep his commandments: And might not be as their fathers, a stubborn and rebellious generation; a generation that set not their heart aright, and whose spirit was not stedfast with God. (Psalm 78:1-8)

We need revival, in which God takes over, when His presence causes Christians in our churches to confess their sins; revival where souls are converted, churches are changed, and cities and counties are turned upside down for Him! We must pass the mantle of the “old-time, Holy Spirit religion” on to the next generation.

Oh, God, send revival, and “. . . in wrath remember mercy.” (Hab. 3:2)
B. Myron Cedarholm: Man of Character, Man of God

Stephan M. Mattesen

On June 13, 1997, an audience of 900 gathered to pay tribute to the Chancellor of Maranatha Baptist Bible College, who had entered the presence of his Lord on June 6. Many were former students who had dedicated their lives to Christ’s service through the influence of Dr. B. Myron Cedarholm. What was the key that made Dr. Cedarholm loved by multitudes of fellow-preachers? The answer is found, not in merely reciting the facts of his biography, but in understanding his desire to serve the Lord Jesus Christ.

The formation of B. Myron Cedarholm’s character began before he was even born. His lineage was noted for its preachers, evangelists, and missionaries. His father, Anton Cedarholm, was internationally known as a gospel singer and evangelist who served as a songleader and soloist with some of America’s foremost evangelists, including W. B. Riley, J. B. Compton, and Dr. R. A. Torrey. Rev. Cedarholm was at times associated with George Stevens, F. E. Oliver, and Paul Rader as well.

Dr. Cedarholm’s mother, L. Genevieve Carlson, also came from a family whose men answered Christ’s call to the ministry. Both his mother and father were Bible college graduates who served the Lord in evangelism and pastorates across America. It is little wonder that Blaine Myron Cedarholm, born June 20, 1915, would someday continue his family heritage and become a preacher of the gospel.

The first step on his journey was taken on July 1, 1920, when at the age of five his parents led him to Christ. Dr. Cedarholm followed the Lord in believer’s baptism on his tenth birthday. He was baptized by his father, who was serving at the time as pastor of Hermosa Beach Baptist Church in Hermosa Beach, California.

Dr. Cedarholm attended Redondo Beach High School where he was active in football, basketball, track, and tennis. His continued his sports activities at what is now known as the University of Northern Iowa, as evidenced by his participation in football, basketball, and track. This interest in sports enabled him to build a lifelong ministry to young people. Even though busy with academics and athletics, he did not neglect the spiritual vision so necessary for Christian leadership. He served two years as the president of Inter-Varsity Fellowship while attending the University of Minnesota.

When he graduated from the University of Minnesota in 1940, Dr. Cedarholm lettered in football, track, baseball, tennis, and water polo. The courage, discipline, and will to win that he developed through sports later proved invaluable when he took a Fundamentalist, separatist stand against modernism and New Evangelicalism. First, however, Dr. Cedarholm determined to find a partner.

Dr. Cedarholm became interested in Thelma Melford but did not ask her for a date until a year had passed. In the ensuing 12 months he watched her behavior, checked up on her friends, and asked numerous people questions about her. Meanwhile, Thelma was praying that the Lord would not allow her to date anyone but her future husband. Finally Dr. Cedarholm did indeed ask Thelma Melford for a date and, perhaps to make up for lost time, proposed then and there. Miss Melford accepted, and they became engaged.

Wedding bells rang for the Cedarholms on September 6, 1941, in Forest Lake, Minnesota. The new Mrs. Cedarholm would share the same love for the Lord and His people, the same heart for ministry, the same Fundamentalist and separatist stand as her husband for the next 56 years. The effects of this happy union upon the ministry of Dr. Cedarholm are incalculable.

Dr. Cedarholm studied for three years at the Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary in Philadelphia and earned his Bachelor of Divinity degree in 1943. He was nominated for a scholarship to take graduate work from Princeton Theological Seminary in New Jersey. He received his Master of Theology degree and completed residence studies for a theological doctorate. Many of those who attacked Fundamentalists as ignorant and unscholarly were strangely silent about the educational career of men such as Dr. Cedarholm.

The Cedarholms served in the pastorate of Lehigh Avenue Baptist Church in Philadelphia from April 1943 to November 1947. Dr. Cedarholm must have been extremely busy, for it was during this pastorate that he studied at Princeton for his Th.M. and took his doctoral classes.

During these years Dr. Cedarholm’s fundamental stand brought him to the attention of other likeminded pastors. Together they labored during 1947 to organize the Conservative Baptist Association of America (CBA of A). In November he submitted his resignation from Lehigh Avenue Baptist Church in order to accept the position as the CBA of A Central Area Evangelist. In May 1948 he became the organization’s General Director.

Thus began nearly two decades of fruitful ministry with uncounted numbers of churches, pastors, and congregations. The godly example of parents devoted to ministry,
the discipline of sports, the rigors of academic life, and the practical experience gained during five years of pastoral ministry now combined to put a keen edge on the character of Dr. B. Myron Cedarholm—a character which made him pastor-at-large in pulpits all across America.

During this period Dr. Cedarholm became renowned as an intense pulpiteer, a prophet who preached against the spiritual decline evident among so many. Yet Dr. Cedarholm never lost his pastor’s heart. For example, in 1948 a lady wrote a letter taking exception to his use of the term “cocktail drinking missionaries” to describe those sent out by the Northern Baptist Convention. She accused him of the sin of gossip.

Dr. Cedarholm replied in a single-spaced, typewritten letter five pages long detailing the facts behind his statements. It is certain that he disagreed with the lady regarding the purity of the Northern Baptist Convention, and it is equally certain that he acted as a Christian gentleman with a profound desire to win her to a Biblical position on the issues.

In 1960, after 13 years of devoted and faithful service to the people and churches of the CBA of A, Dr. Cedarholm and his wife were awarded the opportunity of visiting Conservative Baptist Foreign Mission Society missionaries around the world. This globe-circling voyage, which enabled them to visit 325 missionaries in 52 countries, fulfilled the dreams of both Dr. and Mrs. Cedarholm because both had initially been interested in missionary service.17

In 1965, after traveling almost 100,000 miles yearly and assisting in the organization of hundreds of churches and camps, as well holding innumerable revivals, Dr. Cedarholm accepted a new challenge. Recognizing New Evangelical trends and compromises in the CBA of A, he resigned as the General Director. In May of 1965, at the age of 50, he assumed the leadership of Pillsbury Baptist Bible College in Owatonna, Minnesota.

After three years he resigned the presidency of Pillsbury, a move that left the Cedarholm’s “troubled and torn.”18 However, the move freed them for Dr. Cedarholm’s greatest opportunity—the establishment of a new Bible college.

It must have been a “wild ride” during the next 16 weeks as God worked what was to become known as the “Miracle of Maranatha.” Maranatha Baptist Bible College was dedicated September 14, 1968, with Ephesians 1:12, “To the praise of His glory,” as its motto.19

For the next 15 years Dr. Cedarholm gave himself to the students of Maranatha. He had an open-door policy so that students could visit him for advice, counsel, and encouragement. Perhaps it would have been better called an open-heart policy, for he loved the students, especially his “preacher boys.” He instilled in the students a love for the local church, and he developed in them a zeal for missions.

As commencement followed commencement, from 1969 until his retirement in 1983, Dr. Cedarholm continued to demonstrate his love and concern for each graduate by giving each of them a particular verse. To this day graduates relate how uncannily prophetic their verse has been.20

The Lord allowed Dr. Cedarholm 14 years of retirement. Alzheimer’s disease slowly dimmed his incredible memory for people and gradually sapped his vigor.

Doctorates and other honors were bestowed upon Dr. Cedarholm throughout his years of ministry, including degrees from Northwestern College, 1952; Baptist Bible College in Denver, 1957; Bob Jones University, 1970; Maranatha Baptist Bible College, 1988.21 However, his secretary may have written of the best tribute for Dr. Cedarholm—which is inscribed, not on plaques of wood and bronze, but in the hearts and lives of people:

Dr. Cedarholm always saw the potential of what God could do with the life of a student, however slight it may have seemed at the moment. The wisdom of his insight has been borne out many times in the present age as these men are leaders in Fundamentalist circles. Dr. Cedarholm’s obedience to the Lord’s leading . . . will only be realized in eternity.22

Stephan M. Mattsen directs the Cedarholm Library and teaches missions at Maranatha Baptist Bible College in Watertown, Wisconsin. He also serves as pulpit supply and special speaker through Mattsen Ministries.

—Blaine Myron Cedarholm Biography, undated vita on college stationery supplied by Charlotte Cedarholm.

1 Memorial Service for Dr. B. Myron Cedarholm, Friday, June 12, 1997, order of service provided to attendees.
2 News Release, undated carbon copy supplied by Charlotte Cedarholm.
3 Biography.
4 Biography.
5 Biography.
6 Biography.
7 Biography.
8 Memorial Service.
9 Interview, April 1999, with Charlotte Cedarholm.
10 Memorial Service.
11 Biography.
12 News Release.
13 Biography.
14 Ibid.
15 Memorial Service.
16 There seems to be a chronological difficulty in the records at this point. The Biography states that he resigned his pastorate in November 1947. The Memorial Service order of service states that in December 1947, he became the Area Evangelist. However, the Biography states that his call to become General Director came in May 1947, a date prior to his becoming Area Evangelist, which is impossible. Both the History of Minnesota and the News Release state that Dr. Cedarholm served as Evangelist and General Director of the CBA of A for 18 years. Dating his acceptance of the position of General Director in 1948 necessitates the supposition that the Biography contains a typographical error at this point.
17 Memorial Service.
18 Mrs. Cedarholm wrote a children’s book of 87 pages, With Dick and Jane by Silver Plane, under the auspices of the CBFMS, a copy of which is in the Cedarholm Library on the campus of Maranatha Baptist Bible College. In her book she details adventures in Brazil, Argentina, Europe, West Africa, India, China, the Philippines, Japan, etc., while on this missionary pilgrimage.
20 Ibid.
21 Ibid.
22 Note from Dr. Cedarholm’s secretary, who wishes to remain anonymous, received April 1999.
Richard Volley Clearwaters was born in Wilmot, Kansas, on June 28, 1900. Disliking school and wanting his freedom, Clearwaters became a prodigal son at age 16. He discreetly packed a few belongings and hid them along the roadside one evening. The next morning, when he supposedly was making his two-mile trek to school, he retrieved his belongings and hopped a train bound for Calgary, Alberta. Drifting from job to job, he acquired the language and habits of the men with whom he worked.

While Clearwaters worked in a pulp mill, God providentially intervened. An accident at the mill resulted in a serious injury to his right hand. The hand was never perfectly restored and the injury would be a life-long reminder of the fact that God can deal with sinners. One of the nurses at the hospital knew the Clearwaters family and provided Richard’s mother with his address. Hannah Clearwaters wrote and urged her son to return home. Another part of the letter was memorable to Clearwaters: his mother reminded him that “the way of transgressors is hard” (Prov. 13:15). After a three-year absence, the prodigal son returned home. He intended to visit his family for only a brief time.

His Conversion

While at home Clearwaters was using a horse-drawn wagon to haul a load of sand with his eleven-year-old brother, Weldon. Weldon was fatally injured when he lost his balance and fell in front of the wagon.

This was the first grave dug for the immediate family, and Richard felt responsible for the event. The following months were consumed by his personal depression. He would tell of spending hours near his open bedroom window listening to the crickets at night. Years later he would paraphrase Huxley’s The Cicada, “Oh, thou harper of the night, I heard thy voice and hoped again.” Clearwaters observed:

After I was saved, I looked back and thought how foolish the mystery of iniquity makes people, that they would be comforted by one of God’s most miniature creatures like a cricket, when with open arms the Son of God stands before them saying, “Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.” To keep me reminded of those days, a metal cricket has adorned my desk for years.1

In December of 1921 the Methodist Church was having revival meetings. Clearwaters knew he was a sinner bearing a load of guilt, and he was ready to receive the Savior. Upon his conversion, changes came immediately. On leaving the church that evening Clearwaters tossed away an unfinished pack of cigarettes. He went home and settled in next to the wood-burning stove and began to read his Bible. He read the whole Gospel of Matthew, and one phrase penetrated his heart: “And he healed them.” Clearwaters was a healed soul through the saving grace of Jesus Christ.

The next morning he tried to witness to his brother, saying, “I was saved last night.”

His brother’s response was to drop his boot and observe, “You were saved! Well, I’ll be—!”

Richard retorted, “You sure will if you don’t accept Christ. You don’t have any other choice.”2

As he began living his Christian life, Clearwaters determined to serve Christ as faithfully as he had previously served the devil. He was faithful in church attendance and shared his testimony whenever he could. He even joined the choir, although he had little musical talent.

A few months after being saved, Clearwaters was called to the ministry. As was her regular practice, his mother was up before the men in the family and making breakfast. As she worked, she sang softly to herself, but loudly enough to be overheard. This particular morning she was singing “The Ninety and Nine.” The Lord seemed to speak to Clearwaters’ heart about his willingness “to go to the desert to find my sheep.” Clearwaters wrestled for a time with his call. He envisioned a pastor as an educated man, and Clearwaters was well aware that he was a high school dropout and had not liked school. He spent some time at Weldon’s grave and committed himself to the Lord with these words, “Lord, I’m not much, but what I have and what I am I’m willing to give to you. Thank you for my salvation.”

His Early Ministry

Saved in a Bible-preaching Methodist Church, counseled by a Presbyterian pastor (his brother-in-law), Clearwaters headed off to Moody Bible Institute in 1922 to become a Baptist. Overcoming his handicap of being a dropout, Clearwaters would go on to earn his diploma from Moody as well as a university degree from Kalamazoo College and graduate degrees from Northern Baptist Seminary and the University of Chicago. Later his leadership among Baptists led to him being recognized with honorary doctorates by Northern Baptist Seminary, Bob Jones University, and San Francisco Baptist Theological Seminary.

In the 1920s Clearwaters’ study at Moody gave him an unshakable confidence in the authority of the Word of God. His convictions were challenged during his studies at liberal Northern Baptist institutions such as Kalamazoo College and the University of Chicago. But these challenges only served to sharpen his commitment to God’s Word. Throughout his years of education Clearwaters held a succession of pastorates. His most extensive pastorate was at the Fourth Baptist Church in Minneapolis, Minnesota. Clearwaters entered the work there in 1940 and remained as its pastor until his retirement. Almost immediately upon locating in Minneapolis, Clearwaters became a coworker in
Conservative Baptists had not defined their position in the Convention because of internal tensions. This was inevitable because the churches, the Conservative Baptist Association of America, and the CB movement organized its own fellowship of Baptist Fundamentalists. They renamed itself the Conservative Baptist Fellowship (CBF), the Convention. By 1947 the Fundamentalist Fellowship of the Northern Baptist Convention, organized in 1920 to battle modernism in the Convention offices; the Fundamentalists lost. The Fundamentalists proposed a doctrinal statement for the Convention; the Fundamentalists lost.

In 1943 the Fundamentalists had organized an alternative foreign mission society because of the liberalism in the American Baptist Foreign Mission Society (ABFMS). By 1946 they wanted Convention recognition of their mission agency but were refused. Not only did the liberal leadership of the Convention manage to beat back each attempt by the Fundamentalists to influence the Convention, the liberals also changed the procedures for sending messengers to the annual meetings in a fashion which was distinctly aimed at undercutting Fundamentalist influence.

The CB Movement

The Conservative Baptist movement is rooted in the failure to redirect the Northern Baptist Convention. Liberalism was entrenched in the Convention; many of the Fundamentalists realized that it was time for them to organize their own fellowship. They already had a mission agency (the Conservative Baptist Foreign Mission Society—CBFMS). They also had the Fundamentalist Fellowship of the Northern Baptist Convention, organized in 1920 to battle modernism in the Convention. By 1947 the Fundamentalist Fellowship renamed itself the Conservative Baptist Fellowship (CBF), and the CB movement organized its own fellowship of churches, the Conservative Baptist Association of America.

Within a decade the CB movement manifested its own internal tensions. This was inevitable because the Conservative Baptists had not defined their position vis-à-vis the Convention. Many in the CB movement did take a strong separatist position. Clearwaters led the Fourth Baptist Church to separate from the Northern Baptist Convention in 1948. The church dropped support for all missionaries who remained in the ABFMS. The CBF was the separatist center for the CB movement; Clearwaters served as its president from 1948 to 1951. But many in the CB movement formed a “mixed multitude,” fellowshipping with the CBs, but remaining in the Convention too.

New Evangelicalism

This attitude of the CB “mixed multitude” was reflective of the emerging New Evangelical theology of the era. New Evangelicals claimed to be Bible believers, but they did not want to practice separation from liberalism. One of the men in the forefront of New Evangelicalism in the ministry was Evangelist Billy Graham. In 1947 W. B. Riley chose Billy Graham to succeed him as the president of Northwestern Schools.

Various factors coalesced in 1956 to lead Clearwaters to establish Central Conservative Baptist Theological Seminary. Northwestern Schools closed its seminary that year due to insufficient finances. The CB movement did not have a seminary that represented the separatists. The following year Northwestern Schools closed its Bible college, and Clearwaters led the Minnesota Fundamentalists to convert Pillsbury Academy to Baptist World Mission. By 1967 Clearwaters’s church, Central Baptist Theological Seminary, Pillsbury Baptist Bible College, and Baptist World Mission all withdrew from their CB connections. The Conservative Baptist Fellowship also withdrew and changed its name to the Fundamentalist Baptist Fellowship.

At an age when most men retire, Clearwaters was still “going strong” in the ministry. He continued to pastor the Fourth Baptist Church until 1982. He continued as president of Central Baptist Seminary of Virginia Beach until 1987. He was “promoted to glory” in 1996. He left behind him a heritage of separatist Baptist Fundamentalism in pastoral ministry, missions, and Christian education.

Dr. Michael H. Windsor is a member of the faculty at Central Baptist Theological Seminary of Virginia Beach, Virginia.

1Taped personal testimony, December 10, 1975. Dr. Clearwaters usually took a seminary chapel service in December to share his testimony in commemoration of his salvation on December 10, 1921.
3Many Fundamentalists have wondered how this happened, but to Riley in 1947 it would have seemed very reasonable. Riley was interested in evangelism and Graham was an evangelist. Both men were Baptists with interdenominational contacts. Riley was a Fundamentalist and Graham seemed to have Fundamentalist roots. Graham was personable and Northwestern Schools needed a personable leader with national contacts. Initially Graham and Clearwaters had a great deal of admiration for one another. But within two years of Graham’s presidency the relationship cooled. Clearwaters tendered a resignation from his seminary work, but did not follow through because Graham convinced him that he was needed at the seminary. By 1952 it was clear to many people at Northwestern Schools that Evangelist Billy Graham’s version of Fundamentalism was not the Fundamentalism of W. B. Riley. After some harsh meetings with the Northwestern board of trustees (of which Clearwaters was a member), Graham chose to resign.
4Because of their softness on these issues, the New Evangelical crowd in the CB movement were often known as the “soft policy” group. The Fundamentalists were known as the “hard core” group.
Bickering of unprincipled nature, common censorious, and unchristian petty animosities have weakened, and seriously so, the image and message of Fundamentalism. . . . Fundamentalists should never bow to compromisers and radicals, but they need to bow low before the Lord and find His will for what they do and say.”¹ Little did George Dollar know when he wrote those words in 1967 that the next year would bring a serious rift between two long-time leaders of the Fundamental Baptist Fellowship—Myron Cedarholm and Richard Clearwaters.

After Monroe Parker resigned from the presidency of Pillsbury Baptist Bible College in 1965, Cedarholm, who had recently resigned after serving 20 years as general director of the Conservative Baptist Association of America (CBA of A), became the new president of Pillsbury.

Pillsbury’s trend of growth, which had begun under Parker’s leadership, continued during Cedarholm’s presidency. Friction soon developed, however, between Cedarholm and Pillsbury’s board, primarily over the extent of Cedarholm’s authority as president. Relations between Cedarholm and the board deteriorated, until finally Cedarholm resigned on April 30, 1968. Because Clearwaters was chairman of the board and its best-known member, the conflict was perceived as being between the two men alone.

The conflict quickly became public. Perhaps feeling his integrity was at stake, Cedarholm took his case before the Pillsbury faculty and student body in the April 30 chapel service. The next day, May 1, Clearwaters responded in chapel by presenting the board’s position.

Students, faculty, and area pastors aligned themselves with one or the other of the two leaders. FBF president G. Archer Weniger, whose sister was married to Cedarholm’s brother, was sympathetic to Cedarholm.² Cedarholm’s appearance at the FBF board meeting in May to answer questions regarding his resignation from Pillsbury was interpreted by Clearwaters’s followers as a clear sign of the FBF siding with Cedarholm. A number of pastors loyal to Clearwaters served in churches in the fledgling New Testament Association of Independent Baptist Churches (NTAIBC), and thus a rift developed between the FBF and the NTAIBC.

In June Cedarholm began sending out letters announcing the new college God was leading him to begin in Watertown, Wisconsin. The founding of Maranatha Baptist Bible College added fresh fuel to the dispute, for it was seen by many Clearwaters loyalists as a spiteful action designed to harm Pillsbury. By this time a number of documents were in circulation outlining various charges against one side or the other. The bitterness displayed, not so much by the two leaders themselves but by their supporters, “left angry sentiments among some Baptists in the midwest for two decades.”³

How could two great leaders with great hearts for the Lord come to be involved in such an acrimonious conflict? How could two men who had always stood together against liberal unbelief and New Evangelical compromise come to such bitter disagreement? Is the conflict proof of the old criticism of Fundamentalists—if they have no one else to fight, they will fight each other? Not at all.
Contention and conflict between strong Christian leaders is nothing new. One such conflict is found in the book of Acts. Barnabas, the “son of consolation” (4:36), is described as “a good man, and full of the Holy Ghost and of faith” (11:24). It was Barnabas who sought out Paul and vouched for him before the other apostles at Jerusalem (9:27). Later Barnabas went to Tarsus and sought out Paul. He brought Paul back with him to Antioch and involved him in the church (11:25–26).

Paul and Barnabas had already labored together in the Lord’s service for many years when the Holy Spirit chose Barnabas to accompany Paul on Paul’s first missionary journey (13:2). Barnabas preached alongside Paul and shared Paul’s persecutions (13:46–50; 15:35). Nevertheless, the disagreement between them over taking John Mark on a second missionary journey was so “sharp” that they separated from one another (15:36–40). The Greek vocabulary implies that their conflict was heated and that their separation was more than just a physical parting of the ways.

Although the New Testament does not explicitly say that Paul and Barnabas were reconciled, their reconciliation is implied in several Scripture passages. Three involve Mark, the cause of the dispute between Paul and Barnabas. The best known of these is 2 Timothy 4:11, written near the end of Paul’s life, where Paul says, “Take Mark, and bring him with thee: for he is profitable to me for the ministry.” Apparently, Mark had at some time redeemed himself with Paul. In Philemon 24 Paul refers to Mark as his fellow-laborer. In Colossians 4:10 Paul again commends Mark.

In one other epistle Paul mentions Barnabas. In 1 Corinthians 9:6, written after his separation from Barnabas, Paul implies that he and Barnabas are again co-laborers.

The same is true regarding the dispute between Cedarholm and Clearwaters. Their reconciliation is implied in several letters and events, and reconciliation is even more clear among many of their followers.

Less that three years after the traumatic dispute, G. Archer Weniger wrote a kind letter to Clearwaters after hearing that Clearwaters had been ill. “We think of you from time to time and rejoice in all that the Lord has done through you,” he wrote. Later that year Weniger’s brother Max was invited to sit on an ordination council with Dr. Clearwaters.

In October 1974 the boards of the FBF and NTAIBC met together in Atlanta and passed “A Resolution Toward Unity and Fellowship” to promote “warm fellowship between the two organizations.”

Reconciliation between the two primary individuals in the dispute, however, came more slowly. “I would be delighted to have fellowship again with Central and Pillsbury,” Cedarholm said in a June 21, 1979, letter to Dr. Harry Love. “I am ready any time to restore fellowship.” In October 1980, Clearwaters and Cedarholm both appeared as speakers at the annual fellowship of the Independent Baptist Association of Michigan, an association headed by Dr. Love. In 1981 Cedarholm heard that the Pillsbury board passed a resolution stating that they considered Maranatha a sister school. Rejoicing in the news, he wrote, “We thank the Lord that things seem to be working out real good.”

In 1985 Pillsbury Baptist Bible College hosted the FBF’s national meeting. Cedarholm and Clearwaters were both among the speakers. They were obviously willing to put aside any personal differences that may have remained between them for the good of all fundamental Baptists.

Today there are some who criticize the Fundamentalists of previous generations for their human weaknesses. These critics imply that they are more spiritual than their ancestors because they would not have been involved in such conflicts. This attitude, however, displays a spiritual pride and arrogance much like that of the Pharisees who said, “If we had been in the days of our fathers, we would not have been partakers with them . . . ” (Matt. 23:30).

Our Baptist forefathers were human, with all of man’s failings and frailties, but they were also men, exemplifying Paul’s admonition in 1 Corinthians 16:13: “Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, quit you like men, be strong.” Anyone who has studied the lives of Richard Clearwaters and Myron Cedarholm knows that these men were examples of verse 14 as well: “Let all your things be done with charity.”

The day in which Myron Cedarholm and Richard Clearwaters lived called for strong men who knew how to use both the sword and the trowel.

2FBF Information Bulletin, July/August 1968, contains a report about the controversy.
4G. Archer Weniger, letter to Dr. R. V. Clearwaters, January 28, 1971.
5B. Myron Cedarholm, letter to Dr. and Mrs. Harry Love, September 2, 1981. Dr. Robert Crane, current president of Pillsbury Baptist Bible College, was unable to confirm this action of the board, although he said it could have happened and not been recorded in the minutes. He believes that a reconciliation between the two men took place in the early 1980s.
Are Fundamentalists Legalists?

Part Two

Dave Doran

In Part 1, Dr. Doran examined the charges of legalism sometimes made against Fundamentalists. He discussed the meaning of legalism in New Testament times and pointed out the differences in the way the term is often used today.

The Meaning of Legalism

From this starting point, that the law is a set of rules and regulations, the allegation of modern legalism shifts to the meaning of the term legalism itself. Legalism is defined as “an attitude, a mentality based on pride. It is an obsessive conformity to an artificial standard for the purpose of exalting oneself” (Swindoll, Grace Awakening, p. 81). Although he expressly calls legalism an attitude, Swindoll’s definition attacks both the actions (“obsessive conformity to an artificial standard”) and attitudes (“for the purpose of exalting oneself”) of alleged legalists. It is certain that he means much more than a prideful attitude. It is a prideful attitude expressed through standard-keeping. It is crucial to note his definition of the law as “an artificial standard.” This is a classic example of the first syllogism!

Following is how the second syllogism makes its argument:

Major Premise: The Galatians were going back to the law.

Minor Premise: Returning to the law (a set of rules) is legalism.

Conclusion: Therefore, to have a set of rules is legalism.

The second syllogism misses what I believe is the cardinal distinction. The Galatian problem was reliance upon the Mosaic law as the means of justification. Their problem was not merely adopting the law as a means of developing godliness or holy living. Their problem was adding requirements for salvation. Millard Erickson has defined legalism as a “keeping of the law, particularly in a formal sense, and a regarding of obedience as meritorious” (Concise Dictionary of Christian Theology, p. 95). The modern counterparts to this heresy are found in groups that teach doctrines such as baptismal regeneration or sacramentalism, not churches that advocate practical applications of Scripture for personal holiness. The immensity of the gap between the teachings of the Judaizers and those normally being accused of legalism is overwhelming. In fact, it is quite probable that the apostle Paul would find it strange that contemporary writers suggest it is legalistic to use the Mosaic law to instruct and inform us regarding ethical principles. This is exactly what Paul does in 1 Corinthians 9:9–10 and 1 Timothy 5:18.

In these passages Paul appeals to the Mosaic regulations regarding the treatment of oxen as the basis for the principle of compensation for those who minister the gospel. It appears safe to conclude that we can, and should, use the
Mosaic law as a source for developing ethical principles to guide Christian behavior, and that doing so is not legalism. The crucial distinction between the Judaizers and Paul is the reason for appealing to the Mosaic law. The Judaizers are seeking a means of justification, whereas Paul is advocating guidelines for Christian obedience. My observation is that most modern Fundamentalists follow in the footsteps of the apostle Paul, not the heretical Judaizers. Unfortunately, some Fundamentalists do possess both a self-inflated view of their own righteousness and a judgmental spirit, but my encounters with New Evangelicals suggest those problems are not unique to Fundamentalism!

The Ministry of the Spirit

The first two planks of the anti-legalist platform redefine the terms law and legalism to suit their argument, but the third plank introduces another avenue of attack—the believer’s relationship to the Holy Spirit. John MacArthur is representative of this attack when he writes, “Only pride or ignorance could lead a believer to live by an outward list of rules and commands in his own limited and sinful power when he can live by the perfect and fully sufficient inner power of the Holy Spirit. Yet that is what many believers in the Galatian churches were trying to do, and what many believers since that time have endeavored to do” (Galatians, p. 152).

The flow of logic in the argument runs two directions. First, there is a contrast between living in our “own limited and sinful power” or in the “perfect and fully sufficient inner power of the Holy Spirit.” Second, MacArthur mentions an “outward list of rules and commands” in connection with living in our own limited and sinful power. Strangely, there is no stated contrast with this “list of rules and commands,” but the distinct impression is given that the inner work of the Spirit replaces these external regulations.

Let’s lay out the argument in the form of a third syllogism:

**Major Premise:** The OT saint was under law (a set of rules or standards).

**Minor Premise:** The NT saint is led by the Spirit.

**Conclusion:** Having standards is to reject the Spirit’s power and work.

This third syllogism is a classic example of the fallacy of the excluded middle. This fallacy sets up two extremes as the only options available with no ground left between them. In this case the two extremes are, on one hand, being led by the Spirit and, on the other hand, living according to standards. According to MacArthur we are left with the choice of living without standards but according to the Spirit of God or with standards and without the Spirit. Are these truly our only options? Absolutely not! The establishing of personal standards does not rule out the work of the Spirit in our lives. Rather, they may indeed be the very evidence of the Spirit’s work!

One of the prime works of the Spirit in the life of the believer is that of illumination. A complete discussion of this doctrine goes beyond our purpose here, but the central thrust of illumination is the Spirit’s enabling the believer to perceive the significance or application of the Word of God for his or her life. The natural result of this process of study and the conviction of the Spirit should be guidelines that enable the believer to grow in Christlikeness (2 Cor. 3:18) and avoid making provision for the flesh (Rom. 14:13). This is precisely what Paul is advocating when he commands the first-century believers to walk in the Spirit, be led of the Spirit, and to keep in step with the Spirit (Gal. 5:16, 18, 25).

Again, Douglas Moo is helpful:

> As powerful as is the Spirit, He indwells people who still possess sinful natures. Reliance on the Spirit alone, with no external guidelines, quickly leads to an enthronement of the individual ego. I do what I do because I do what I do because... 

In sum, then, the New Testament pictures as the ideal the believer whose heart and mind are so closely aligned with God’s will that he automatically does what is right. Such a renewed mind is a crucial source for the guidance of the believer’s thinking and actions. But the New Testament also makes clear that the renewed mind never becomes perfectly renewed in this life, but is always in the process of being more and more transformed. Thus, the external, specific commands of the “law of Christ” remain as the authoritative, indispensable guide to the renewed mind. One should not be set against the other: the renewal of the mind is to be guided by God’s commands. God’s commands are to be applied to specific circumstances through the wisdom that comes from the renewed mind (Renewing Your Mind, p. 150).

The most grievous aspect of this third syllogism is its simplistic pietism. Its argument sounds so pious and spiritual, but sadly it is mostly empty platitudes—dangerous results. Rather than linking the ministry of the Spirit and the Word of God, it falsely elevates a misconception of the Spirit’s work. The end result of this misconception is not holiness and spiritual freedom, but self-centered disobedience. As Moo writes,

> As powerful as is the Spirit, He indwells people who still possess sinful natures. Reliance on the Spirit alone, with no external guidelines, quickly leads to an enthronement of the individual ego. I do what I do because... 

> Let me give it to you straight. Don’t give me your personal list of do’s and don’ts to live by! And you can count on this: I will never give you my personal list of do’s and don’ts to follow!” (Grace Awakening, p. 132). While this plays well in the ears of a generation—my own—that has been brainwashed by three decades of narcissistic philosophy, it cannot be squared with the teaching of Scripture.

First, it flatly contradicts the pattern of discipleship taught and displayed in the New Testament. The heartbeat of discipleship is reproduction of a pattern—a disciple becoming like his...
teacher (Luke 6:40). Second, it ignores the clear practice of the apostle Paul, who called believers to follow his example (1 Thess 1:6; 1 Cor. 4:14–16, 11:1). It seems impossible to honor both the discipleship mandate and Swindoll’s radical individualism. While some may immediately dismiss this argument by making a distinction between this apostleship and our status, it must be remembered that Paul instructed Timothy to follow this same practice (1 Tim. 4:12, 2 Tim. 2:2). Finally, the clear Biblical responsibilities given to the leaders of the local assemblies involve the type of behavior that Swindoll so cavalierly condemns. Swindoll’s radical individualism and autonomy seem to clash full force with the commands for believers to submit to and obey the leaders of the local assemblies (Heb. 13:17, 1 Thess. 5:12–13). The very fact that these leaders are responsible for the spiritual direction and moral training of the believers necessitates practical instructions and guidelines for personal holiness.

Conclusion

So, are Fundamentalists the modern equivalent of the first-century Judaizers? Is the teaching of personal standards legalistic and driving believers away from the Spirit of God? Would the apostle Paul classify you as a heretic? I believe the obvious answer to each of these questions is a resounding “No!” In light of what we have seen about the Biblical concept of legalism, it is fair to say that few, if any, Fundamentalists are guilty of legalism in the Biblical sense of that term. In reality, Paul would probably be appalled by the trivialization of this crucial theological issue.

Yet it would be wrong to conclude from this observation that it is impossible to abuse the issue of personal standards. That is not my point. I do believe the New Testament addresses the danger of allowing man-made traditions to replace the authority of God’s Word in our lives, but that is properly called Pharisaism, not legalism. Jesus rejected the Pharisees because they were preoccupied with external appearances of righteousness rather than possessing a heart of righteousness. They should have combined scrupulous obedience with the “weightier matters of the law” (Matt. 23:23). Instead, the fact that they exalted man-made traditions over the authority of God’s Word exposes the self-centered nature of their “righteousness.”

The Pharisees were obsessed with external appearance because they hungered for status and were addicted to seeking man’s approval (Luke 11:43, 20:46). Inside the Pharisees’ world, the way up the ladder was to have the most stringent code of conduct—even if it meant going beyond God’s Word. Spirituality was judged by conformity to the approved practices, and non-conformity to the traditions brought rejection (Luke 11:37–38, 15:1–2). Jesus did not fit in that world, and He refused to let it go unchallenged (Luke 11:39–52).

While it is unlikely that any Fundamentalists are seeking to earn righteousness with God through the works of the law, it is possible that some Fundamentalists have fallen prey to the Pharisaical spirit that is so controlled by people’s opinions that it perpetuates external conformity without internal devotion. However, honest evaluation would reveal that this is not a Fundamentalist problem; it is a humanity problem! God told us 3,000 years ago that “the fear of man brings a snare,” so it should not surprise us to find people continually trapped in the snare of conformity for the sake of approval. It certainly happens among Fundamentalists, but it happens just as frequently among evangelicals. The symptoms may vary, but it is the same disease.

God’s grace has provided His righteousness for us by faith in Jesus Christ apart from the works of the law (Rom. 3:21–22), and that same grace teaches us to deny ungodliness and worldly desires and to live sensibly, righteously, and godly in this present age (Titus 2:11–12). As Fundamentalists, we should affirm these truths without apology and live them out without fear of false accusations or surrender to the opinion polls of people.

Dr. David M. Doran is pastor of Inter-City Baptist Church in Allen Park, Michigan, and chancellor of Detroit Baptist Theological Seminary.
Satan’s former stronghold has disintegrated! His worldly fortress known as modernism has crumbled before our very eyes. This does not mean that the conflict of the ages is over.

Fundamentalists must continue fighting to push back the gates of hell. However, we must start aiming our heavy artillery at the devil’s latest citadel while it is still under development. Our current battle is against postmodernism, also called post-industrialism and post-structuralism.

Since a thorough understanding of modernism is foundational to exercising discernment regarding postmodernism, let’s review the historical facts regarding modernism. Modernism was twofold in its origins: First, it was based on an affirmation of mankind which was based on the myth of man’s inherent goodness. This developed into metanarrative (narrative that claims to explain a culture to itself) that told the story of the inevitable progress of humanity. Modernism’s second foundational tenet was an affirmation of method that was presented as scientific excellence in pursuit of universal and regular natural laws that supposedly govern the physical and social worlds. This type of pseudo-reasoning was used to legitimize the propaganda of evolution, liberalism, and socialism.

The affirmation of mankind was first discredited in 1918 by Oswald Spengler’s famous book, *The Decline of the West.* Since the First World War, humanity has passed through horrors far greater than Spengler could have imagined. As a result, the myth of man’s inherent goodness is dead. The affirmation of method was largely discredited when the two principal ideologies of liberalism and socialism virtually collapsed as adequate explanations of the world and ourselves. This took place as early as the late 1960s, or perhaps as late as 1989, with the fall of the Berlin Wall. This means that the only lingering tenet of modernism is evolution, which itself has evolved into a “green” philosophy.

The “green” philosophy of postmodernism directs us, both as individuals and in our collective affairs, to pursue harmony with nature. The logic is that since we evolved from the cycles and systems of the natural world, to interfere with nature is akin to insulting our “mother”—Earth. Postmodernity’s personification of our environment has turned into deification, as demonstrated by clear, and sometimes loud, instructions to recognize our dependence on Mother Earth and our inescapable judgment should she become sufficiently provoked.

Postmodernism is something more modern than modernity, something radically new. All the teachings of modernism are being questioned by academics and university students, with evolution being the only exception. This means that the non-academic thinking of our society is becoming increasingly postmodern. Acquiring discernment regarding postmodernity is not a pedagogical exercise, but a practical attempt to be like the wise men who “knew the times” (Esther 1:13) and the children of Issachar who “had understanding of the times” (1 Chron. 12:32).

Relevance is the ultimate virtue of postmodernism. This means that Fundamentalists have a tremendous advantage. We do not have to try to make the Bible relevant—it *is* relevant. For people to see its relevance, all we have to do is adjust the time frame. We must change it from then to now, from *was* to *is.* The hearers will be thinking, “All of this concerns me *today!*”

Postmodernity is characterized by a renewed appreciation of oral language, communication, and rhetoric. Since God has chosen face-to-face preaching as His ordained method of communicating with men, Fundamentalists stand to benefit. We must continue to say the same things, but we must learn to say them in more interesting ways. Our literary style must be free of clichés, pastoral patter, trade talk, and stale fancy phrases. We must also avoid archaic terms, melodramatic phrases, corny maxims, and hackneyed idioms.

Postmodernism offers ambiguous and contradictory thoughts about both man and method. It has given up any idea of intelligible historical process and causality, and with it, any idea of making sense of history. Our postmodern society proposes neither meaningful existence nor transcendent hope. The message of the Holy Bible offers a meaningful existence called the abundant life and a transcendent hope in the coming of our Lord and Savior. Truly, Fundamentalists have a tremendous opportunity!

Postmodernism honors human diversity and the proliferation of “lifestyles.” The family has become fragmented because individual experience takes precedence over all collective bodies. The pace of modern living is detrimental, with its endless striving and restlessness. What is the result of these factors? People are frantically asking themselves, “Are there no limits to human liberation?” Fundamentalists have the answer in the immutable and inflexible teachings of Scripture. God’s truth will set individuals free from their chaotic postmodern society and establish them as permanent and valuable members of His family.

In summary, Fundamentalism needs to stop beating the dead horse called modernism. We need to stop solving problems that nobody has and answering questions that nobody is asking. We need to understand our postmodern times and start afresh, determined to meet the age-old needs of postmodern man. Let’s purpose in our hearts to return to an assertion of the immutable truth of the gospel. Let’s advance the gospel of Christ by faith. It worked against modernism, and it will work against postmodernism!

Dr. Jerry Cramer serves as associate pastor of Church of the Open Door in Greensburg, Pennsylvania.
Do you like hymn history? Our family does, and we especially enjoy visiting various places relating to hymn composers and their works. We recently took a trip that enabled us not only to find several hymn history sites but also to see some of our country’s back-country beauty. Ride along as we visit them now.

Begin your trip with us in Philadelphia. In addition to seeing the well-known landmarks of our country’s history, let’s go down to the Tindley Temple United Methodist Church on South Broad Street. Here Charles Albert Tindley (1851-1933) pastored. We remember him best for his hymns “Nothing Between,” “Stand By Me,” “We’ll Understand It Better By and By,” and “Leave It There.” Mark Sidwell’s Free Indeed (Bob Jones University Press) gives an excellent review of Tindley’s life. Charles Tindley, Prince of Preachers (Abingdon Press, 1982) by Ralph H. Jones, gives further information on the life of this master preacher and orator, the son of a former slave.

Next we head north and west to the lovely little village of Rome, Pennsylvania. It’s not on some maps, but Rome is rich in hymn history. Located on the main road through town is the P. P. Bliss Gospel Songwriters Museum. Take your time here seeing the memorabilia that the dedicated museum trustees have collected on P. P. Bliss (1838–76), James McGranahan (1840–1907), and D. B. Towner (1850–1919). A quick check of your hymnbook will yield many treasured hymns from these three men from “the gospel hymn era.” We suggest you write or call the museum before visiting (Route 1, Box 293, Rome, PA 18837; phone 717–247–7683), as they are not open every day. Also, if you’re interested in additional information about The Music Men of Rome, you may want to read Dr. Al Smith’s book by that title (Al Smith Ministries, 2200 Wade Hampton Blvd., Greenville, SC 29615).

Before you leave Rome, go east to the town cemetery and see the historical marker that tells of Philip Bliss. Also examine the cenotaph in the middle of the cemetery. It was erected by the public to the memory of Bliss and his wife in response to Evangelist D. L. Moody’s call. Hundreds of Sunday school children across our country collected their pennies for its placement. Your heart will be touched as you see the marker’s inscription from Psalm 119:54: “Thy statutes have been my songs in the house of my pilgrimage.” Moody spoke and Ira Sankey sang at the cenotaph’s dedication.

But Philip and Lucy Bliss are not buried in Rome. To go to the place of their burial, we must travel westward to Ashtabula, Ohio, where the Ashtabula railroad bridge disaster took their lives on December 29, 1876. Philip and Lucy had left Rome to join up with D. L. Moody in Chicago for evangelistic meetings. Near the passenger depot in the center of Ashtabula, as the train was crossing the Ashtabula River, the bridge gave way and the Blisses and 78 other people lost their lives.

The Ashtabula railroad bridge disaster shocked the nation. Congress subsequently passed legislation that gave the Interstate Commerce Commission authority to regulate and inspect railroad bridge design.

Today, the ravine over the Ashtabula River has been filled in, but the depot still stands, closed and boarded up. Although no bridge exists over the accident site today, a very long, narrow railroad trestle stands over the river downstream. It gives an idea of just how steep and deep the ravine at the accident site must have been.

Before leaving Ashtabula, go to the Chestnut Hill Cemetery and find the long ridge in its middle and the tall granite obelisk marking the “Unrecognized Dead of the Ashtabula Bridge Disaster.” The bodies of Philip and Lucy Bliss are interred there.

Our next hymn history site is just south of Ashtabula at Kinsman, Ohio, where James McGranahan retired. After P. P. Bliss’s death, McGranahan left his postmaster’s job in Rome, Pennsylvania, and teamed up with Major D. W. Whittle. Along with D. L. Moody, they continued revival meetings in America and abroad.

At Kinsman you’ll want to stop by McGranahan’s beautiful home—now the Baumgardner Funeral Home (Box 285, Kinsman, OH 44428; phone 330-876-2271). Hugh and Ardeen Baumgardner graciously showed us around the home, which was known as Maplehurst when
McGranahan purchased it. It includes beautiful Tiffany stained glass windows in the stairwell and a portrait of McGranahan over the fireplace. And McGranahan’s grave is located in the Kinsman town cemetery.

Next we drive southeast, back into Pennsylvania, to the town of New Castle. Here we’ll find much on the life of Ira D. Sankey (1840-1908). D. L. Moody preached the gospel, and his partner Ira Sankey sang the gospel to thousands in the U.S. and Great Britain in the latter part of the 1800s. Sankey’s musical setting of Elizabeth Clephane’s poem “The Ninety and Nine” became his trademark solo. A few of the many familiar Sankey hymns are “For You I Am Praying,” “Hiding in Thee,” “Trusting Jesus, That Is All,” and “Who Is on the Lord’s Side.”

Begin your Sankey tour by visiting the Lawrence County Historical Society (408 East Jefferson Street, New Castle, PA 16101; phone 412-658-4022). The Society has a room completely dedicated to Ira Sankey; it includes one of his portable reed music organs used in the Moody-Sankey meetings. After visiting the Society, go to the downtown public library and ask to see the box of letters, photos, and news clippings on Ira Sankey, which can be found in the “special reserves” section.

Several miles west of New Castle is the tiny town of Edinburg. Here, next to the post office, you’ll find the historical marker commemorating Sankey’s birthplace.

We’ve seen a lot on this hymn history trip! However, there is one more “site for our souls” that we’ll want to visit before heading home again. On the banks of the Ohio River southwest of New Castle is East Liverpool, Ohio. Here lived Will Thompson (1847–1909), who wrote “Jesus Is All the World to Me” and “Lead Me Gently Home, Dear Father.” We know him best, though, as the composer of the great invitation hymn “Softly and Tenderly.”

D. L. Moody encouraged Thompson, a successful music publisher, to write “songs that would bring people to Christ.” In Treasury of Hymn Histories, Dr. Al Smith relates how Thompson traveled all the way from East Liverpool to Northfield, Massachusetts, to see Moody just before Moody went home to God. During their conversation, Moody told Thompson that if he, Moody, could live his life over, he wished he could have written “Softly and Tenderly.”

Will Thompson was known as “the bard of Ohio” for his secular and sacred music publishing. He gave 100 acres to the city, today known as Thompson Park. His home has been restored and is located right on the bank of the Ohio River. He’s buried in the Riverview Cemetery near town.

Upon entering the renovated public library in downtown East Liverpool, look at the brass plaque memorializing Thompson. Once inside, you may get access to the Historical Society’s 30-plus pages on Thompson and various news articles about him. The library also has a bound copy of Thompson’s secular and sacred music.

We’re at the end of our hymn history holiday. Our hearts have been filled with joy, our souls strengthened and refreshed, and our lips have given forth praise to God for the “heritage of those who [have feared his] name” (Ps. 61:5), who have led us in singing “the ways of the Lord” (Ps. 138:5).

Captain Joe Henderson is an international pilot flying Boeing 767s for U. S. Airways. He is an active member of Colonial Hills Baptist Church in Indianapolis, Indiana, and serves on the boards of several Christian ministries.
Subscribing for Missionaries

Community Bible Church in Norfolk, Nebraska, has joined many others in subscribing to *Frontline* for missionaries. Recently the church ordered three-year subscriptions for nine of its missionaries. Tabernacle Baptist Church in Virginia Beach, Virginia, recently subscribed for about 50 missionaries around the world. If you would like to provide *Frontline* for your missionaries, contact us first so we can tell you whether another church is already providing *Frontline* for them.

Attention Missionaries

If you are returning from the field or taking a furlough, don’t forget to give us your new address. We don’t want you to miss a single issue of *Frontline*.

Many Thanks

First, to FBF board member Dr. Wayne Van Gelderen, who allowed *Frontline* to set up a display and solicit subscriptions at the Godly Generations Conference held in February at Falls Baptist Church in Menomonee Falls, Wisconsin.

Second, to Stephan Mattsen, librarian at Maranatha Baptist Bible College in Watertown, Wisconsin, for his assistance with research pertinent to the FBF’s history.

Third, to Pat Passig, librarian at Central Baptist Theological Seminary in Plymouth, Minnesota, who allowed me to tie up the library’s copier for a full day while photocopying *FBF Information Bulletins* from years past.

And finally, to Dr. M. James Hollowood of Watertown, Wisconsin, who served as editor of the *FBF Information Bulletin* for 12 years. He and his wife graciously allowed me to have many FBF files and records that had been stored in their basement for many years.

Banner Ads Available on the Frontline Web Pages

More than 160 articles from past issues of *Frontline* have now been posted at the FBF web site—www.f-b-f.org. These articles are accessible to anyone visiting the *Frontline* web pages. More articles and information are being posted at the site every week. Our goal is to make the FBF/*Frontline* web pages a valuable resource for fundamental Baptists. If you are a current subscriber and would like to access current issues (1999), you can get a passcode simply by requesting it. E-mail your request to FBFLINE@aol.com.

Banner ads with hyperlinks to your web site are available on the *Frontline* web pages to promote your products or services. For information on pricing and specifications, contact the *Frontline* office.

FBF National Representative

At the FBF mid-year board meeting last February, Dr. Marion E. Fast accepted the appointment as the first FBF National Representative. Before his retirement, Dr. Fast served for many years as pastor of Faith Baptist Church in Longmont, Colorado. He is available for meetings and can be reached by writing to him at 1426 Pratt Street, Longmont, CO 80501, or calling (303) 776-7029.

Coming FBF Meetings

**July 5–9**

**National Meeting**

in conjunction with the

World Congress of Fundamentalists

Bob Jones University

Box 34555

Greenville, SC 29614

(864) 242-5100, ext. 3120

**July 27–29**

**Alaska Region**

Hamilton Acres Baptist Church

138 Farewell Ave.

Fairbanks, Alaska 99701

(907) 456-5995

**October 4–5**

**Northeast Region**

Trinity Baptist Church

80 Clinton Street

Concord, NH 03301

(603) 225-3999

If you know of other FBF meetings not listed here, please contact us so we can announce them in an upcoming issue.
“GFA’s Fundamentalist stand remains unchanged”

“In 1949 we went to Japan under a well-known mission board but later withdrew due to its drift into New Evangelicalism. We prayed that God would raise up a mission board whose position would not shift with the wind. When GFA missions was founded in 1961, we were among its first missionaries. Today, these many years later, we can testify that GFA’s Fundamentalist stand remains unchanged.”

Dr. & Mrs. Gerald Johnson, GFA missionaries; the Johnson family in Japan, 1959

“...narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it.” Matthew 7:14
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COLORADO
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(GOA)
First Partaker

Reading Something Distinctly Spiritual

Almost thirty years ago I was given Thomas Watson’s A Body of Divinity. It was the first Puritan work I had ever seen. In fact, I was not even quite sure what sort of person a Puritan was. But the introductory memoir, by Spurgeon, recommended it as “one of the most precious of the peerless works of the Puritans,” adding that “the conscientious student is the most likely man to become a successful preacher.” That interested me, and I took it that Spurgeon assumed that a “conscientious student” would show himself such by poring over this impressive tome. I was conscientious for 85 pages. But I had gotten a taste. For many years after that, any fleeting reference to something by a Puritan fanned a dim longing for acquaintance with these men whose works Spurgeon had called “peerless.” But where to start?

I dabbled in Thomas Taylor’s work on Titus and Thomas Manton’s on James, but the long, drawn-out points and unfamiliar sentence structures quickly dampened my enthusiasm. A professor remarked offhandedly one day that life was too short to read the Puritans. After all, who reads long books over 300 years old? “Bibliomaniacs do,” a friend joked. So that’s where I left the experiment for ten years. The Puritans were for men like Spurgeon. They may have been peerless in their day, but dry reading in ours. People with lots of time on their hands used it up reading such works.

Those first impressions make me entirely sympathetic with any pastor who picks up the Puritans a stray book at a time, only to thumb them a moment or two before putting them back down. It is for those preachers that I want to write. I would not do so unless the Puritans were really worth reading. But they are. In fact, I have come to feel that it is important to read them. Not as oracles. Not to be an educated or well-rounded preacher. And not to the imbalance that disdains other devout literature. But certainly as the Lord’s provision at this critical hour in the life of His Church. Here’s how I came to feel this way.

A Personal Discovery

One snowy January afternoon, while rummaging through the back shelves of a Pennsylvania used bookstore, I happened across a small (about the size of a 3 x 5 card), leather-bound book entitled A Call to the Unconverted. Vaguely recognizing the author, Richard Baxter, as a Puritan, and being in no hurry to get back out into the cold, I sank down on the floor, propped myself up against the shelving, and started turning the pages—very carefully. This book was broken at the front hinge, torn on the title page, and mottled a sort of bread crust brown all the way through, so I barely pulled back the leaves. But the opening sentences arrested me.

It hath been the astonishing wonder of many a man, as well as me, to read in the holy Scripture, how few will be saved; and that the greatest part even of those that are called, will be everlastingly shut out of the kingdom of heaven and be tormented with the devils in eternal fire. Infidels believe not this when they read it, and therefore must feel it.

Here was plain Scriptural talk. I was at that time finishing up a doctoral thesis that had required my becoming more familiar than I liked with the kinds of infidels to whom Baxter was referring. I had found their books to be piles of unbelief, “valuable,” as Spurgeon once said, “to housemaids for lighting fires.” But what was
really troubling me was the respectful way in which evangelical writers entertained the scholarly skepticism of those unbelieving authors. In addition, the evangelicals I was reading offered very little enlightening exposition to compensate for their pages of chary dialogue with the enemy. Even when they did, it was somehow light without heat. There is a warm, reverent devotion to Christ, even in academic exposition, that is the almost intangible but unmistakable overflow of a devout man. It is the kind of thing you come across in Paul’s epistles when he breaks out into doxologies, or seems to pause to say a word about the Lord. I was hungry for it, but wasn’t finding much of it in the new book catalogs.

Baxter gripped me. Page after page was firm and fervent. This book breathed devotion. It had been awhile since I’d had that experience with a book. This one was feeding my soul.

I walked out into the twilight with that little volume in my possession. It lies open beside me now as I write. It would be impossible to reconstruct in any connected order how my appreciation for the Puritans has developed between that purchase nearly twenty years ago and my writing about it this evening. But in between I have uncovered numerous testimonies from people who also know the difference I sensed that day between uninspiring writers—whose chief credential seems to be their esoteric knowledge of one another—and the fervent, spiritual tone of one who seems to make eternal verities live. Richard Baxter himself testified (in The Reformed Pastor) to sensing this same difference between ministers:

There is in some men’s preaching a spiritual strain, which spiritual hearers can discern and relish; whereas, in other men’s this sacred tincture is so wanting, that, even when they speak of spiritual things, the manner is such as if they were common matters.

George Whitefield verified that this spiritual strain seemed to run through the writings of those very ministers Baxter was commending a hundred years earlier. “Though dead, by their writings they yet speak,” Whitefield testified. “A peculiar unction attends them to this very hour.”

I have come to share that viewpoint. And I am writing about it because I covet certain reading experiences for the Lord’s people everywhere. I am sometimes heartsick over what Christian people are reading. If a word or two about the Puritans would turn even some away from the husks of most contemporary authors to the solid food of some older writers, I would rejoice! More importantly, the Lord Jesus Christ would be glorified.

So Who Were The Puritans?

Puritanism is hard to define. It is the spirit that went willingly to Bloody Mary’s fiery stakes and the sort of stuff out of which the Mayflower Pilgrims were made. That much is clear. What is not clear is how to circumscribe it with a definition. So let me try to make a reasonably definable species out of the movement by classifying it four ways: nationally, chronologically, denominationally, and philosophically. A long the way, I hope to give you some compelling reasons for wanting to read them.

Nationally: They Were English

Puritanism as a movement was English. The hotbed for its preachers was Cambridge, and the flower of its influence blossomed in London.

Puritanism as a spirit was something more than English. It is this international spirit to which some refer when they classify non-English reformers as Puritans. In 1972, for instance, the London preacher Dr. David Martyn Lloyd-Jones argued that the Scottish reformer, John Knox, should be regarded as Puritanism’s actual father because “he brings out so clearly the guiding principles of Puritanism.” William Barker, in his recently published Puritan Profiles—a survey of influential members of the Westminster Assembly (which authored the Confession of Faith and catechisms used in Presbyterian churches to this day)—includes the 15 Scottish commissioners to the Assembly among the Puritans.

Such elastic uses of the term should not confuse you about the Puritans’ national identity. The same concerns and values that were concentrated in an entire movement of Englishmen invigorated men of other nations as well. In general, however, when an author or speaker refers to the Puritans in an unqualified way, he is speaking of the English movement. But were there not American Puritans? My view is that there most certainly were and that New England was merely one of Puritanism’s most lively branches running over the wall. Some scholars on the subject prefer reserving the term for the more narrowly defined group of churchmen who never left England. But no one disputes the fact that the Mayflower Pilgrims were English and that their motivations for leaving the homeland were, in the main, precisely those of their brethren who stayed behind. I would, therefore, consider both groups Puritan.

Chronologically: They Lived In The 16th & 17th Centuries

Here, again, your initial reading about Puritans is likely to bring you into contact with some inexact
statements. Speakers or writers sometimes refer to nearly every reformed English preacher from John Wycliffe (1320?-1384) to David Martyn Lloyd-Jones (1899-1981) as a Puritan. This loose chronological use of the term is being popularized currently in Robert Martin's A Guide To The Puritans (an otherwise excellent work). Acknowledging the generally accepted chronological restriction of the term to the 16th and 17th centuries, Martin nevertheless takes the liberty to apply it to such reformed contemporary writers as John Blanchard, Jerry Bridges, Walter Chantry, Faith Cook, and Iain Murray. Doubtless, these authors have some of that Puritan spirit. But to readers seeking a framework of specific dates, such imprecision is bewildering.

The first documented use of the term “Puritan” by an English author is dated about 1563, almost two hundred years after Wycliffe. English historian John Stow testified that by that time there were “many congregations of Anabaptists in London who cawlyd themselves Puritans or unspotted Lambs of the Lord.” A thouth by no means officially dating Puritanism's beginning, Stow's statement does establish that the term was in circulation by at least the last half of the 16th century. But J. I. Packer and Martyn Lloyd-Jones, both writers on the Puritans, trace what we are calling 16th century. But when did it end?

A gain, it is important to differentiate between Puritanism as a historical movement and Puritanism as a spirit which cannot be quite so chronologically confined. Most authorities conclude historical Puritanism with the close of the 17th century. The reason for this is that after August 1662 (when over 2,000 English preachers were ejected from the Church of England for failing to conform to its liturgy), Puritanism as a reforming flame within the Church of England was effectively extinguished. Since most of those ejected were buried before the end of that century, it would be hard to defend a terminus for Puritanism much beyond 1700. Its disembodied soul lingered in what is known as English Nonconformity (represented by men like Matthew Henry, Isaac Watts, the preachers of Lady Huntingdon's Methodist Connection, and C. H. Spurgeon), but the battles it fought had been so decisively settled that no new army of militants within the Church of England rallied to its lost causes. Chronologically, then, you can get your hands around Puritanism's dates simply by holding your King James Bible in them and thinking of the roughly 75-100 turbulent years before and after its printing in 1611.

Denominationally: They Were Diverse

Here the differentiation between the historical movement and its broader spirit becomes critical. In order to understand why, we will have to erect some historical scaffolding. I think it will repay our patience to follow its reconstruction.

Denominationally, Puritanism most certainly originated within the national Church that Henry VIII commandeered from Rome. Henry was driven, you may recall, by his infatuation for a lady-in-waiting in his court named Anne Boleyn, whom he wished to wed after having his marriage to his first wife, Catherine, annulled. The King applied to Pope Clement VII for the annulment. But Clement dithered six years over the issue until Henry, determined to legalize his affair with Anne (who was probably already carrying the child who would become Queen Elizabeth I), married her secretly in January of 1533, seized the English branch of the Roman Catholic Church, proclaimed himself its Supreme Head and Governor, and coerced its bishops into nullifying his marriage to Catherine.

Henry VIII was no Protestant Reformer. He lived and died a practicing Roman Catholic. But his break from Rome and his subsequent authorization of an English translation of the Scripture (known for its imposing size as the Great Bible) opened the door for reforming spirits to press for Protestant changes to reach the national Church, now called “the Church of England.”

At Henry's death in 1547, his only son, Edward (by a third wife), zealously pursued some of these further reforms. But all of them were quashed with the boy-king's tragic death of tuberculosis three months before his sixteenth birthday in 1553 and the subsequent crowning of Mary, Henry's daughter by Catherine. Mary's legacy was the renaissance of Roman Catholic religion in the Church of England and the burning of no less than 288 good people who opposed her efforts— including 26 clergy, 55 women, and 4 children (see J. C. Ryle's small but moving Five English Reformers). Mercifully, God terminated her brief but bloody reign in 1558 (with what was probably ovarian cancer), making way for the accession of Anne Boleyn's daughter, Elizabeth, and opening the door for a more complete reformation of the Church. Or so some thought.

What many anticipated as an opportunity to purge the English church of all remaining vestiges of Romanism turned out to be a vain hope. Good Queen Bess, as Elizabeth was known, was a more secular soul than her half-sister, Mary. While she approved the return of the English Church to Protestantism, she stopped short of further reforms. This renewed but still-stifled Protestantism set the stage for a sizable faction within the Church which, though not officially organized, was nevertheless a clearly definable party. This is where Puritanism, as a chronologically measurable movement, probably begins. Thomas Fuller, who was on the scene at the time, said as much: “The odious name of puritans was
first applied in 1564 to those who resisted the attempt of the bishops in that year to enforce uniformity in ritual and in the use of vestments” (Church History of Britain). But Puritanism’s concern was more than clothing. And in our reconstruction of Puritanism’s historical scaffolding this is where the denominational issue surfaces.

A central issue to the Elizabethan Puritans was church government. We need not linger over the explanation of this, but the issue is important, then and now. The background, in a nutshell, was that some of these godly men fled to the continent of Europe during Mary’s bloody reign and then returned to England after Elizabeth’s accession. On the continent, particularly in Geneva, Switzerland, they had witnessed the example of Presbyterian polity and had come to believe that this, rather than Anglicanism’s rule by bishops, was the New Testament pattern. Their experience under bishops had convinced them that it was impossible for a single official to competently shepherd Christ’s flock when it was comprised of so many thousands of people in one diocese (a bishop’s district) and he himself was secluded away in the hushed shrines of a distant cathedral. They had come to see this arrangement not only as unscriptural, but unworkable. Given the system’s limitations even under the most well-intentioned bishops, it was no wonder that the people were, at best, ignorant and carnal and, at worst, unevangelized and damned. Baxter, a century later, argued for multiple local overseers from Acts 20:28 (“Take heed . . . to all the flock”):

If the pastoral office consists in overseeing all the flock, then surely the number of souls under the care of each pastor must not be greater than he is able to take such heed to as is here required. Will God require one bishop to take charge of a whole country, or of so many parishes or thousands of souls, as he is not able to know or to oversee? . . . We must labour to be acquainted, not only with the persons, but with the state of all our people, with their inclinations and conversations; what are the sins of which they are most in danger, and what duties they are most apt to neglect, and what temptations they are most liable to; for if we know not their temperament or disease, we are not likely to prove successful physicians (The Reformed Pastor).

When the persecuted exiles returned to England with these ideas they became known as a kind of Presbyterian strand within the Church of England. For this reason, Puritanism is sometimes defined denominationally as Presbyterianism. This is an oversimplification; nonetheless, it is this “Presbyterian” movement for reform within the Church of England during and after Elizabeth’s reign that everyone acknowledges as the trunk of Puritanism (no matter what they argue about its less obvious roots or later branches). Baxter (1615-1691), Thomas Manton (1620-1677), Thomas Watson (?-1686), and John Flavel (1630?-1691) were some of the more highly regarded Presbyterian Puritans whose writings are being reprinted today.

In time, however, the Presbyterian wing of Anglicanism feathered out to produce still another minority within the Church of England. These men were called Independents or Congregationalists because they believed in even less hierarchy than that proposed by Presbyterians. Thomas Goodwin (1600-1680), an Independent, debated the case in a lengthy treatise (reprinted as The Government of the Churches of Christ). “There is not one Scripture in the New Testament that doth so much as call a presbytery, over many congregations, church,” Goodwin argued. “There is a presbytery in every church,” he continued, and God instituted this so that, no matter how small, every church might be “a perfect [i.e., complete] body.” Many of the Independents’ profitable works on Christian living are also available, including reprints of works by Jeremiah Burroughs (1599-1646), William Bridge (1600-1671), and John Owen (1616-1683).

So what were the Puritans denominationally? Some were Anglicans who believed in government by bishops; some were Presbyterians who held to government by elders; and some were Congregationalists who argued for government by the believers in the pews. And all of these were, in many senses, birds of common feather nesting together within the Church of England—until the Ejection of 1662 when they were, by virtue of their nonconformity, involuntarily separated out of her.

The denominational splintering of the Puritan movement was not over, however.

And there are some very critical questions for contemporary ministry which arise out of that further development. Lord willing, the next issue’s column will explore them.

In the meantime, a good place to begin sampling the Puritans is I. D. E. Thomas’s A Puritan Golden Treasury, a portable paperback anthology of some 1500 quotations from a wide range of Puritan literature.

Dr. Mark Minnick is the pastor of Mount Calvary Baptist Church in Greenville, South Carolina, where he has served on the pastoral staff since 1980. He speaks frequently in churches and at conferences across the nation and ministers regularly on mission fields around the world.

“Puritanism as a movement was English. . . . Puritanism as a spirit was something more than English.”
THE hymnwriter, a 19th-century Scottish Presbyterian named Horatius Bonar, had a heart that throbbed for souls. His book, *Words to Winners of Souls*, addresses ministers and the ministry with this underlying emphasis. In five brief chapters, Bonar captures the essence of the Christian mission and ministry.

Bonar opens his first chapter, dealing with the pastor’s heart, with this arresting statement: “How much more would a few good and fervent men effect in the ministry than a multitude of lukewarm ones!” This is a work for the heart, to be read on our knees in the privacy of our own study. “The lukewarm ministry of one who is theoretically orthodox,” he adds, “is often more extensively and fatally ruinous to souls than that of one grossly inconsistent or blatantly heretical.” Bonar’s earnestness will stir the reader’s heart. “A man may be free from all scandal either in creed or conduct, and yet may be the most grievous obstruction in the way of all spiritual good to his people. . . . How many souls have been lost for want of earnestness, want of solemnity, want of love in the preacher, even when the words uttered were precious and true!” He continues:

The question, therefore, which each of us has to answer to his own conscience is, Has it been the end of my ministry, has it been the desire of my heart, to save the lost and guide the saved? Is this my aim in every sermon I preach, in every visit I pay? Is it under the influence of this feeling that I continually live and walk and speak? Is it for this I pray and toil and fast and weep? Is it for this I spend and am spent, counting it, next to the salvation of my own soul, my chiefest joy to be the instrument of saving others? Is it for this that I exist? To accomplish this would I gladly die? Have I seen the pleasure of the Lord prospering in my hand? Have I seen souls converted under my ministry? Have God’s people found refreshment from my lips and gone upon their way rejoicing, or have I seen no fruit of my labors, and yet am content to remain unblest? Am I satisfied to preach, and yet not know of one saving impression made, one sinner awakened?

Such words drive most of us into our closets. Do we need a heart-to-heart confession with the Lord, pleading soberly for His power and His blessing, and asking Him once again to restore unto us the Holy Spirit’s fullness and focus on the ministry? Even good men get distracted, usually by good things. The enemy of the best, it has been said, is not the bad but the good. It is always good things that prevent us from engaging in the best things.

*Men, are we weak in the pulpit because we are weak in the prayer closet? The man of God must be a godly man. The life of the man of God must be a holy life. It is holiness of life that makes him a bold and effective instrument in the hands of the Savior, for it is the righteous who are as bold as a lion. Those who know their lives are riddled with tolerated unrighteousness must labor under the timidity of a conscience that condemns them. Bonar refers to Robert McCheyne’s challenge in his chapter on “The Minister’s True Life and Walk.”

If my heart be early seasoned with H is presence, it will savor of Him all day after. . . . I ought to pray before seeing anyone. Often when I sleep long, or meet with others early, and then have family prayer and breakfast and forenoon callers, it is eleven or twelve o’clock before I begin secret prayer. This is a wretched system. It is unscriptural. Christ rose before day, and went into a solitary place. . . . It is best to have at least one hour alone with God before engaging in anything else. At the same time, I must be careful not to reckon communion with God by minutes or hours, or by solitude. . . . Your own soul is your first and greatest care. . . . Study likeness to Him in all things. Read the Bible for your own growth first, then for your people.

In less than 60 pages, Bonar escorts the man of God to his Father’s woodshed. But he does not freeze the heart with discouragement. He warms the heart to see our human weaknesses as divine opportunities. Indeed, God can use us! He desires to have a holy minister passionate about the lost! God used this work to stir my own heart and retrain my focus on the best things, the eternal things. Brethren, purchase this little gem and bring with thee the books.” *(2 Tim. 4:13)*

Dr. Mark Simmons is the pastor of Marquette Manor Baptist Church in Downers Grove, Illinois. He has ministered as a church planter and senior pastor since earning his Ph.D. from Bob Jones University in 1981.
The writers of the synoptic gospels record three occasions on which the Lord Jesus explicitly forewarned his disciples of his approaching betrayal, death and resurrection. (See a harmony of the Gospels to compare the exact parallel passages.)

The first occasion prompted Peter’s rebuke of the Lord and the Lord’s rebuke in reply (Mt.16/ Mk.8/Lk.9). Soon after, the Lord repeated the prediction on a second occasion (Mt.17/ Mk.9/Lk.9).

With the stinging rebuke of Peter still fresh in their minds, it is no wonder that, though the disciples “did not understand” His statement and “were deeply grieved,” nonetheless “they were afraid to ask Him.” Their lack of understanding at this point is not particularly mystifying. “Their views of a reigning Messiah made His words utterly enigmatical to them” (Hiebert on Mk. 9:32).

But on this occasion, Luke alone adds that the Lord’s statement “was hid [concealed, parakalupto, perfect passive participle] from them,” literally “in order that they should not perceive [aisthanomai, aorist subjunctive] it.” Was hidden? By whom? In order that they should not perceive it? Why? Plummer underscores the grammatical force of the verbs: “they were not allowed to understand the saying.”

The third occasion is even more puzzling (Mt.20/Mk.10/Lk.18). After Jesus again explicitly spelled out his approaching death and resurrection, Luke pens a three-fold statement of the disciples’ utter incomprehension of Christ’s unambiguous prediction: (1) they did not understand (suniemi) these things, (2) this saying was hidden (kupto, perfect passive participle) from them, and (3) they did not know (ginosko) these things.

Which word did they not understand? Most commentators appeal to the context of the parallel passages in Matthew and Mark to support their explanation that the disciples were distracted by the anticipation of their part in the glory of an earthly kingdom. Their preoccupation with the earthly and physical made them insensitive to spiritual truth.

But that explanation is not fully satisfying here for two reasons. (1) Luke himself does not offer that context to help explain his unusual remark. (2) Even that explanation does not adequately account for the full grammatical force of these three expressions of incomprehension piled on top of one another.

So what does this statement mean? A key that helps unravel what is going on in Luke 18:34 is Luke 24:45ff., when Christ finally “opened their understanding that they might comprehend the Scriptures” that “it was necessary for the Christ to suffer and to rise from the dead the third day.” As Plummer observes, “Their dulness was providential and it became a security to the church for the truth of the resurrection.”

How is it that Jesus’ own disciples, who heard such predictions repeatedly, did not understand or remember them, yet Jesus’ enemies did understand and remember them (Mt. 27:62)? The inspired phraseology of the text seems to assert that the disciples failed to comprehend this truth because, even though Christ revealed it to them, it was simultaneously “hidden from them,” as Luke says. By whom? By God! Only God, then, could remove that dullness and incomprehension—which is exactly what Luke says happened in 24:45ff.

But why would God reveal something so crucial yet, at the same time, “hide” it from the very ones to whom it was revealed? Plummer has already suggested a partial answer. The words and deeds of Christ’s enemies who remembered supplies the rest.

It seems that God revealed yet hid this from the disciples to insure that they would do nothing to cast any suspicion on the authenticity of the resurrection. Any confident anticipation of the resurrection on their part could be misconstrued as casting some suspicion on the disappearance of the body. So Plummer also rightly notes that “the theory that they believed [in the resurrection] because they expected Him to rise again is against all the evidence.”

Yet, it was not “hidden” from the enemies of Christ. They understood and remembered. Why? God not only prevented the disciples, through their providential dullness, from doing anything that might compromise the integrity of the resurrection. God also actually employed the unbelief and hostility (and understanding and memory) of His own enemies to help establish and validate the authenticity of the resurrection. By securing the tomb and setting the guard (Mt. 27:62-66), and by having to concoct such an implausible alibi (Mt. 28:11-15), God’s enemies actually helped Him validate the very truths they themselves rejected (see Psalm 76:10).

On a final practical note, this episode underscores the truth that God Himself holds the gift of understanding even what He plainly reveals. He is free to hide from us, for His own reasons, even the most obvious of Biblical truths. Without His illumination, we are prone to error, to insensitivity, to dullness. May He help us never to become confident in our ability to decipher eternal, spiritual, God-given truth but, beyond the sacred page, to seek Him.

—Layton Talbert
The Brevity of Life

One can hardly thumb through a family photo album without being struck by the reality of passing time. Often at reunions, relatives give such revealing exclamations: “My, how you've grown!” “Boy, it seems like just yesterday when we did that.” “Doesn't time fly?” We easily become oblivious to the passing of time. To youth, time is slow-moving; to the aged, it is otherwise.

The Bible frequently reminds us of the brevity and frailty of life. Our days are as a shadow that is lengthened (Ps. 102:11) and our constitution is dust (Ps. 103:14). Man at his best is vanity—fleeting, transitory (Ps. 39:5); his life is a momentary flash in the pan of time. Man’s days are as grass (Ps. 103:15), and he is nothing but a breath (Job 7:7). Nearly every obituary and funeral service testify that we finish our years like a sigh (Ps. 90:9). We are like a flower that falls under the passing wind (Psalm 103:16) or withers beneath the scorching heat of the sun (James 1:10). The Lord likens our life span to a handbreadth (Psalm 39:5), our existence to a mere day, for we grow like grass in the morning, and like grass we are cut down in the evening (Ps. 90:6). “For what is your life? It is even a vapour, that appeareth for a little time, and then vanisheth away” (James 4:14). Think of the morning mist hovering over a wet lawn, the floating smoke of a campfire, or the steam rising from your favorite mug filled with morning coffee. The mist swiftly dissipates with the sun, the smoke disappears into the atmosphere, the steam wafts upward only a few inches before it vanishes. That is God’s image for man’s life. Man’s days pass swifter than a weaver’s shuttle, a runner, a speedy ship, or an eagle diving upon its prey (Job 7:6, 25-26).

History tells the tale of men who sought for long life. The Spanish explorer Juan Ponce de Leon (1460–1521), having searched the Florida peninsula for the legendary Fountain of Youth, was mortally wounded at the age of 61 by an Indian arrow (Grovier Multimedia Encyclopedia).

Though no one expects to find a fountain of youth today, man continues to search for longer life through diet, vitamins, exercise, and medicine. Yet for all the advancements in medical science and technology, man has lengthened his life expectancy by a hairbreadth. The average man in the Philippines will live 64 years; in Equatorial Guinea, 52 years; in the Republic of Sudan, 55 years. In Chad, Cambodia, and Kenya men live 45–47 years, and in Ethiopia the average man will die at age 40. Think of that—only 40 years! Life expectancy worldwide is only 66 years. Even in a wealthy, advanced nation like the United States, the average man will live only 73 years (The World Almanac and Book of Facts, 1998, 760–861, 875). After all these years, God is still right: “our years are threescore and ten” or “if by reason of strength . . . fourscore years” (Ps. 90:10). Life is brief.

The Uncertainty of Life

No one expects to live forever, but most assume they will live well into their retirement years to enjoy ease and luxury. The truth is that no one is assured of a single day beyond the present. Our newspapers headline tragedies daily. A teenager commits suicide; A businessman has a heart attack; A bus overturns; A train derails; Aائرate gunman enters a restaurant and opens fire. A fourteen-year-old dies in the crib. The Bible reminds us of the uncertainty of life: “Boast not thyself of to morrow; for thou knowest not what a day may bring forth” (Prov. 27:1). The rich man tells himself, “Soul, thou hast much goods laid up for many years.” But God replies, “Thou fool, this night thy soul shall be required of thee” (Luke 12:19–20).

In 1997 in the United States, nearly 93,000 people died unexpectedly in accidents. A nother 29,725 people committed suicide, and nearly 20,000 were victims of murder or manslaughter. Consider going 40 mph or more in your car, right past other cars going the same speed in the opposite direction. You are potentially two feet from a fatal accident, yet you travel like this all the time when you leave your home. A nd what about your home? Most people think of their home as a safe haven, but 28,400 people died in 1997 from accidents at home (The World Almanac and Book of Facts, 1998, p. 866–889). Everyone knows the adage that “nothing in this world is certain but death and taxes.” But taxes, at least theoretically, can be repealed.

Sometimes it takes a national tragedy for our society to remember how uncertain life is. Think of the many who died last year through disasters such as tornadoes, hurricanes, and other severe weather. The whole nation thought about life’s uncertainty in April 1995 when the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building was bombed in Oklahoma City. One of the most memorable national tragedies of the 1980s was the space shuttle Challenger catastrophe. On January 28, 1986, just 73 seconds into its tenth mission with virtually no warning and in full view of Americans who watched at the Kennedy Space Center and on television, the shuttle’s external tank exploded. The fireball ripped Challenger apart. Smoke and debris littered the blue sky in an indelible display of life’s uncertainty. The shuttle’s seven-member crew perished.

Among the crew was Christa McAuliffe, a 37-year-old schoolteacher from Concord, New Hampshire, who
was basically “along for the ride.” The other female crew member was Judith Resnik, a 36-year-old electrical engineer. Resnik had been only the second woman to fly in space (her first flight was on the shuttle Discovery’s maiden mission in 1984). A classical pianist with tremendous intellectual gifts and an effervescent smile, Resnik told a friend just after she turned 30, “I’ll never get old” (Newsweek, February 10, 1986, 26–36). She didn’t. “Ye know not what shall be on the morrow” (James 4:14).

A merica had seen Alan Shepard become the first American in space in 1961, Edward H. White make the first space walk in 1965, Neil Armstrong step onto the moon in 1969, and Columbia launch the shuttle program in 1981. But on January 28, 1986, America was confronted with the arresting arm of providence. Man lives and achieves only as long as God allows, “seeing his days are determined, the number of his months are with thee, [and] thou hast appointed his bounds that he cannot pass” (Job 14:5). What, then, is the proper response to such a reality? “Lord, make me to know mine end, and the measure of my days, what it is; that I may know how frail I am” (Ps. 39:4).

The Opportunities of Life

Since life is so brief and full of uncertainty, the wise will avail themselves of the opportunities they are afforded. A Latin phrase captures this concept: Carpe diem quam minimum credula postero. “Enjoy today, trust little to tomorrow.” In its more familiar abbreviated form, Carpe diem means to seize the day, to take advantage of present opportunities (Webster’s New International Dictionary).

Inventors, explorers, national leaders, business entrepreneurs, athletes, and others who aim to make their mark in history utilize this philosophy. At the age of 11, William H. Gates III took the opportunity, along with 31 other children in Seattle, Washington, to win a dinner from the Reverend Dale Turner by memorizing the Sermon on the Mount. The young Gates tackled the daunting task and had Matthew 5–7 memorized in short order. The Reverend Turner noted that “Gates probably didn’t learn the verses for their spiritual value, but because he loved a challenge.”

A genius in high school (scoring a perfect 800 on the SAT math section), Gates combined hard work, frugal methods, and a hatred for wasting time with a ruthless competitor’s edge. A fter dropping out of Harvard, he and Paul Allen co-founded Microsoft with the motto, “a computer on every desk and in every house.” Gates’s passion for seizing opportunities made him a billionaire by age 31. Today, according to Michael Klower and Robert Gunther, he is worth $61.7 billion (American Heritage, October 1998, 58; Janet Lowe, Bill Gates Speaks, 4, 23–33). Carpe diem, seize the moment! But what does all that money do for a man one second after death? “He heareth up riches, and knoweth not who shall gather them” (Ps. 39:6). What would it profit Bill Gates, or anyone else, to gain the entire world at the cost of his soul? Or what will a man give in exchange for his soul (Matt. 16:26)? At death, which is worth more—$61.7 billion, or the Sermon on the Mount?

Certainly a believer should make good use of opportunities—opportunities to serve God, to cultivate your relationship with Him, to rear a godly family, to influence your generation, and to propagate the gospel of Jesus Christ. More opportunities beyond the present are never guaranteed. Lady Jane Grey, the nine-day queen, came to the English throne through an elaborate power-play by her cousin, Edward VI, which was tantamount to high treason. Jane herself did not want the throne, but her family and advisors insisted she must become the queen. She assumed the throne at 16 years old! Her countrymen viewed her as a usurper, and her own family quickly abandoned her. While her enemies urged Queen Mary to execute her, Lady Jane took her last opportunity to testify to her sister Katherine. She penned in her Greek New Testament: “I have sent you, good sister Katherine, a book, which although it be not outwardly rimmed with gold, yet inwardly it is more worth than precious stones. . . . It will teach you to live and learn you to die.” Jane Grey’s final opportunity to speak for God came on February 12, 1554, when she was led to meet the executioner’s ax: “I pray you all, good Christian people, to bear me witness that I die a true Christian woman, and that I look to be saved by none other means, but only by the mercy of God, in the merits of the blood of his only Son, Jesus Christ” (Mary Luke, The Nine Days Queen, 396, 402).

Robert Murray M’Cheyne, the great Scottish preacher of the 19th century, died at the age of 29. In one of his sermons, “Time Is Short,” M’Cheyne admonished believers to “sit loose to everything here. Believers should look on everything in the light of eternity. Value nothing any more than you here. Believers should look on everything in the light of eternity. Value nothing any more than you will do then. Sit loose to the objects, griefs, joys, occupations of this world; for you must soon change them for eternal realities” (R. M. M’Cheyne, From the Preacher’s Heart, 199). M’Cheyne’s friend and biographer, Andrew Bonar, recalled that M’Cheyne’s inexplicable impression that his ministry would be short motivated him to vigorous activity. Bonar related that “his friends remember how his letters used to be sealed with this seal, ‘The night cometh!’” (The Life of Robert Murray M’Cheyne, 99).

We have no higher calling or more pressing incentive than to follow the example of Jesus Christ: “I must work the works of him that sent me, while it is day: the night cometh, when no man can work” (John 9:4). “So teach us to number our days, that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom” (Ps. 90:12).

Jeff Rush is Assistant Pastor at Mount Calvary Baptist Church in Greenville, SC.
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There was a swish and a sickening thud! Although the hayloft was only ten feet above the barn floor, it had seemed like an eternity before I finally hit the ground. I lay there on the hard wooden floor stunned. Did that really just happen? Was I dreaming? Surely I was deep into reverie and would soon awaken in perfect condition.

It was not out of slumber that I awakened, however, but rather out of a dazed stupor. As I struggled to stand to my feet, a sharp pain shot through my elbow. Please Lord, no! I thought. Why is this happening to me?

The words of my best friend interrupted my thought. “Are you all right?” asked Katy.

“You’re going to be fine, dear,” her mother reassured me.

Mrs. Dunning was like a second mother to me. She had seen me through many cuts and abrasions in the past, and her soothing voice calmed my frightened heart. Yet deep down inside, I knew that something had happened to my body. Only shock allowed me to gently cradle my elbow close to my body and walk to the car.

Once inside, Katy climbed into the back seat with me, her mother into the front, and the three of us sped off to the hospital. I remember waking up in a hospital room with my elbow in a half cast and a vague recollection of the day’s events. Not until then did my willful spirit begin to wrestle with the Lord.

God, I have climbed up those shelves a hundred times before. Why this time? Why did You allow this to happen to me?

Frustration slowly turned to bitterness as I reasoned with God. Little did I realize that God would teach me a lesson that I would carry with me for the rest of my life.

There was a stir in the bed next to mine, and I saw a young girl about my age lying there. Her name was Becky. A few moments later my parents arrived to visit me. Becky’s parents came shortly thereafter. The six of us became acquainted and began to talk. Over the next three days my parents had many opportunities to witness to Becky and her parents. As a result, the three of them accepted Jesus Christ as their Savior. Praise the Lord!

I have heard it said that God’s way would be our way if we saw everything that He does. I often wonder if Becky and her family would have come to know Christ had I never taken a fall that day. My elbow had been dislocated and severely shattered, yet God in His mercy and grace saw fit to restore most of the movement to it. He allowed me to develop arthritis in that joint, and every time I feel pain I am reminded that there will be three souls in heaven as a result of this injury.

God’s way is perfect. The Psalmist echoes clearly this thought in Psalm 18:30: “As for God, his way is perfect: the word of the Lord is tried; he is a buckler to all those that trust in him.” Many a Christian can utter a hearty “amen” to the perfection of God’s will. Paul reiterates this message in Romans 8:28: “For we know that all things work together for good to them that love God...” This is a precious promise to us as Christians. We needn’t fear that the Lord allows apparent tragedies to happen by accident. Our heavenly Father has a purpose for all that He does. He will “never leave... nor forsake” us (Heb. 13: 5b). Trust Him, Christian, for our God truly makes no mistakes.

Corinne M. Dyer is a freelance writer living in Greenville, South Carolina.
The neighbors bristled to see the first Asian family move into the community. Though the mother appeared to be a young girl, she carried the little infant with all the tenderness of a seasoned mother. With a radiant smile on her face, she strolled daily with the baby, but she was usually ignored with a silent contempt by most of our neighbors. Seeing the young Korean mother with babe in arms touched my wife’s heart, and she invited the little lady in for refreshments. Communication at first was limited pretty much to smiles and pleasantness, but our Korean neighbor, Sun Shin, knew she had discovered a friend.

The visits increased, and as Sun’s English vocabulary slowly grew, the conversations began to center on the Lord Jesus Christ and His wonderful grace. It turned out that Sun had been raised in a Presbyterian church in Korea. That explained why the hymn tunes were familiar to her as she first visited the services of Faith Baptist Church in Warren, Michigan. Sun’s husband was never really interested in our services, but out of respect he too came from time to time.

In time Mr. Shin’s name was called. I nudged him, he stood, and we approached the bench. I said, “Your Honor, I am Dr. Cummins, pastor of the Faith Baptist Church of Warren, Michigan. Mr. Shin is my neighbor, and being from Korea, he knows very little of the English language. It is his desire that I represent him.” The judge, after acknowledging that this was a very unusual procedure, agreed that I could serve in that capacity.

In my best professional form, I began my defense of Mr. Shin. “Your honor, Mr. Shin has come to America from Korea. He is married and the father of one child. He is industrious and has attempted to supply his family’s needs, but his ability to make a living with his limited knowledge of our language has caused many complications.

With these statements I could see that the judge was softening, and I sensed that those in the gallery were “in my corner,” and in essence were silently cheering me on. I continued: “Your Honor, my client [it is amazing how soon one adapts to the use of legalese] acknowledges his guilt, but we believe there are extenuating circumstances that must be taken into account. Your Honor, I must point out the fact that Mr. Shin, for a very logical reason in his mind, did not have his car properly registered. Mr. Shin had just recently purchased the car in question. His former vehicle had succumbed to old age, and he had secured a replacement. In Korea one transfers the plates to new purchases without doing any paperwork, and thus Mr. Shin had believed he was within the law. Realizing that ignorance is no excuse,
my client admits total guilt on all three counts and wishes to throw himself upon the mercy of the Court.”

The judge seemed to weigh her words, but her first response was encouraging for she said, “Dr. Cummins, the Court appreciates your concern for your neighbor and the fine presentation you have made in his defense. The Court wishes to show mercy and justify Mr. Shin, but before mercy can be shown in any court of law, there must be a personal acknowledgement of guilt. Therefore, I must ask Mr. Shin directly, Sir, are you guilty?”

At this point, Mr. Shin tightened his resolve and stood at his full stature. He looked the judge in the eye, and resolutely answered, “No!” There was a ripple of laughter and a few audible gasps in the gallery.

I immediately stepped forward and said, “Your Honor, Mr. Shin does not understand English. Let me have a few moments aside to explain to him, and I am sure he will admit his guilt.” The judge graciously concurred, and I took Mr. Shin a few feet away and whispered firmly, “You must admit guilt. You will go free if you will admit your guilt. When the judge asks you another question, you must answer ‘yes.’ Do you understand?” With glazed eyes he looked at me, and we shuffled back before the bench.

Again the judge intoned: “Sir, are you guilty?”

Once again Mr. Shin stiffened as he looked forward and responded, “No.”

Amidst the laughter of the audience, I stepped forward again and said, “Your Honor, the Court must realize what is in Mr. Shin’s mind. In Korea any admission of guilt would mean immediate incarceration, and, when asked that question, my client could only envision prison bars.”

It is not my purpose to report the resolution of the case, but I would point out the great truth that the secular judge stated: “Mercy can be granted only when there is a personal acknowledgement of guilt!”

It is also thus in the Divine Court of Heaven. God has abundant mercy, and it is available to sinners if they are willing to acknowledge their guilt before Him. The most difficult thing in the world today is to find a sinner. Men and women seek to justify themselves, not realizing that the mercy of God is available freely to all who will admit the guilt of sin and accept the grace of God. Justification, pardon, and mercy can only be experienced when men acknowledge and admit their sin. How appropriate for sinners to call unto the Lord, “God be merciful to me a sinner” (Luke 18:13).

Dear friend, the loving God offers you His free pardon today if you will admit your guilt and by faith trust in Him. If you by faith today would throw yourself on the mercy of God, your judgment would be removed, and eternal life would be yours. God would place you in His Son, and wonderfully, “There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus” (Romans 8:1).

Dr. David L. Cummins is Deputation Director of Baptist World Mission in Decatur, Alabama. He says that Mr. Shin finally admitted his guilt and was allowed to go free.
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Whatever a man trusts in, from that he expects happiness. —a Puritan

To be able to fill leisure intelligently is the last product of civilization. —Arnold Toynbee

Be steady in your work and leave the results to God. —William Carey

Bach almost persuades me to be a Christian. —Roger Fry

A pessimist is a person who sees a difficulty in every opportunity. An optimist is a person who sees an opportunity in every difficulty. —Gipsy Smith

The Holy Ghost rides in the chariot of Scripture, and not in the wagon of modern thought. —C. H. Spurgeon

Miracles serve not to convert, but to condemn. —Blaise Pascal

Grief is itself a medicine. —William Camper

Golf is a good walk spoiled. —Mark Twain

Alexander Hamilton originated the put and take system in our national treasury: the taxpayers put it in and the politicians take it out. —Will Rogers

In our natural life our ambitions are our own. In the Christian life we have no aim of our own, and God’s aim looks like missing the mark because we are too shortsighted to see what He is aiming at. —Oswald Chambers

He who would be angry and sin not must not be angry with anything but sin. —Thomas Secker

There are two freedoms: the false, where man is free to do what he likes; the true, where a man is free to do what he ought. —Charles Kingsley

The greatness of a man’s power is the measure of his surrender. —William Booth

Better shun the bait than struggle in the snare. —John Dryden

My temptations have been my masters in divinity. —Martin Luther

All wicked men are slaves. —Cicero

The difference between the right word and the almost right word is the difference between lightning and the lightning bug. —Mark Twain

On the soft bed of luxury most kingdoms have died. —Edward Young

As the music is, so are the people of the country. —Turkish proverb

It is a poor sermon that gives no offense; that neither makes the hearer displeased with himself nor with the preacher. —George Whitefield

No image but the image of God can fit our soul; every other seal is too narrow, too shallow for it. —John Donne

A man must first love that he would be, before he can be that which he loveth. —Andrew Willet

The natural mind is ever prone to reason when we ought to believe; to be busy with work when we should be quiet; to go our own way when we ought steadily to walk in God’s way, however difficult that may be to the natural man. —George Mueller

“... the pastor didn’t fall asleep, ... he’s just entering your wedding plans in his laptop ...”

Compiled by Dr. David Atkinson, pastor of Dyer Baptist Church, Dyer, Indiana.
FINANCES, FEAR OF THE FUTURE, HOMESICKNESS, PEER PRESSURE. THESE OBSTACLES CAN MAKE FINDING GOD’S WILL SEEM LIKE A TREACHEROUS RIDE THROUGH THE RAPIDS. ATTENDING NORTHLAND BAPTIST BIBLE COLLEGE FOR MINISTRY TRAINING IS NOT A CHOICE WITHOUT ITS OBSTACLES EITHER. GOD HAS PLACED NORTHLAND IN WISCONSIN’S NORTH WOODS—FAR AWAY FROM MOST EVERYTHING AND EVERYBODY.

CHOOSING TO TRAIN AT NORTHLAND WILL REQUIRE SOME SACRIFICE ON YOUR PART. BUT YOU WILL FIND A LIKE-MINDED CAMPUS FAMILY, A GROUP OF PEOPLE WHO REALLY CARE ABOUT EACH OTHER. MINISTRY TRAINING IS OUR FOCUS, AND THAT’S WHY WE EXIST. BEFORE YOU RIDE THE RAPIDS, TAKE OUR HAND. IT ISN’T AN EASY PATH, BUT NO ONE NEEDS TO WALK IT ALONE.
The Importance of Prayer in Evangelism

Phil Shuler

My wife and I were reminiscing about evangelism in our childhood, attempting to determine the primary reason that we saw many souls saved then, and so few saved today. We contrasted the lack of television then to the deluge of entertainment on the tube today. Back then family was the focus for spiritual growth outside the church, but today Mom and Dad both work and the kids are left on their own most of their idle time. We remembered the friendly open door of our neighbors to our testimony concerning Christ, but today almost every business and home in some towns display “no solicitation” signs.

We came to a conclusion. In the day that my father’s church saw souls saved at almost every service, the service was preceded by 30 minutes of prayer. In our revivals back when I was a child, the prayer room was crowded 30–45 minutes before the opening of the service. Shut-ins were contacted so that they could join our efforts from their beds. Everything about those early meetings was bathed in prayer, and the results showed it!

Revival is God’s gift in answer to our prayers. It is not given without conditions. That is why the wise pastor will spend several weeks prior to his evangelist’s arrival preaching sermons of preparation, which includes the necessity of prayer.

Jesus said in John 14:13, “And whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, that will I do, that the Father may be glorified in the Son.” Asking is the key to the promise.

During Outreach 2000 next year, a number of evangelists are looking to preach soul-seeking revivals, Monday through Friday, in cities all over America. In these meetings, we will preach to the lost only. The plan is for 1999 to be set aside for prayer and preparation. Churches will gather as many members as possible to pray, and unsaved folks will be contacted to attend.

As we read through the Bible, we read of promises with restrictions. For example, Adam and Eve were given God’s solemn promise of perpetual perfection in an environment of nothing less than Paradise, if only they would obey. They disobeyed, however, and stamped with sin every child that would be born on this earth! Second Chronicles 7:14 begins, “If my people, which are called by my name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways...” The promise of God follows this conditional clause. The word “if” is the really big word here. Second Chronicles 7:15 hinges on the four conditions in verse 14. “Now [after you have met the fours prerequisites] mine eyes shall be open, and my ears shall attent unto the prayer that is made in this place.” Revival comes after we meet God’s conditions and clear the way for our prayers being not only heard by God, but also answered without reservation.

As I write this article, I am holding a revival for my old college roommate, Jim Singleton, the pastor of Trinity Baptist Church in Tempe, Arizona. We were both in the U.S. Navy during World War II and served in the South Pacific. The first time I saw him, I liked him.

I remember many things about Jim. His bed was made neatly, his shoes were always shined, and his hair was always combed just right. But the thing that is most vivid in my memory was the fact that about 5:30 each morning, while the other three of us were still in bed, Jim would slip out of bed and get on his knees to spend the better part of 40 minutes in silent prayer. You see, when Jim was in the Navy, he had observed the Marines landing on hostile beaches. He observed that the victory over the enemy was the direct result of pre-landing planning. The troops had practiced over and over again on the beach of an island near Hawaii. The Navy would disembarak the troops at the precise time that the shelling ceased. We aboard ship were never surprised at the success of the Marine Corps.

The same kind of intense preparation should be made prior to any evangelistic campaign. Prayer prepares God’s people for revival, prepares the lost for the conviction of the Holy Spirit, and brings down the power of God in revival. Evangelism is dead without prayer, and evangelism is dying today because of a lack of prayer by God’s people!
SAUL: Birth of the Monarchy
(1 Samuel 9-31)

Clearly displeased with the timing, motive, and attitude of Israel’s demand to have a king so “that we also may be like all the nations” (1 Sam. 8:5, 20), God nevertheless graciously acquiesced. He not only chose the very best man available, but graced him supernaturally in several ways. In the end, the gracious supernatural endowment of an already naturally gifted man only underscored the tragedy of his fall.

Saul was graced by God with outward gifts (9:1–2) as well as inward qualities such as faithful submission (9:3), diligence (9:4), genuine concern such as faithful submission (9:3), diligence (9:4), genuine concern such as faithfulness (9:5), conscientiousness (9:6–7), humility (9:21), and meekness (10:14–16, 27; 11:13; cf. 15:17). To this, God added remarkable supernatural gifts. Saul was: given confirmatory Providential signs (10:1–5), endowed with the Spirit’s enablement (10:6, 10), changed into another man (10:6), promised God’s presence (10:7), given another heart (10:9), and granted loyal followers “whose hearts God had touched” (10:26). How could Saul have had any greater incentive to love and obey God? Likewise, God has given the Christian a new heart and a new life (2 Cor. 5:17), endowed us with divine power by which to live (Phil. 2:13), granted us promises by which we can partake of the divine nature (2 Pet. 1:3, 4), and blessed us individually in many different ways. How could our debt of gratitude and incentive to obey God be any deeper?

God’s charge to both king and people was unambiguous. Steadfast, unconditional obedience will be blessed (12:14); disobedience will result in chastisement (12:15). Following a divine object lesson of God’s seriousness (12:16–19), the charge is restated. Render devoted heart-service to the Lord, and He will not forsake you (12:20–23); fear the Lord and serve Him from the heart (12:24), or your defection will result in removal (12:25).

Saul promptly failed his first test, blaming his disobedience on circumstances (13:1–11) and arguing that circumstances should surely excuse him from obedience (13:12). When he is informed that his disobedience has forfeited his kingdom and dynasty (13:13–14), he displays no repentance (13:15ff.). He reveals instead a growing arrogance, substituting pious deeds for honest repentance and demonstrating that few people are as intolerable and troublesome as a disobedient, unrepentant man who tries to camouflage sin and rebellion with a self-righteous, false piety (14:1–46).

Likewise, Saul fails an even more explicit charge from the Lord, this time rationalizing that his actions are for a good cause, on the assumption that good intentions should surely excuse one from rigid obedience (15:1–23). But 15:9 states the case in black and white: Saul and the people were unwilling to obey the clear Word of God. God is neither fooled nor pleased by sacrifices that parade as substitutes for plain obedience. His response to rebuke (15:24–29) this time is a false repentance for show (15:30–31). Saul’s problem? An obstinate, rationalizing insubordination to God’s Word (15:23). Why? He is no longer little in his own sight (15:17).

True to His word, God punished Saul’s rebellion with chastisement and his defection with removal, though His timing for replacement was not immediate. The rest of Saul’s life is dismal reading—a miserable tale of anger, jealousy, paranoia, emotional instability, tyranny, irrationality, attempted murder, military defeat, and death. He came to see David, God’s choice, as his arch nemesis, but his real enemy was within himself. But most ominous are the repeated references to God’s departure from Saul (14:37; 16:14; 18:12; 28:6, 15, 16; cf. 16:14–23; 18:10; 19:9).

Great gifts or calling neither guarantee success nor make one an exception to God’s Word. “No man’s greatness”—or gifts or usefulness or blessing—“exempts him from judgment” (Matthew Henry). There is no substitute for simple obedience to God: “To obey is better than sacrifice, and to heed is better from the fat of rams” (Samuel). There is no substitute for genuine repentance: “It is not sinning that ruins men, so much as sinning and not repenting” (Matthew Henry). That marks the crucial difference between David and Saul. Both men sinned, even grievously. But David repented.

DAVID: Pinnacle of the Monarchy
(2 Samuel 1–1 Kings 2)

It is significant that David’s name appears more frequently than any other in Scripture (1139 times). About 10 percent of the OT is by or about David. Of the segment of the OT devoted to the history of the monarchy (Samuel, Kings, Chronicles), 34 percent is devoted to the story of David.

David the Man

David’s Character. A survey of the life of David unveils character traits that underscore the secret of his greatness. Even from an early age, David (1) was motivated by jealousy for God’s honor and courageously relied upon the Lord for protection and victory (1S. 17:26, 34–37, 45–47), (2) displayed wise and prudent circumspection and spiritual maturity (1S. 18:5, 12, 14–15, 30), (3) showed genuine humility in the face of great honor (1S. 18:18; 2S. 7:18; 1C. 29:14), (4) possessed a tender conscience and meekly deferred to God’s timing for His will (1S. 24:5, 6–12; 26:8–11, 23), and (5) though not perfect, was humble, correctable, teachable (1S. 25:32–35). As king, David (6) maintained a
conscious recognition that the Lord was behind every success and a dependence on God for leading even in apparently obvious situations (2S. 5:12, 17–25), (7) nurtured an abiding passion for the honored presence of God (2S. 6–7), (8) attributed and dedicated all his successes to the Lord (2S. 8:10–12), and (9) took the initiative to fulfill his personal obligations (2S. 9–10). Nevertheless, he (10) was still depraved in heart (2S. 11), but (11) genuinely repentant (2S. 12; Ps. 51), (12) humbly accepting the consequences of his actions, even when his circumstances were grossly misinterpreted (2S. 15:25–26, 30; 16:5–13). To the end of his days, David manifested (13) a repentant spirit (2S 24:10), (14) an unshakable confidence in God’s character (2S. 24:14), (15) genuine compassion for those affected by his sin (2S. 24:17; cf. 2S. 12:15f., 18:33), and (16) a self–sacrificial heart for the Lord (2S. 24:24). There is no explanation for a man like David other then the grace of God working in an open and honest heart. God has recorded so much through and about David for a reason. For every believer, he models a sincere heart. God has interpreted (2S. 15:25–26, 30; 16:5–13). To the end of his days, David manifested (13) a repentant spirit (2S 24:10), (14) an unshakable confidence in God’s character (2S. 24:14), (15) genuine compassion for those affected by his sin (2S. 24:17; cf. 2S. 12:15f., 18:33), and (16) a self–sacrificial heart for the Lord (2S. 24:24). There is no explanation for a man like David other then the grace of God working in an open and honest heart. God has recorded so much through and about David for a reason. For every believer, he models a sincere and passionate heart for God.

David the King

God’s Standard. Israel’s kings are repeatedly measured by David’s example. He is the Divine standard. “David is the pattern for all the kings, not because he was morally free from blame, but because he held to this fundamental law” of singular devotion and loyalty to Yahweh (Bahr). God’s comparisons to David take three forms: (1) a command to be like David (Solomon, 1K. 3:14; 9:4; Jeroboam, 1K. 11:38); (2) a positive comparison to David (Asa, 1K. 15:11; Jehoshaphat, 2C. 17:3; Hezekiah, 2K. 18:3; Josiah, 2K. 22:2); or (3) a negative contrast to David (Solomon, 1K. 11:4; 6; Israel, 1K. 11:33; Jeroboam, 1K. 14:8; Abijah, 1K. 15:3; Amaziah, 2K. 14:3; Ahaz, 2K. 16:2).

Chronology of David’s Life. Taking all the Biblical data into account, one can nearly pinpoint David’s age at a number of various events throughout his life. Born in 1041 at Bethlehem to Jesse, the grandson of Boaz and Ruth (Ruth 4:22), David was anointed by Samuel at Bethlehem in 1029 at the age of 12, and soon thereafter was briefly called to Saul’s court (1S. 16). He reappeared at the age of about 16 (around 1025) to slay Goliath (1S. 17), and served Saul’s court in honor for about 5 years (1S. 18–20). Saul’s jealous paranoia forced David to spend his next 10 years, age 21–30 (1020–1011), constantly fleeing from Saul (1S. 21–2S. 1). David was 30 when Saul died, and reigned in Hebron over Judah (2S. 2–4) for 7 years (1011–1004). Not until he was 37 (1004) —25 years after being anointed— did he begin to reign in Jerusalem over all Israel (2S. 5–24). He was 49 at the time of his adultery with Bathsheba in 992 (2S. 11–12), and 50 when Solomon was born in 991 (2S. 12). When Absalom rebelled in 976, David was forced to flee Jerusalem at the age of 65 (2S. 15–18). In 973, 68-year-old David declared Solomon his heir (1C. 22–23), but Solomon’s official coronation (1K. 1–2; 1C. 28–29) did not come until 971. David, then 70, died later that year (1K. 2:10–11; 1C. 29:26–30). [Merrill, Kingdom of Priests, 211–284.]

David the Prophet

God’s prophetic voice often spoke through David by means of music (2S. 23:1–2). David was a gifted musician from his youth (1S. 16:14–18), a skilled composer and arranger of music and choirs (2C. 15, 16, 23–26), an able craftsman of musical instruments (1C. 23:5; 2C. 29:25–27), and an innovative inventor of musical instruments (Amos 6:5). His prophetic ministry included at least 73 psalms, virtually half the Psalter.

David the Priest

An obscure and seemingly insignificant event became the basis for one of the most theoretically profound developments in all of Scripture: the meeting between Abraham and Melchizedek around 2000 B.C. (Gen. 14:17–20). About 1000 years later, Melchizedek’s name suddenly appears out of nowhere in one of David’s psalms (Ps. 110:1–4). About 1000 years later again, the fulfillment of this prophetic oracle is declared in the NT book of Hebrews (5:1–11; 7:1–22). Psalm 110 suggests that “not only the Messiah but David himself was such a priest.” In moving the ark and tabernacle to Jerusalem (2S. 6), “David saw himself as a priest and was accepted by the people and the Levites as such. His sacerdotal role is seen also in his appointing of the religious personnel to attend to the tabernacle” (1C. 16:4–6), and in his other priestly activities (1C. 21:18–28; 22:1–2). “That no mention is made of a priest in Jerusalem may imply that David himself fulfilled that responsibility at least initially” (Merrill, 264–266).

David—as king, prophet, and priest—typified and foreshadowed the Messiah who fulfills all these roles fully, flawlessly, and eternally.

SOLOMON: Grandeur of the Monarchy

(1 Kings 1–11)

Solomon’s Beginning

Solomon’s other name was Jedidiah, “beloved of Yahweh” (2S. 12:24–25). He “loved the Lord, walking in the statutes of David his father” (1K. 3:3); the Lord exalted him greatly and “bestowed upon him” unparalleled “royal majesty” (1C. 29:25).

Continued on next page
Solomon's Reign

The Biblical record of Solomon’s reign (971–931 B.C.) reflects 40 years of domestic building, international commerce, and accumulation of wealth. The sacred historian focuses on God’s first appearance to Solomon (1K. 3); a description of his administration, power, and prosperity (4); the construction and consecration of the Temple, along with other major building projects (5–8); God’s second appearance to Solomon (9); the famous visit of the Queen of Sheba and a description of Solomon’s enormous wealth (10); and a final brief account of Solomon’s idolatry and its consequences (11).

Solomon’s Wisdom

The Dream. Everyone knows the story of Solomon’s request for wisdom from God, demonstrating, it is said, his humble spirit and mature sense of priorities. But we often miss an important detail—Solomon actually only dreamed that he asked God for wisdom (1K. 3:5, 15)! Was Solomon’s request, then, a manifestation of what was already in his heart? Or was this dream God’s own gracious way of impressing upon Solomon what really was important?

The Nature of Solomon’s Wisdom. The Hebrew word for “wisdom” means skill and can be applied to a wide variety of abilities. The frequent references to Solomon’s wisdom invariably include a description of that wisdom in some specific area: (1) insight into human nature, aiding his administration of justice (3:16–28); (2) powers of observation and artistic expression (4:29–34); (3) managerial and diplomatic prowess (5:1–12); (4) mastery of monarchical majesty and ceremonious royalty (10:1–9); (5) sagacity of speech (10:23–24). The text is also punctuated by repeated reminders that his wisdom came from God (3:12, 28; 4:29; 5:7, 12; 10:24).

The Expression of Solomon’s Wisdom is encapsulated in Song of Solomon, Psalms 72 and 127, Proverbs 1–29, and Ecclesiastes. He composed a total of 3,000 proverbs and 1,005 songs (1K. 4:32).

The Limitations of Solomon’s Wisdom. If Solomon was so wise, how could he have strayed so idolatrously from the Lord? The Queen of Sheba exulted to Solomon, “Happy are your men and happy are these your servants, who stand continually before you and hear your wisdom!” A thousand years later, Christ called His own generation to account with this reminder: “The queen of the south will rise up in the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it; for she came from the uttermost parts of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and, behold, a greater than Solomon is here” (Matt. 12:42). We have access to the complete revelation of God, and to Christ “in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge” (Col. 2:3). Why do we wander from the Lord? Because we fail, or cease, to heed the wisdom we have been given—just as Solomon did.

Solomon’s Domain

In addition to Israel proper, Solomon’s rule extended over a considerably larger domain. (1) Provinces. “Kingdoms and states immediately contiguous to Israel,” including Damascus, Ammon, Moab, Edom, and “several smaller principalities” which Solomon governed “through Israelite governors or other superordinates.” Provinces “were subject to taxation and description and were expected to defend Israel.” (2) Vassal States. Nations “including Zobah, Hamath, Arabia, and possibly Philistia” which “were brought under Israelite control by military or diplomatic means.” They “were allowed to retain a certain measure of autonomy” but had to “provide tribute of goods and services to the king on stated occasions and to maintain loyalty” to Israel, “especially in times of war.” (3) Allied States. Solomon maintained “a network of parity treaties with neighboring or even distant powers with whom he was on friendly terms,” such as Tyre and Egypt. [Merrill, 301–302]

Solomon’s Wealth

The wealth of Solomon’s empire was amassed and sustained by a combination of: (1) domestic taxation; (2) tribute from provinces and vassal states; (3) international trade, of which Israel, located strategically “at the overland and maritime crossroads of the eastern Mediterranean world,” was not merely a participant but a key broker, monopolizing the flow of all manner of merchandise with lucrative results; and (4) voluntary gifts from other kingdoms (e.g., 1K. 10). “One can say without fear of contradiction that Israel under Solomon had reached the very pinnacle of international power and prestige. With Assyria and Egypt, Israel could rightly claim to be one of the three great powers of the tenth century.” [Merrill, 307–310]

Solomon’s Decline: Causes and Consequences

Solomon’s idolatry is appended almost as a postscript to an incredible testimony of his greatness. His early character and reign are laudatory (1K. 3). Twenty-five years later, God appeared again and reaffirmed the promises and warnings of the Davidic covenant (1K. 9). If it were not for one brief passage (1K. 11) at the end of the glorious account of Solomon’s reign, we would not know of his spiritual fall at all. Chronicles does not mention it. It occurred “when [he] was old” (1K. 11:4). In his dotage, after years of indulgence and blessings both inherited and heaped upon him by the Lord, Solomon allowed his pagan wives to lead his heart away from Yahweh alone. “It was this blend of physical and spiritual polygamy which brought upon Solomon and the kingdom the judgment of Yahweh”—a judgment which commenced with God’s providential “stirring up” of adversaries against Solomon (1K. 11:14, 23, 26–40) and resulted in “the dissolution of Israel into two irremediably separate” kingdoms. [Merrill, 312]
Falwell Speaks at BBF Meeting

Dr. Jerry Falwell spoke February 15 at the Baptist Bible Fellowship meeting in San Diego, but some within the BBF objected to his presence. The Washington State BBF unanimously passed a resolution on January 5 expressing their opposition to Jerry Falwell’s appearance. The resolution cited several articles from The Baptist Preacher, a BBF publication, pointing out Falwell’s lack of involvement with the BBF and his move toward the Southern Baptist Convention. “The choice of national speakers is a very important one—that’s the reason for the approval process,” the resolution said. “Speakers who are given such an honor are necessarily lifted up as role models and examples for others to follow, especially our younger men. Also, national speakers declare an identity of us as a fellowship—certainly to those on the outside observing us, but more importantly to ourselves. Are we seeing a new trend started which will surely change what we are as a fellowship? We respectfully request that Dr. Gillling, the Executive Committee approving our speakers, and host pastor Jim Baize, remove him as a speaker.”

According to the January-March issue of its magazine Together, the lead article, “Toward a spiritualty based on justice and ecology,” stressed not Christ but other names. The first article criticized “the Religious Right and large corporations in America” that “manipulate racist feelings.” It then criticized “religious fundamentalism. Fundamentalism feeds frightened people easy answers to daunting questions. It offers people both a boundary to limit their compassionate concern and a convenient scapegoat.” Bryant Myers, executive publisher of Together, said, “When I read it, I was horrified. This is hugely embarrassing: It’s not World Vision’s position, and it’s not what we’d want to put out.” Myers said that because of personnel changes, the “normal checks and balances” for assessing articles were not in place, and the issue “went through without any editorial review.”

SBC Divided

In 1991 the Southern Baptist liberals formed the Cooperative Baptist Fellowship, which now claims 1600 churches. According to the January 1999 Baptist Banner, published by Southern Baptists in Virginia, the CBF includes leaders who deny the fundamentals of the faith, support abortion, defend homosexuality, and call for the ordination of women. The Banner also said that conservatives lead in 11 SBC state conventions, liberals in 5, and 11 more are mixed (Calvary Contender, 3/1/99). At their state meeting, representatives of Georgia’s Baptists failed to pass a ban on charismatic activities, including speaking in tongues and “being slain in the spirit.”

World Vision “Embarrassed”

World Vision is a “privately funded, faith-based relief and development organization” with revenues last year of $241 million. In the January-March issue of its magazine Together, the lead article, “Toward a spirituality based on justice and ecology,” stressed not Christ but other names. The first article criticized “the Religious Right and large corporations in America” that “manipulate racist feelings.” It then criticized “religious fundamentalism. Fundamentalism feeds frightened people easy answers to daunting questions. It offers people both a boundary to limit their compassionate concern and a convenient scapegoat.”

Street Preachers’ Convention

Bible Baptist Church of Marysville, California, pastored by Dr. Brad Weniger, hosted the third National Street Preachers’ Convention February 18–21. The Convention was under the direction of evangelist Gerald Sutek. About 200 preachers from as far away as North Carolina and Florida took part in the evangelistic endeavor. Their efforts resulted in at least 20 professions of faith, including the photographer from a major newspaper covering the event. The next convention is scheduled for June 22–25, 2000. Bible Baptist Church will again host the event.

The Price of Ecumenical Unity

Pope John Paul II, writing in Catholic Moment, said: “Christian unity will not become a reality unless all churches accept the authority Christ entrusted...
to St. Peter and his successors. Unity in Christ is based on following His will. This unity will not be fully manifested until all Christians accept Christ’s will for the Church and acknowledge the apostolic authority of the bishops, in communion with the successor of Peter. . . . The Church’s structure of authority and service, based on Christ’s mandate to Peter and the other Apostles, is an essential part of fidelity to Christ’s will.” (Current Trends & Updates, 1/4/98)

**Appeals Courts Ban Prayer**

Student-led public prayers may be permitted at high school graduation ceremonies, but not at football games, according to a 2–1 ruling by a panel of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit. The March 1 ruling could end a long-standing tradition of pre-game prayers in Texas. (Maranatha Newswatch, 3/14/99) The 6th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals ruled on March 18 that the Cleveland Board of Education is violating the Constitution by opening its meetings with a prayer. Advocates had claimed that the prayer was permissible because it was similar to opening a legislative session with a prayer, which has been allowed under court rulings. (Daily Brief, 3/19/99)

**WCC Celebrates 50th Anniversary**

“The World Council of Churches has no authority to agree or disagree with the Bible!” declared Dr. Konrad Raiser, WCC General Secretary, when challenged by a member of the press regarding the Bible’s condemnation of homosexuality. For almost two weeks that very attitude was demonstrated—by a member of the press—toward the member churches, now numbering 339. At the first press conference a reporter asked Raiser about the relationship between the WCC and the Roman Catholic Church. Raiser related that there was a joint working group regarding cooperation between the WCC and the Roman Catholic Church. A booklet, Joint Working Group Between the Roman Catholic Church and the World Council of Churches, was given to all in attendance. It rehearsed the past seven years’ work and emphasized the “growing relationship of the WCC and the Roman Catholic Church.” The Roman Catholic Church is already a full member of 56 national councils of churches throughout the world. (ACC Report, 2/23/99)

**Pro-Homosexual Video Being Shown in Elementary Schools**

Helen Cohen and Debra Chasnoff have teamed up to produce a pro-homosexual video called It’s Elementary: Talking About Gay Issues in School. Chasnoff has this to say about her video, “What’s clear in the film is that the younger the kids, the more open they were . . . . If we could start doing this kind of education in kindergarten, first grade, second grade, we’d have a better generation.” The principal of an elementary school says on the video: “I don’t think it’s appropriate that values only be taught at home. There are social values as well, there are community values.” The video was funded largely by the San Francisco-based Columbia Foundation, as well as by People for the American Way, the Gay & Lesbian Alliance Against Defamation, and the California Teacher Association’s Interpretation of the Inerrant Word.” (Current Trends & Updates, 1/4/98)

**NOTABLE QUOTES**

A democracy cannot exist as a permanent form of government. It can only exist until the voters discover that they can vote themselves money from the Public Treasury. From that moment on the majority always votes for the candidates promising the most benefits from the Public Treasury with a result that a democracy always collapses over loose fiscal policy, always followed by a dictatorship. The average age of the world’s greatest civilizations has been 200 years. These nations have progressed through the following sequence: from bondage to spiritual faith; from spiritual faith to great courage; from courage to liberty; from liberty to abundance; from abundance to selfishness; from selfishness to complacency; from complacency to apathy; from apathy to dependency; from dependency back into bondage.—Alexander Fraser Tytler (1748-1813), Scottish lawyer, university professor, and judge, in his book The Decline and Fall of the Athenian Democracy

In 1976, I was invited to Scotland to be the evangelist for the World Congress of Fundamentalists. It was headed up by Ian Paisley as far as the European segment was concerned, and this is the man who often leads the Protestants to the front and they kill one another—a minister of the gospel. When I was there, I was to preach a sermon on “Dangerous Evangelism” and knock Billy Graham, because he would often unite with Catholics. I couldn’t do it. . . . Oh, folks, I wish I could get into all the verses I was preaching in those days because I was brainwashed that we should “Mark them and avoid them” (Rom. 16:17). We were to come out from among them and be separate (2 Cor. 6:17). We were to rebuke them (Eph. 5:11) and withdraw ourselves from them (1 Tim. 6:5) and to have no fellowship with them (2 Tim. 3:5). But in this book I wrote [Sabotage in the World Church] through 65 theologians covering 100 years, [I showed] that these interpretations were wrong and I called the chapter “The Errant Interpretation of the Inerrant Word.” . . . I was deeply moved as Pope John Paul II opened his humble heart of love to all of us. Billy Graham calls him the moral voice of the 20th century, and I agree.—Evangelist and former Fundamentalist Jack Van Impe, from a transcript of his television program of July 23, 1995

ed by the WCC at its 50th Anniversary Assembly in Harare, Zimbabwe, December 3–14, 1998. An assembly of the WCC is the coming together of its member churches, now numbered 339. At the first press conference a reporter asked Raiser about the relationship between the WCC and the Roman Catholic Church. Raiser related that there was a joint working group regarding cooperation between the WCC and the Roman Catholic Church. A booklet, Joint Working Group Between the Roman Catholic Church and the World Council of Churches, was given to all in attendance. It rehearsed the past seven years’ work and emphasized the “growing relationship of the WCC and the Roman Catholic Church.” The Roman Catholic Church is already a full member of 56 national councils of churches throughout the world. (ACC Report, 2/23/99)
Gay and Lesbian Caucus. The film also credits the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) with a hand in helping to fund the project. *It’s Elementary* has picked up several awards, including the prestigious C.I.N.E. Golden Eagle for the Best Teacher Education Film of 1996. Targeted to state departments of education and local school boards, the video has been screened in at least six states, and California Assemblywoman Sheila J. Kuehl, an open lesbian, said she intends to have it shown in all 50 states. (AFA Action Alert, 3/5/99)

**Children Viewing Porn in Libraries**

Filtering Facts, a librarian organization that promotes the protection of children in public libraries, released a report entitled “Dangerous Access” that documents 503 incidents of patrons accessing pornography in public libraries. Children were involved in 245 of the incidents, and 20 involved child pornography. Among the incidents uncovered were adults deliberately exposing children to pornography, a molestation, and several attempted molestations. The report documents 195 incidents of children accessing pornography, at an average age of 12 years old. The American Library Association, however, continues to deny that any problem even exists. Ann Symons, president of the ALA, recently said, “The whole issue of protecting children has been blown way out of proportion by the media and those who seek to promote their own agendas.” ALA’s main recommendation to libraries has been that they install “privacy screens” to prevent others from seeing what children and adults are viewing. “Not only is ALA denying there is a problem, but their advice to libraries is to cover up the problem by installing privacy screens,” said Filtering Facts president David Burt. “They want public libraries to literally create peep show booths for children, except there’s no slot for quarters because taxpayers have already paid the quarter.” The 94-page report is available online at http://www.filtering-facts.org/da-main.htm. (Filtering Facts news release, 3/2/99)

This news is presented to inform believers. The people or sources mentioned do not necessarily carry the endorsement of the Fundamental Baptist Fellowship.
A re You a Member of the FBF?

This is a question often asked among fundamental Baptists. Many men will quickly answer “yes”; some will say, “No.” A few will answer in a tone that communicates more than a simple “yes” or “no.” Others argue that no one is really a “member” of the FBF, but is rather an “affiliate.” Yet terms like “FBF men,” “FBF church members,” and “members of the FBF” are used regularly, and here at Frontline we hear from churches inquiring about our “denomination” or wondering how their church can join. But churches do not join the FBF; it is a fellowship of individuals. Although most of those identified with the FBF are pastors or missionaries, it is not required to be in the ministry to be a part of this fellowship.

The position of the FBF has not changed since it began in 1920. We are often accused of being archaic, and we plead guilty; our position is as old as New Testament Christianity. Identifying with the FBF means identifying with this position articulated in our doctrinal statement and manifestos on separation and evangelism. The attempt to avoid the term “membership” has probably been more a matter of semantics than fact. Membership fees have not been collected since the 1970s when the leadership of the FBF sought to avoid any appearance of a trend toward denomination or hierarchy.

Producing an annual directory and maintaining accurate records—a valuable tool for pastors, missionaries, and church members relocating—is costly. There has to be a charge for the directory, just as there is for Frontline. The increasing number of services provided by the FBF will necessitate a return to some sort of nominal membership fee in the near future, but it is far more important now for us to understand what membership in the FBF actually means, and therefore what the Fundamental Baptist Fellowship actually is.

It is first and foremost fundamental. Fundamentalists will often disagree on the exact number of fundamentals and some Baptists assume that their distinctives are fundamental to Christianity, but we mean by “fundamental” what Fundamentalists have historically meant—belief in and faithfulness to the fundamentals of the Christian faith. We are not, however, merely a “Fundamentalist Fellowship.” That was the original name of the Baptists who met to encourage each other in the days of the American Baptist denomination’s departure from orthodoxy nearly 80 years ago, and it was understood that they were Baptists.

As that denomination continued its doctrinal deterioration, separation was the only alternative, and groups such as the General Association of Regular Baptists, and later the Conservative Baptists, began to pull out. In the 1960s the name “Fundamental Baptist Fellowship” was chosen to identify those separatists who were the remnant of those who had first sounded the alarm in 1920. The goal was to maintain a pure fellowship of true Fundamentalists practicing and proclaiming Biblical Christianity, while continuing to stand against compromise and corruption.

Furthermore, the FBF is Baptist. We hold not only to the fundamentals of the Faith, but to the historically held Baptist distinctives such as Biblical authority, the autonomy of the local church, the priesthood of the believer, the two ordinances—baptism and the Lord’s supper—individual soul liberty, a saved and baptized church membership, the two offices of pastor (synonymous with elder and bishop) and deacon, and separation of church and state.

Again, the FBF is a Fellowship—not a denomination. The doctrinal statement of the FBF affirms, “We hold that the local church has the absolute right of self government, free from the interference of, and hierarchy of, individuals or organizations; and that the one and only superintendent is Christ through the Holy Spirit; that it is Scriptural for true churches to cooperate with each other in contending for the faith and for the furtherance of the gospel; that every church is the sole and only judge of the measure and method of its cooperation; on all matters of membership, of policy, of government, of discipline, of benevolence, the will of the local church is final.” Dynamic personalities will always have influence, but no personality has power in the FBF.

We exist to honor the Lord and His Word and to encourage other like-minded fundamental Baptists.

We would love to hear from you.
As any reader of this column knows, I love the wealth of information available at my fingertips through the Internet. Some cautions, however, are in order. Pornography is the third largest sector of the Internet, with over $1 billion in annual revenues, according to the Family Research Council. Forty million Internet pages contain sexually explicit photos, with the number growing daily. Reader Marty Goggins, associate pastor of Shenandoah Baptist Church in Rocky Mount, North Carolina, sent the following article outlining some of the dangers and what we can do to protect ourselves and others.

As a preacher of the gospel, I believe we should use every available resource and means to prepare sermons and study God’s Word. These resources include books, tapes, magazines such as Frontline, and they can include the Internet. I have found over the past few years many wonderful sites full of good, sound, fundamental teaching and illustrations. I cannot begin to relate how profitable the Internet has been to my ministry and my personal study.

Unfortunately, Satan has used it much to his own ends, just as he does with most things. Today, the Internet is full of everything from the sickest and most perverted kinds of sex sites, to sites that instruct one how to build bombs and steal credit card numbers. If the human mind can conceive it, it can probably be found on the Internet.

What is a preacher of the gospel, or any Christian for that matter, to do? Should we give up the Internet totally and let Satan have it? I have pastor friends who have taken that road and unfortunately have given up a wealth of good, godly information. If a person is diligent and does a little research, the Christian and the Internet can get along very well together. However, without the proper tools it can be a terrible obstacle that is difficult to control.

Fortunately there are programs available that “filter” Internet sites to keep predetermined offensive materials out. Programs such as “Net Nanny,” “Cyber Patrol,” and “Surf Watch” use a web site that is updated weekly to determine which sites to deny access to. While this is effective in most cases, there are over 1000 new sites going up each week. This allows a six-day window that any of these new sites can be viewed. Other programs, such as “KidProof,” use a word list and restrict any site that contains any of the words in its database. This is a much more effective method, as it does not depend on a weekly update. This type of program also prevents any offensive language from showing during a search, such as on Alta Vista or Yahoo. It does not filter e-mail, however.

We buy these types of programs to protect our children from undesirable content on the Internet, but who protects us from that same undesirable content? This is where I am afraid many Christians get caught in

Continued on page 39
I remember my first home: a small red house with a combination open pantry, kitchen, and living room on the first floor and two tiny bedrooms upstairs. We lived on an island inhabited by only 180 people; our house was next to the general store, the gas pump, and the main wharf. When the Bay of Fundy tides were extra high, we sometimes wondered if our home situated so close to the water would survive.

From this foundation of shifting sand our family moved to a more solid foundation: a four-bedroom “mansion” just a short distance up the road beside what used to be a lighthouse’s house. This “prestigious” piece of real estate became our permanent home on that tiny island.

I am only now beginning to understand the hard work and sacrifice that my parents as a young couple must have made to raise us. Some memories are gone, but I can well imagine that my father—in spite of the challenges—must have greatly loved his young children. To see in his eyes such contentment when his grandchildren were on his lap, or when he was teasing them in some humorous way, was some indication of what it must have been like when we were young. The love of children is a heritage of God passed on in such ways. I admit, he could at times develop a look that would strike terror to the heart of any child, but at the same time, we knew that we were greatly loved.

That house was a wonderful project over the years, as most older houses are. It filled our lives with memories that range from laughter to scenes of near madness. I can see my father sitting on a chair or on the floor, dust every-where, shoveling old plaster out the upstairs windows. Every inch of the house needed renovation, and the work continued for years. Like the rebuilding of the walls of Jerusalem, it proceeded in bursts of energy and lulls of despair. What laughter we enjoyed as well, while running around the circumference of the downstairs to avoid Dad’s strong arms and teasing canes.

Dad was 29 years old when his illness came. September, always hard for him, was the month we moved to the house. That next September, polio threatened his life, and for a time took most of his health. I cannot remember well the day he was able to come home. That next September, polio threatened him again, and for a time took most of his health. I cannot remember well the day he was able to come home.

In one year my father, in the hospital in New Brunswick, had progressed from complete paralysis of his lower body to the ability to walk with the aid of braces and crutches. In time, from his efforts at home, God gave him the ability to walk without the crutches but always with braces and canes. God also, in His wisdom, gave him a strong will and the ability to work, first as a manager of the local fish-buying wharf, and then eventually at his former occupation as a fisherman plying the waters that surround that island. For 34 years he continued in the things that he understood and loved. For most of those years it was as if he had no disability at all.

There were exceptions. One day while painting the underside of the boat, he fell into the mud. He was so drenched with the mud that he had to take off all his outside clothes. He was then hosed down, helped onto the back of a pickup truck, and taken home, dressed in only his long underwear and walking braces. Knowing Dad, he probably enjoyed the laughter and the attention he got. Once in a while he accepted help, but most of the time when he fell, he refused assistance. He had been told by those who had helped him learn to walk that it was important that he learn how to get up by himself, and with God’s help he always did.

My father was subject to human emotional frailty and weaknesses as all of us are at times. His one great wish was to have lived and worked without his leg braces. He thought somehow he could have done so much more if he had his original strength, but I doubt he could have accomplished any more than he did. What he imparted to us through his life are blessings that some only dream about.

His life lived unselfishly for his family reminds me of a love and a sacrifice that was far deeper: God the Father in the Person of His Son, who knew no human weakness, became of His own choice weak that we might be strong. Calvary’s cross, where Jesus died for our sin, is a scene of weakness and suffering that speaks to our hearts and tells us of God’s love and our need. It tells us that the salvation that God planned is not through human strength; it is the wonder of a salvation that only God can provide and could have designed. My father’s life is to me a reminder of these eternal truths, and of the day I saw in the humility of Christ’s weakest hour my need of salvation.

To many in this world a “Christ crucified” is deliberately foreign to their idea of salvation. However, it is a truth that is consistent with the very nature of God. The Bible says that God “hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty” (1 Cor. 1:27).

I can see Dad now sitting in his chair reading his Bible in the early hours of the morning before he went to work. I can also see him climbing in the earlier days, hand over hand, up the ladder of the fishermen’s wharf, pulling his stiff lower body behind him. I can see him holding his canes in one hand and passing them to me as he opens the door and then struggles to settle back into the driver’s seat of his truck. I can even see him at times falling, and thank God, always getting back up, and I can say, “Thank you, Dad,” because you, like Christ, have given me more in your “weakness” than you ever could have given with your strength.

What’s on the Web Continued

Satan’s snare. It is all too easy as a man to be tempted to “sneak a peek” at some “adult” site. After all, who will ever know?

One of the things that make the Internet so dangerous for Christians is the anonymity. Someone who would never consider entering an adult bookstore or renting a pornographic video for fear of being seen can readily access in secret the vilest forms of filth online. The Bible tells us in John 3:19 that “men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil.”

All of the programs mentioned above use a single password administrator who can turn on or off the filter and make changes in settings. For this reason I suggest getting a friend or neighbor to enter the password for you. This way, no one in your home will have access to any undesirable web pages. Now not only are our children protected, but so are we.

The Internet can be a wonderful tool in the preacher’s toolbox, and with a little work it can be a clean and safe environment in which to work. You can find any of the programs mentioned above at your local software store.

Thank you, Marty, for those words of warning.

Another reader, J. Ray Bobo, pointed out a mistake in a URL in this column in the Jan./Feb. issue. I gave www.jeru.huji.ac.li/jeru as the URL for the Jerusalem Mosaic. The correct address is http://jeru.huji.ac.li/jeru.

Next month we’ll get back to discussing more exciting web sites for Christians. Thanks to all of you who have suggested web sites to be reviewed in future columns.
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