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New World, Old Lies
Echoes from 1918

In August of 1914 British author H. G. Wells penned a series of articles on the escalating war in Europe; these were later collected and published in a volume entitled *The War That Will End War*. The title of the book became a popular catchphrase to describe the great conflict from 1914 to 1918. Many in the West believed that the successful prosecution of the struggle by the Allies would not only end war but would also make the world safe for democracy.

History has proven the underlying fallacies of their optimism. The fact that we now refer to the event as World War I is a commentary on their naivety concerning the nature and enduring quality of human conflict. What was it that made otherwise brilliant leaders of the Western democracies so wrong in their evaluation of the future of their world? They based their conclusions on unbiblical philosophies concerning humanity. Yes, the end of the war brought a new world, but most political and religious leaders in 1918 were still embracing old lies.

From the beginning of time Satan has seduced man to live without God. His temptation of Eve in the Garden of Eden was essentially the proposition that she did not need God. At the beginning of the twentieth century the religious philosophies of Darwinism and German Higher Criticism were being wed with an optimistic globalization, producing a man-centered view of life and a society that ultimately left God out. It was a new world, but it was being built on ancient error.

In the face of Satan’s deception in 1918 a remnant of biblical Christians stood as a voice against the unbelief of their day. The roots of modern fundamentalism were nurtured in churches around the United States which would not imbibe the poisonous potion of humanism. They recognized that the answer to the need of man was a right relationship with God through Jesus Christ, a relationship which could not be experienced apart from the Bible’s being the literal authoritative Word of God. Thus they stood on the fundamentals.

This issue of *FrontLine* will present various key aspects of the political and religious world of 1918, exposing the old lies upon which their plans were being built. We anticipate that you will discover that many of the same battles are being waged in our day. Theological liberalism resurfaces in each generation. Globalism is the driving economic force in our modern world. Marxism, the philosophical root of Communism, was a key topic in our last presidential election. The seduction of fundamentalists and evangelicals by the errors of neo-orthodoxy is an ongoing reality. Nazism and its social implications are in the headlines. Israel is still the national apple of God’s eye, though anti-Semitism is a growing attitude among the nations.

We will conclude this issue with Dr. Moritz’s historic affirmation of fundamentalism as we celebrate one hundred years of men and women standing on the authority of the Word of God! May He find us faithful!

—Bud Steadman
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Matthew and Rachel Potter recently returned from a four-month survey trip through Gospel Fellowship Association to Papua New Guinea. They have moved to Ohio so that Matthew can complete an internship at a church plant while he finishes an MA in Biblical Studies and get flight experience for the possibility of flying in PNG. In a few years they hope to begin deputation to return to PNG for a ministry of discipling national pastors.

Pastor Steve Crozier was a vital part of the ministry of Hamilton Square Baptist Church from 2007 to 2017. As he struggled with the cancer that took him to heaven, Steve performed his duties with enthusiasm and excellence until the end. Though he was not formally trained in theology, he was known for his doctrinal soundness. Dr. Innes remembers him as one of the finest men he has worked with in his forty years of ministry.

Dr. Wallace Higgins graduated to glory on October 1, 2017. He will be missed for his passion for the gospel and church planting. He and his wife, Norma, were used of God to build His church in the western US. As founder of Northwest Baptist Missions, he shared his burden with passion and persuasion, resulting in other church planters’ coming West.

The article “What Were You Thinking?” by Dr. Andrew Hudson in your July/August 2012 issue was very insightful. It explained very clearly the sanctification process. Trying to conform to a list of rules or seeking to be transformed by emotional appeals is truly not the way to be sanctified. What we think affects how we feel. Then, how we feel usually affects how we act. This is why it is important to “know the truth” which can “set us free” (John 8:32). This is a great article for all Christians to encourage them to think properly in a world whose thoughts are so evil. Thank you.

Camille Roy
Québec, Canada

Editor’s Note: This and other copies of FrontLine (except for the current year’s copies) are available to the public online at https://fbfi.org/frontline/.
The end of the Great War (or World War I, as we know it today) brought about an era of cultural disillusionment because of the overwhelming destruction and loss of life. It also brought about a theological disillusionment with postmillennialism and the concept of “bringing in the kingdom.”

The word “postmillennialism” is a combination of “millennium” (which refers to the thousand-year reign of Christ referred to in Revelation 20) and “post,” which means “after.” Postmillennialism is the belief that Christianity will grow and overtake the world, eventually making it such a spiritual place that it will be worthy of Christ as its King. When that happens, Christ will come to rule the kingdom that the Church has already created. Negatively, World War I shattered the mistaken belief that the world would continue to become a better place. The positive result of this disillusionment, though, was the setting of the stage for the advancement of Biblical dispensationalism.

The Influence of Augustine

Honest historians agree that the early church was premillennial; that is, believers before Augustine expected the return of Christ before the promised millennium on earth. Premillennialism argues that instead of the world becoming good enough for Christ, Christ must come and establish His thousand-year kingdom. Augustine (354–430) changed that. He held that the age between the first and second advents of Christ is the millennium of which the Scriptures speak and that the second advent would occur at the end of the millennium. In so doing he laid the theological foundation for the Roman Catholic Church, which views itself as the Kingdom of God.

Augustine believed that in about AD 650 there would be a great outburst of evil, the revolt of Gog, and the coming of Christ in judgment. His followers later adjusted the date of the second coming to about AD 1000. The failure of Christ to arrive on time led to two changes in interpretation: some began to argue that the millennium did not start with Christ, while others argued that the millennium was not a thousand years in length. Both of these interpretations were incorporated into the postmillennialism that was so popular in the past few hundred years.

Christian Postmillennialism and Liberal Postmillennialism

Postmillennialism became the dominant theological belief among nineteenth- and twentieth-century American Protestants. It was an optimistic theology that predicted a “golden age,” a Christian kingdom formed primarily by human achievement before the Second Coming of Christ. The movement took two forms. The prophetic form was Christian and was championed by conservative theologians and pastors such as John Owen in the seventeenth century, Jonathan Edwards in the eighteenth century, and Presbyterian Charles Hodge and Baptist Augustus H. Strong in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Popular hymns promoted this belief. One well-known example is “The Battle Hymn of the Republic”:

Mine eyes have seen the glory of the coming of the Lord;  
He is trampling out the vintage where the grapes of wrath are stored;  
He hath loosed the fateful lightning of His terrible swift sword:  
His truth is marching on.
The liberal form was more humanistic and should be distinguished from the Christian form. The liberals saw the millennium as rooted not in the power of God but in the gospel of social betterment, naturalistic evolution, and the goodness of mankind. Some of these postmillennialists promoted reform movements such as abolitionism (the outlawing of alcohol, which resulted in the Eighteenth Amendment to the Constitution) and the Social Gospel (the belief that sin and salvation are human issues that can be corrected by humans). Darwin’s evolutionary ideas replaced supernaturalism. While Darwin himself was not an atheist, his theory “demonstrated” that God was no longer needed as an explanation for the existence of the world. The emphasis on nature resulted in the Bible becoming merely a record of one people’s religious evolution.

A key element of theological postmillennial teaching is that the forces of Satan will gradually be defeated by the expansion of the Kingdom of God (i.e., the Church) until the Second Coming of Christ. The decades before World War I were “clear evidence” of the truth of this. Technology was booming—people could travel across the country in days via the train rather than weeks via stagecoach; communication via telegraph and telephone became instantaneous; factories were creating new living conditions; cash was flowing; human ingenuity seemed limitless. Much of this continued after the Great War, but the War changed peoples’ perspectives. People could purchase things that had been reserved for the nobility in the past. The US had no income tax—people could keep the money they made. Immigrants coming to the United States could do more than find a job in a factory; they could become factory owners. Noble blood was no longer required for a person to make an impact on the world. Merit came from what one did, not from who one was or what family one was born into. Various titans of industry became amazingly wealthy, but the majority of them also became great benefactors to the common person. This became known as the “Gilded Age” of American history!

Theologically, the world was being Christianized. There were wars, to be sure, but they were often between Christian nations (England, Spain, Germany, Portugal, and the US) and pagans (China, Africa, the Middle East). In these various wars, the Christians won and began to convert the nationals to whatever version of Christendom the conquering nations held. Peace, prosperity, and hope abounded. It was easy to believe and preach that the promised Kingdom of Christ was just around the corner.

Then came the Great War. In that war, Christians fought Christians. It was Christian Germany against Christian France, England, and America. And the war was grisly. Chemical weapons were used indiscriminately; it is estimated that nearly 100,000 soldiers died just from gas warfare. Trench warfare was horrid. Both sides dug trenches and fought from those trenches. The trenches filled with water and mud. There were lice and rats. “Trench foot” caused swelling of the soldiers’ feet, often resulting in amputation. Lives were sacrificed for the potential of moving the trenches a few feet forward. About 10 million soldiers and nearly 7 million civilians died in the war.

More significantly for theology was the linkage between the source of the Great War (Germany) and the source of theological liberalism (Germany). Distrust of the Germans politically translated into distrust of the Germans theologically. Liberalism and its form of naturalistic or...
Wilson’s Globalism and the League of Nations
For God or Against Him?

In a speech before Congress on January 8, 1918, Thomas Woodrow Wilson, twenty-eighth president of the United States, presented his Fourteen Points, an idealistic call for a new international order founded on self-determination, unfettered international trade, the end of militarism, and a worldwide organization of states—to be known as the League of Nations. The foreign policy behind the Fourteen Points, popularly called “Wilsonianism,” desired to identify the main underlying causes of war in the entire world and to eliminate or minimize them. He desired that the global conflict being experienced would be the “war to end all wars.”

President Wilson was a complex man characterized by paradox. He was a Southern conservative who became the Democratic Party’s most effective advocate of advanced progressivism. His political view argued for a “living constitution” that “must be Darwinian in structure and in practice.” Government for him was “not a machine but a living thing. It is modified by its environment, necessitated by its task, shaped to its functions by the sheer pressure of life.” The Southern conservative laid the foundation for modern political liberalism.

Wilson’s Roots

Wilson grew up in Virginia during the Civil War and Reconstruction, an eyewitness to the humiliation, economic ruin, and shame that the loser of a war experiences. Likewise, he observed the hatred that grows from such, as well as the rampant corruption of the carpetbaggers. Many of his later efforts as president would be aimed at ending war as well as removing corruption from government.

His family’s roots were Scotch-Irish, immigrants from Presbyterian Northern Ireland. He came from a long line of Bible believers who embraced the reformation theology of John Knox. Thus politics and religion were wed inextricably in Woodrow Wilson’s heart and mind.

The religious perspective of Woodrow Wilson was greatly influenced by the theological compromise of his day. Charles Darwin’s Origin of Species, coupled with textual Higher Criticism coming from Germany, was leading most mainline denominations into error. Falling in line with his church, Wilson embraced the social Darwinist view that survival was for the fittest races. Somewhat as a logical result, he supported eugenics, a popular social movement and philosophy that argued that it is possible to improve the human race and society by encouraging reproduction by people or populations with “desirable” traits (termed “positive” eugenics).

Wilson considered the United States a Christian nation destined to lead the world; he viewed himself as a prophet and his theological postmillennialism as the way forward.
and discouraging reproduction by people with “undesirable” qualities (termed “negative” eugenics).3 He believed there were “progressive races,” such as Anglos and Aryans, who had superior and enlightened governments, and “stagnant nationalities”—Eastern and Southern Europeans—who needed authoritarian governments to control them.4

Blending his Reformation theology and social views, he became notoriously anti-Catholic5 as well as racist in his policies relating to segregation. Wilson despised post-Civil War Southern Reconstruction that promoted African-American participation in public life. “The white men of the South,” he wrote in A History of the American People, “were aroused by the mere instinct of self-preservation to rid themselves, by fair means or foul, of the intolerable burden of governments sustained by the votes of ignorant Negroes and conducted in the interest of adventurers.”6

Woodrow studied at Davidson College in North Carolina 1873–74 and at Princeton University from 1875 to 1879. He proved an exceptional student, primarily interested in debate and politics. In 1885 Wilson was appointed as a history instructor at Bryn Mawr College, an elite Quaker school for women near Philadelphia. In 1888 he moved to Wesleyan University, a Methodist college in Connecticut. His reputation as an outstanding leader in political science brought him a professorship of jurisprudence and political economy at Princeton University in 1890. For the next twelve years he taught at Princeton and became the president of the school in 1902.7

Wilson's Political Career

While at Princeton, Wilson became actively involved with the Democratic Party in New Jersey. Using his influence in a corrupt political environment, he became an advocate for reform and the elimination of graft. By 1912 he had emerged in the eyes of many as the cleanest, most religious, best known, and most dynamic leader in the Democratic Party.8 He was on a fast track to the presidency.

William Frank McCombs, a New York lawyer and a friend from college days, instigated Wilson’s run for the White House in 1912. Much of Wilson’s support came from the South, especially from young progressive professionals. William Howard Taft had defeated former President Theodore Roosevelt in a bitter contest for the Republican nomination, but Roosevelt walked out of the Republican convention and ran as a third-party candidate. Following his nomination by the Democratic Party, Wilson’s success in the electoral college was assured, despite receiving only 41.8% of the popular vote.

During his first term in office, war broke out in Europe. Wilson philosophically could not stay detached from the conflict, interjecting himself repeatedly as a proposed broker of peace. Seeing every effort fail, in 1917 he led the United States into the war, setting up a draft and training millions of soldiers, sending the American Expeditionary Forces to France under the command of General John J. Pershing. In such a context he delivered his “Fourteen Points” speech to Congress, considered by many to have been a major influence in ending the Great War.

Following the war and victory, Wilson played the central role at the Versailles Conference that would set the peace terms in 1919 and formally propose the establishment of the League of Nations. Having articulated at home the way for globalization and international unification, he failed nonetheless to obtain Senate approval for the Versailles Treaty because it required American entry into the League of Nations and a possible loss of control over autonomy relating to warfare. Stinging from this stateside disappointment, he was determined not to fall short in his negotiations with Europe.

The key western European leaders—David Lloyd George of the United Kingdom, Georges Clemenceau of France, and Vittorio Orlando of Italy—along with President Wilson, known collectively as the Big Four, would shape the map of postwar Europe. Wilson was primarily interested in globalization; the other three to varying degrees were concerned with revenge. In order to save his League of Nations, Wilson abandoned his Versailles rhetoric and surrendered his philosophical demands to the leaders of the victorious allies. By doing so, he facilitated the planting of the seeds of World War II when he agreed to the rearrangement of the boundaries of Eastern Europe without regard for the ethnic or religious origins of millions of people.

Wilson considered the United States a Christian nation destined to lead the world; he viewed himself as a prophet and his theological postmillennialism as the way forward. Wilson felt assured that he was following God’s guidance. His Fourteen Points and his Covenant of the League of Nations were, in his view, divinely inspired paths to achieving a new world order.9 By his words and actions President Wilson laid the foundation for a century of globalization, establishing a political universalism dominant in our world today.

Wilson’s Legacy

While Wilson, a daily Bible reader, believed that he was doing God’s work, the question must be asked: is the
After what seemed to be impressive political and cultural progress during the nineteenth century, European optimism was shattered by the unparalleled destructiveness of World War I. Although many younger survivors in the West described themselves as a "lost generation," adrift without hope or purpose, none of the forces unleashed by the war ultimately proved more terrible than the rise of Communism.

All totalitarian dictatorships demand the complete loyalty of their citizens to the state. At the 1944 trial of a Christian nobleman who allegedly plotted against Hitler, the Nazi prosecutor said, "Christianity and we National Socialists have one thing in common, and one thing only: we claim the whole man."

However, beyond the insistence on loyalty to its cause, Communism embraced a philosophy that made it inherently anti-religious.

**Marx and Lenin**

Karl Marx (1818–83), the father of Communism, argued that economic forces drive history. The past was nothing more than a relentless class struggle between the "have"s and "have-nots" that would climax in a revolution of the proletariat (working class) to establish a classless society, a utopia in which conflict would disappear because its source—private property—would vanish.

Marx died with his dreams of a proletariat revolution unrealized. But World War I allowed his followers the Bolsheviks—the Communist party in Russia—to put his ideas into practice. Battered by defeat, corruption, and famine, the government of the Russian tsar collapsed in 1917, and a new regime led by the fervent Communist Vladimir Lenin (1870–1924) took its place. Winston Churchill wrote of Lenin, "His purpose to save the world: his method to blow it up." When Lenin and his followers gained control of Russia, they instituted what was supposedly a classless society.

All Communists are materialists—that is, they believe in no reality except the physical. Only matter truly exists. Religion has no place in this worldview. Marx famously described religion as "the opium of the people," nothing more than a drug to dull the minds of the people to their suffering, leaving them too anesthetized to recognize their deliverance through Marxism. Even Martin Luther King described Communism as "cold atheism wrapped in the garments of materialism."

Yet Communism itself took on the trappings of religion. Historian Nicholas Riasanovsky noted the ideology's religious elements: Communism's "Messiah is the proletariat; its paradise is the classless society; its church is the party; and its Scriptures are the writings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and . . . Stalin." Because of Communism's atheistic core, Communists persecuted all religions as competitors. Communists attacked all religious believers: Jews, Muslims, and even members of the Russian Orthodox Church. Among the sufferers were Russian Baptists, Christians whose roots lay in a revival movement among Mennonites who had settled in western Russia during the reign of Catherine the Great (late 1700s). Influenced by evangelicals from Europe—notably the Plymouth Brethren and German Baptists who quietly evangelized as tentmakers in Russia—the movement came to the attention of the tsarist government when native Russians began to convert as well.

**Stalin and Khrushchev**

Although the tsars treated the Russian Baptists badly, the Communist regime treated them much worse. Dictator Joseph Stalin (1878–1953) ordered their arrest...
and imprisonment. Many were executed by the secret police. Following the death of Stalin, Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev (1894–1971) cultivated a reputation as a moderate for advocating “peaceful coexistence” of the Communist and free worlds. Nevertheless, he launched a new wave of persecution against Russian Baptists, although instead of arresting them as criminals the government committed them to mental hospitals.

Khrushchev also provoked a split among Russian Baptists by ordering them to limit evangelization and baptism of those under thirty years old. Some Baptists submitted to these restrictions and tried to cooperate with the government. They received limited approval and became known as the Registered Baptists. Those who refused to register and follow these restrictions were known as the Unregistered Baptists. The Registered Baptists were sentenced to imprisonment in the Soviet gulag (prison system) and even death.

As cruel as Communism was to Christians in the Soviet Union, its materialist ideology also became a massive international threat to Christians. Fascists, who emphasized nationalism, tended to practice religious repression largely within their own borders. (Hitler’s Nazism was unusual among Fascist ideologies in successfully expanding into other lands.) Communist ideology, however, committed its followers to aggressive expansion. Only when the whole world had become Communist would Marx’s revolutionary process in history climax with the establishment of a classless society. By definition, a Communist had to be international in outlook.

The Cold War and China

After World War II the expansion of Communism provoked the Cold War, a generation of hostility and competition between the Communist bloc and the free Western world. As Churchill put it, an iron curtain fell across Europe as Stalin occupied Eastern Europe and established satellite Communist states in those lands. The West tried to contrast its values with what Western leaders legitimately called “godless Communism.” For example, during the Cold War the United States officially adopted “In God We Trust” as the nation’s motto and added the words “under God” (from Lincoln’s Gettysburg Address) to the Pledge of Allegiance.

The danger of Communism’s expansionist mindset is apparent in other lands that Communists subjugated. China is perhaps the best example. Following the Communist takeover in 1949, the Chinese government expelled missionaries and imprisoned national Christian leaders. Even worse was the terror of the Cultural Revolution of the 1960s and 1970s. Determined to stamp out any deviation from Marxist ideology, Communist dictator Mao Zedong (1893–1976) sought to “revolutionize” the whole of Chinese society. Any institution, group, or individual labeled as counterrevolutionary endured severe persecution—businessmen, educators, even Communist government officials, and of course anyone professing religious beliefs.

Despite the fall of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War in 1991, the threat of Communism has not vanished. China has adopted many capitalistic reforms to enrich itself, but it remains an authoritarian state still hostile to religion, as the sufferings of the house church movement in China bear witness. Other countries also perpetuate the Communist system and its ideology. Probably the worst example is North Korea, a totalitarian state so committed to Communist ideology and suppression of dissent that Stalin and Mao would have looked on with admiration.

Nevertheless, despite a century of persecuting Christianity, Communism has failed to eradicate the gospel. The survival of Russian Baptists under the Soviets and the house church movement in China testifies to the triumph of the cross against the fiercest hostility of atheistic Communism.

Dr. Mark Sidwell serves as a professor in the Division of Social Science at Bob Jones University. He lives in Greenville, South Carolina, with his wife, Mary, and has written Free Indeed: Heroes of Black Christian History (2001) and Set Apart: The Nature and Importance of Biblical Separation (2016).

One hundred years ago in 1918, a brilliant European Protestant pastor published a commentary on Romans. That book and the author’s further writings and teachings would have a powerful and historical effect on Christian doctrine. The movement that developed from that pastor’s commentary has been called “dialectical theology,” a view of Scripture contrary to the historic fundamental understanding of God’s Word.

The liberal theology of the nineteenth century took the approach of being a blatant frontal attack on the Word of God:

- It portrayed God as Father of all, and hence the brotherhood of all became its emphasis.
- It diminished the reality of sin and the consequent need for a Redeemer.
- And it thereby neutered the power of the gospel.
Fundamentalism, as discussed more thoroughly in another article in this publication, came about historically in the early twentieth century in contradistinction to liberalism’s dismissal of the miraculous in the Bible—that is, to its inherent attack upon the validity of the Bible itself.2

Barth and Neo-Orthodoxy

In 1918 Karl Barth arrived on the scene of contemporary theology as a fresh visionary taking dramatic exception to the staid liberalism that dominated many churches. He appeared to take a new view of what fundamentalist believers had declared to be the teachings of the Scriptures since the original writing of the New Testament.

The early church fathers recognized the authority of the text of the Scriptures. For one thousand years of what Martin Luther called “the Devil’s millennium,” the Roman Catholic system had to a significant degree successfully kept the Scriptures out of the hands of the common man in Europe. Although Satan’s attack on the Word of God received a setback during the Reformation through the publication of the Bible in many languages, the enemy continued his assault upon the Scriptures through nineteenth-century theological liberalism. While Barth repudiated the unbelief of liberal doctrine, his progeny, dialectical theology (also called “neo-orthodoxy”), shares a brotherhood with liberalism, being in reality an attack on the Word of God.

What is “neo-orthodoxy”?

• Dialectical theology (neo-orthodoxy) believes that “truth” is a “dialectic,” that it is dualistic in nature—truth, according to this bizarre viewpoint, may be historically untrue but real in the hearts of its adherents to whom it is “true.”
• Dialectical theology holds to a critical view of the historical reality of Scripture. For instance, many neo-orthodox theologians believe that Moses was not a historical figure but that he was a composite of leaders in the distant Jewish past. In fact, many of them believe that the Jews themselves were consolidated as a people only about 700 BC, which means that King David could not be a real historic figure. Such a view destroys the prophetic truth that the Messiah must come from the lineage of David.
• The neo-orthodox theologian may not believe in the bodily resurrection of Jesus while at the same time speaking of resurrection life in Christ as if he did believe.

Thus dialectical theology is a belief system that uses traditional terminology without traditional meaning, a clever sleight of hand. Appearing as an angel of light, the new theology is in fact a method of “Christian speak,” with the sound of the old, but signifying something entirely different.

When Barth visited the United States in 1962, he was asked by the press what the essence of his theology was. His response: “Jesus loves me, this I know, for the Bible tells me so.” Who could argue with such? Many would say that only an extremist would criticize such pietism and commitment to the essence of Christianity. But as noted above, dialectical theology provides for a difference in word meanings.

Let me illustrate by personal example the subtlety of Barth’s new theology. In 1980 I made an appointment to have lunch with a neo-orthodox theologian at a local restaurant, hosted by a pastor of a somewhat “progressive” church. The pastor was a believer but wanted to love everyone and wanted everyone to love everyone else. He knew of my concern about neo-orthodox thought but said he could not understand what the difference was between my “conservative” view and that of a local seminary professor. The plan was for me to discuss theology with the professor as the pastor listened and “moderated” the differences. All went very calmly at first as I posed questions about such topics as the resurrection and the work of the cross in redemption of mankind. Each question the academic answered with adroit skill, giving answers that appeared to reflect my own belief—until I made an inquiry interposing the magic phrase of “propositional truth.”

My question was simple: “Are the statements of Scripture propositions with truth value? That is, is Scripture propositionally true?” His reaction unleashed a near venom of denial. Raising his voice significantly he replied, “No, Scripture is not, I repeat, not propositionally true.” I pressed the issue further, “So you hold it is not truth functional, but rather dialectical?” “Yes,” was his reply.

Our pastoral host was horrified at the sudden lurch into near fire-breathing exhortations, much louder than the subdued academic discussion during most of the meal. At the professor’s outburst, the pastor in shock said, “What are you two talking about?” “Truth,” I responded, “and how it applies to God’s Word.” The professor’s neo-orthodoxy suddenly came forth in a torrent. He said that I didn’t understand that “truth” was not as the fundamentalist world believed, declaring that truth is not a black-and-white phenomenon. Truth is, he asserted, paradoxical.

What amazed me was that he was angry at walking me along this road, a road that he apparently did not want to travel openly and honestly. He came to it, but only after being flushed out. How odd, I thought, that his view of truth had to be hidden from a common person like me.

Propositional Truth or Dialectical “Truth”?

Two key questions we must consider from this encounter: “What is propositional truth?” and “Why had my ques-
A proposition is a statement that carries a truth value to it. A proposition is either true or false. A syllogism is a good example of propositional statements:

- All men are mortal.
- Socrates was man.
- Hence, Socrates was mortal.

This is truth functional. There is no in-between, no grey, no paradox.

What about “historical” statements? Philosophers tend to miss discussions about the truth-validity of history. Take this one: “Caesar crossed the Rubicon.” If we know from history which Caesar we are talking about, the statement has a truth functional aspect to it. Yes, Julius Caesar did cross the Rubicon. The above proposition about Caesar is either true or false. He either did or did not cross the Rubicon.

Now, can such propositional statements be used in reference to the Bible? We who believe that the Word of God is literally true in the normal use of human language hold that such a question can be answered with a yes or a no, and that our answer is “yes”—that the Bible is itself full of such truth statement propositions.

But that is the kind of “logic” that neo-orthodox theologians abhor. Such logic might be applicable to Greek minds but not to the Hebraic minds who wrote our Bible, they contend. Truth, they would assert, is truth “for us” but may not be “truth” as an objective reality. Nor need it be, they would say. God’s truth transcends the so-called world reality and resides in each believer. The bottom line to such “paradoxical” thought is that one need not believe as fundamentalists believe. While historic liberalism was forthright in denying the Scriptures, neo-orthodoxy cloaks its unbelief in an inherent lie about the very nature of revelation itself.

Nearly one hundred years after Barth’s first work, dialectical theology is embedded in the world culture and is seducing and clinging to much of theologically conservative evangelicalism. Neo-orthodoxy holds to a cultural adoption and adaptation, admitting into its very core the mores and folkways of society. This movement adopts rock music in a “Christian” cloak; it commonly allows socially liberal views of alcohol consumption; its “progressive” views on premarital sex and human sexuality seek to make it “relevant” to today’s culture. In contradistinction to this cultural accommodation, fundamentalism holds to the scriptural admonition that the believer is indeed to be “in the world but not of the world.” Today’s megachurch phenomenon has often adopted a viewpoint that goes beyond Christian liberty and has become libertine. Most often the philosophical root of such unbelief is neo-orthodoxy.

Whereas the liberalism of the nineteenth century has been repudiated consistently by fundamentalists over the past century, neo-orthodoxy continues to seek to seduce fundamentalists by using biblical terminology to fill the old wineskins of liberalism with the new wine of apostasy. Both the old liberalism and the new orthodoxy have identical satanic roots. They attack each other, but it is a blood feud among brothers. Their “gospels” are equally pernicious. Yet there is a remnant—those who love the Word and preach and proclaim the truth in all its miraculous glory. God’s Truth, God’s Word, Eternal Truth . . . the same yesterday, today, and forever!

David L. Thomas is a former member of the South Carolina Senate, having represented District 8 from 1984 to 2012. He holds an MDiv from Southwestern Theological Seminary and a Juris Doctor degree from the University of South Carolina. He currently practices law in Greenville, South Carolina.

2 Adolph von Harnack (1851–1930), a German theologian and church historian who promoted the social gospel and wrote Church Dogma, was the most well-known advocate for liberal theology.
Theology’s Role in the Rise of Nazism

“Millions of ordinary people witnessed the crimes of the Holocaust. Across Europe, the Nazis found countless willing helpers who collaborated or were complicit in their crimes. What motives and pressures led so many to abandon their fellow human beings?” This quote from the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum’s website hints at the central point of this article—that theological/philosophical trends in Germany contributed to the rise of Nazism and ultimately to this unthinkable atrocity. Should we be alarmed that any current theological trends in American culture could similarly lead to the desensitizing toward and justifying of future atrocities?

The year 1918 is significant because Kaiser Wilhelm I of Germany abdicated the throne on November 9, giving rise to the Weimar Republic, under which the seeds of Nazism germinated for fourteen years while Hitler’s Nazi Party gained ever-increasing power. Hitler’s Enabling Act of 1933 dealt a final death blow to the Weimar Republic, completing his transformation of Germany into a one-party dictatorship under the autocratic rule of the Führer.

Without dismissing other contributing factors, such as the humiliations of the Treaty of Versailles, economic depression (including hyperinflation and unemployment), and civil unrest, it was primarily a transformed societal consciousness that opened Germany to autocracy and atrocity. Some contemporaries feared Germany’s direction, resisted the colossal shift in the public moral fiber and apprehended the dark abyss into which German society was accelerating. Key among these were Karl Barth (father of neo-orthodoxy), Heinrich Emil Brunner, and Dietrich Bonhoeffer.

Hitler and Liberalism

In one sense, Hitler rode the tide of a tsunami born out of theological liberalism, Darwinism, and German idealism. By the 1930s Germany had long been a hotbed for modernity. Hitler sought to cast Nazi ambitions as congruent with Christian values. In fact, he leaned heavily on this pseudo-Christian apologetic to argue for passage of the Enabling Act on March 23, 1933. Once theologians had redefined the very nature of biblical revelation through Higher Criticism, some even rejecting the Old Testament entirely, it was all too easy for Hitler to justify his onslaught of the Jews while touting a Nazi “Bible,” void of the Old Testament and other Jewish passages.

Theological liberalism in Germany was the religious expression of German idealism which sought to conform religious thought to the Enlightenment. Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768–1834) masterfully crafted this transition around a pantheistic philosophy that focused
on experience rather than God and His revelation.3 A string of German theologians, from Baur to Delitzsch, Wellhausen, Harnack, Eichhorn, and Bultmann, applied Higher Criticism to the Old Testament, denying the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch and otherwise positing a naturalistic interpretation of the Bible. Key examples include (1) Bultmann’s “Demythologizing” of the New Testament, which replaced supernatural explanations with Christian existentialism (reality rooted in experience), (2) the “God Is Dead” movement, and (3) the fatherhood of God/brotherhood of man emphasis. These theologians, not politicians nor generals, reshaped mainline Protestant theology and precipitated a cataclysmic shift in the moral consciousness of a nation. So efficient had been their evisceration of the faith, that religion was left with nothing to justify its existence but liturgical symbolism and philosophical theories.

Darwinism, based on the survival of the fittest, meshed nicely with the Nazi quest for a super race. Its integration on a philosophical level also further demonstrates our premise that theological liberalism facilitated the rise of Nazism. In his article “Theology from Schleiermacher to Barth and Bultmann,” Ramm convincingly argues, “This [evolution] was in keeping with their higher critical theories and reconstructions of biblical history.” He continues, “Liberal theologians used the theory of evolution not only for the explanation of biological phenomena but as part of their world view.”

Our point is that it was not Darwinism per se, but Modernism’s philosophical integration of it that ironically seemed to provide a moral basis for Hitler’s anti-Semitism.

Germany and Neo-Orthodoxy

From Modernism’s ashes arose new fire in the person of Karl Barth (1886–1968), arguably the most influential theologian of the twentieth century. Although he rejected propositional revelation through inspired and inerrant Scripture, he desperately sought to refocus German Christianity on the Person of Christ and an experiential faith born out of crisis.5 Although Barth’s neo-orthodoxy was merely a theological corpse in a tuxedo, he nonetheless decreed the corrupting contagion of dead liberalism in Germany.6 The new-evangelical Carl Henry is correct in his assessment that “by 1930 most German theologians conceded the death of rationalistic modernism, or classic liberalism, which Barth had deplored as heresy.”

Barth was the key architect of the Barmen Declaration of 1934, a response to Hitler’s subjugation of German Christianity through the German Christian Movement. It declared, “We reject the false doctrine, as though the State, over and beyond its special commission, should and could become the single and totalitarian order of human life, thus fulfilling the church’s vocation as well.”8 Failing to pledge unconditional allegiance to the Führer, Barth was stripped of his professorship at the University of Bonn in 1935 and fled Germany. Dietrich Bonhoeffer, aligned with Barth’s Confessing Church, was less fortunate, being imprisoned in 1943 and hanged in 1945. Neo-orthodoxy could not counter Hitler’s control or the unthinkable atrocity of the Holocaust.

America and God’s Word

Should we be alarmed that any current theological trends in American culture could similarly lead to the desensitizing toward and justifying of future atrocities? Cairns writes, “Even before World War II churches in such totalitarian countries as Germany were forced to keep silent concerning political issues and to concentrate on the spiritual message of Christianity.”9 Does this not sound eerily similar to the demands of the progressives who expect American churches to confine their influence within their own four walls? What a contrast to Christ’s declaration that His disciples are salt and light, and to the Founding Fathers’ conviction that an enduring republic must stand on a foundation of Christian principles. Previous generations understood that everything from personal faith to societal values, including ethics, morality, justice and freedom, is rooted in Scripture.

Like Germany under the Weimar Republic, twenty-first century America has lost its moral compass because she has rejected God’s Word. The indifference of American culture to abortion is perhaps the starkest evidence of the moral shift. The lack of distinction between the church and the world further illustrates the diminished influence of American religion. If contemporary Christianity is more about beautiful words than doctrinal fidelity, then its similarity to German neo-orthodoxy is all too apparent, as is its impotence to counter the culture.

Barth and others of the neo-orthodox camp demonstrated courage and conviction in opposing anti-Semitism, but we cannot commend their theology. Rather than bury the corpse of liberalism, contemporary theologies also continue disguising unbelief with many sweet-sounding words. This perfume continues to mask the corruption of liberalism to this very day, exposing our culture to the same risks that existed under the Weimar Republic. Perhaps no one states it as poignantly as Baxter when he writes, “My own reading convinces me that the leaders of the ‘Neo-Orthodoxy’ assume, generally speaking, the results of the
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When I was a child growing up in New York City, my friends and I learned an important disclaimer that attempted to assist in achieving fairness in most competitive endeavors—the all-important “Do-Over.” The purpose of the Do-Over was to rectify a situation where a replay of sorts was needed to allow for the proper, just, or fair result. For example, if I was up at bat in a stickball game with two strikes already against me and the pitcher threw the ball, and as I swung the bat a pigeon swooped across my field of vision, causing me to swing and miss the ball because I was distracted, I would claim a Do-Over; the strike would not be counted against me (assuming the other participants agreed), and I would prepare for another pitch. If it hadn’t been for the Do-Over, I would have struck out.

The efficacy of the Do-Over was by consensus of the players in the game, and most would be fair about it. Abuse of the Do-Over was rampant, however, and often sore losers or bad players would claim the Do-Over to try to gain an undeserved second chance or unfair advantage. When this happened, the result could be very contentious disagreements and, sometimes, physical altercations.

For me the fate of the implementation of the Balfour Declaration, and the continual opposition to it, and the principles that it stood for, by the Arab and observing world, has come to essentially be a never-ending call from the Arabs of “Do-Over!” They are never finishing their half of the inning and they are never willing to admit that they have lost. No matter what behavior they engage in, if they are unhappy with the result, they resort to the Do-Over, and the world says “OK.” At times there isn’t even a corresponding pigeon, and yet the disruptions still occur.

The Starting Point

In modern terms, the Balfour Declaration was a significant starting point for a century of conflict that will certainly continue into 2018. Even a brief summary of some of these events helps us understand the continuing call for a Do-Over in the Arab/Islamic world, but with stakes much higher than those in a stickball game.

Less than three months past the twentieth anniversary of the First Zionist Congress led by Theodore Herzl in Basel, Switzerland, and while World War I was still going on, the so-called Balfour Declaration was sent by Britain’s Foreign Secretary, Arthur Balfour, to one of the leaders of the Jewish community in Great Britain, Lord Walter Rothschild. The declaration was actually contained in a let-
ter dated November 2, 1917, and was intended to be an encouragement to the Jewish community of that region, as it was a declaration of Britain’s support for a national homeland for the Jewish people in what was then called Palestine. In the letter Secretary Balfour (who would later become Lord Balfour) asked Lord Rothschild to pass the letter on to the Zionist Federation (of Great Britain and Ireland). The text of the declaration follows:

His Majesty’s government view with favour the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country.

Shortly after the letter was sent, the British liberated Palestine from the Ottoman Turks, and a year later the war came to an end. The future homeland of the Jewish people, along with the land occupied by the broader Arab world, then became part of the spoils of war, and a determination had to be made regarding it.

These spoils of war were primarily dealt with at a series of meetings in 1919 often referred to as the Versailles Conference, which culminated with the conclusion that a national homeland for the Jewish people would be established in Palestine, very much in the spirit of the Balfour Declaration. Interestingly, the Arab world claimed an Arab state from Iraq to Yemen which specifically excluded Palestine! At that time the term “Palestine” referred to the land area that today encompasses what we know of as Israel as well as Jordan (though at that time it was called Transjordan). Actually, the determination made at the conference called for all of Palestine to be given to the Jewish people to establish their homeland. Further meetings and conferences were held to put steps in place to make this a reality and, at the same time, other countries in the region were put under the administrative control of some of the victors of the war. (For example, France had responsibility over Syria, and Britain had authority over Palestine as well as Iraq, etc.) The plan was ultimately to enable the various countries to gain independence by self-determination at an appropriate future point when certain criteria were met. Jews all over the world were encouraged to immigrate to the Jewish homeland. The Arab world, which we must remember were the losers in the war, cried Do-Over!

Arab uprisings and other forms of rebellion took place, and the British felt pressure to ease the situation, so in 1922 they divided Palestine, giving Transjordan to the Arabs while Palestine remained for the Jews. Unfortunately, that meant that in one swift move just a few short years after the Balfour Declaration was issued, the homeland for the Jews in the Middle East suddenly shrank to approximately twenty percent of what was intended at the end of the war. The Arab world cried, “Do-Over.” They were not satisfied with eighty percent of Palestine. They wanted it all.

Eventually the League of Nations dissolved as tensions continued to rise in the area through the 1920s and 1930s. The entire world, however, turned its attentions elsewhere with the advent of World War II. Interestingly, the Arab world sided with Germany during that war, so when it ended they were again on the losing side—but that did not deter them from continuing to demand the removal of Jews from the land. They could not be successful in their goal then because the outcry that followed the war when the atrocities of the Holocaust became known made it impossible for the Arab world to stop the continuation of the establishment of the Jewish homeland.

**United Nations Solution?**

When the war ended, efforts began again to make the removal of the Jews a reality. The newly formed United Nations put forth a solution: a partition plan dividing Palestine once again so that the Jewish people would have a recognized homeland but that the Arab world was given more land that had originally been intended for the Jewish people. Thus, even less than 20% of what was originally intended by the Versailles Conferences in the spirit of the Balfour Declaration for the Jewish people would be their homeland. The Jewish people, however, were just emerging from the horror of the Holocaust, so they were thrilled. The Arab world cried, “Do-Over!” They were not satisfied by what was now approximately ninety percent of what was intended to be the land for the Jews.

As the world argued over what to do about the situation, the patience of the Jewish people ran thin, and they declared their independence in May 1948. The Arab world reacted by immediately attacking the new nation from all sides. Miraculously, Israel prevailed, and one by one the nations surrounding Israel were forced to enter into cease-fire agreements with her; the borders of the country were established. At this point the borders were similar to the ones that had been proposed by the United Nations, but the Arab world was not happy about it.

The Arab world still had not accomplished their goal of eliminating Israel, so tensions continued and they sought more Do-Overs. Ultimately the situation reached another milestone in June of 1967 when the Six-Day War took place. Again, Israel was attacked from all sides and she prevailed against all odds. This time, however, Israel took control of the Sinai Peninsula from Egypt. This caused the Arab world to really want a Do-Over, and that anger built until the 1973 Yom Kippur War in which Israel was again attacked by all of the countries that surround her. As in all previous cases, Israel prevailed again, and the Arab/Islamic world cried Yet again...
a very loud Do-Over! This time, however, Egypt decided to try a diplomatic approach, which Jordan later followed, and both countries have become quiet neighbors of Israel. However, there is never a true quiet, as various skirmishes and uprisings by others in the region continue to show, and even Egypt has been unpredictable at times. So much more can be said to make the case, but it is clear that we are far from where the Balfour Declaration intended to take us.

From 1973 through 2017 there has been a constant flow of encounters in the region that are really amazing in light of what was intended a hundred years ago. Many attempts have been made to bring peace, but there can be no true peace until Messiah comes. The Bible is very clear on that.

**The Abrahamic Covenant**

The Bible is also very clear that through the Abrahamic Covenant the Nation of Israel was promised a specific land whose borders actually far exceed the land they are attempting to hold onto. Yet the world wants to take that land from her. Today, the Arab/Islamic world continues to seek the removal of Israel from the Land and the destruction of the Jewish people. The so-called Palestinians claim the West Bank as their homeland and have created an additional conflict on top of the general conflict described in this article. Arab and Islamic children throughout the region now refer to Palestine as the homeland of an Arab people group that became part of the discussion only in recent decades. They were certainly never discussed during the entire nineteen-year period when Jordan controlled the West Bank from 1949–1967! This complete turning upside-down of actual history would be humorous if it were not so tragic. The Arab/Islamic world will blatantly draw the Palestinian flag as the land area that we know of as the State of Israel and brazenly claim cities such as Tel Aviv and Haifa as part of the land properly due the Arab people. A generation has been raised calling for the death of Israelis for living in the land that is a mere fraction of what was intended for them in the Balfour Declaration, and the world stands idly by. The call of “Do-Over” is never-ending, yet the game should have been over a long time ago because the Arab/Islamic world has lost over and over again.

As 2018 begins we must recognize the demonic source of all this confusion. The same source that denies the land promise also denies other foundational truths of Scripture. Conflict will continue and the Balfour Declaration will sadly never be truly implemented. However, there is a day coming in which the entire world will finally recognize the truth, and the King will rule and reign from the heart of the land that is at the heart of the conflict. Let us pray for the peace of Jerusalem as we look forward to that day with joy as we celebrate each day the victory wrought at Calvary and for which will praise our Redeemer forever.

Dr. Craig Hartman is the founder and director of Shalom Ministries Inc., based in Brooklyn, New York. A frequent conference speaker and teacher, Dr. Hartman is part of the leadership at Bethel Baptist Fellowship of Sheepshead Bay, Brooklyn, and also serves on the Executive Board of FBFI.
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Good Reads for a New Year

With Christmas and the New Year just around the corner, I wanted to draw attention to some books that would make good presents under the tree. Whenever I attempt to write an article on book recommendations, I’m torn between featuring more titles and including lengthier annotations. I guess this time I’ve leaned toward the latter. I’ve written of only six titles, but they’re substantive; nothing lightweight here or of merely passing interest. Each of these books is a major contribution within its field and will be consulted by serious students for decades, I feel sure. Perhaps there’s one that will catch your attention and become, in some delightful way, a stimulus and aid to your ministry in the New Year.


This first title is one that a small pastors’ fellowship of which I’m a member read this summer. Donald Brake, former vice president of Multnomah Bible College and Seminary, has been for nearly forty years an avid collector of rare English Bibles and Greek New Testaments. He has succeeded in amassing one of the most complete private collections in America. Reading his *Visual History of the English Bible* is the next best thing to enjoying a guided tour through much of it, almost as if touring a centuries’-old hall of historical rooms. Lavishly illustrated with over 160 drawings and pictures (almost all in color) and printed on heavy paper stock with grey and ivory edgings, the book is a delight merely to thumb through. When you finally pull yourself away from staring at the beautiful pictures and begin to read, the text of sixteen chapters conducts you swiftly through the entire history of the making of our English Bible. Somehow without becoming wearisome, the author interweaves an amazing amount of useful information. Daniel B. Wallace (the NT Greek scholar) writes in his recommendation that he often found himself exclaiming, “I didn’t know that!” My experience was identical.

The chapters on pivotal characters such as Wycliffe, Luther, or Tyndale are deft condensations—knowledgeable, entertaining, and yielding serviceable illustrations for busy preachers. One of Brake’s most enlightening chapters is titled “The Bible in America.” For me, especially riveting were its stories of the “Gun Wad” Bible, publisher Isaiah Thomas’s unusual ad for his 1789 edition of a large family Bible, and the efforts of various Bible societies to provide every Civil War soldier with his own copy of the Scripture. Brake claims that his collection has copies of all of these Bibles printed during the Civil War. He includes pictures and poignant, handwritten inscriptions from several.

A uniquely delightful dimension to *A Visual History* is its inclusion of the stories (attractively framed and inset) of some of Brake’s collecting experiences. He shares his struggles to come up with cash, his wife’s sympathetic support, and some of his most euphoric moments in finally capturing a “prize” against all odds. He makes you want to become a Bible collector!


Daniel Dreisbach, son of former GFA missionaries John and Bettie Dreisbach, is a professor in the Department of Justice, Law, and Society at American University in Washington, DC. His PhD is from Oxford University, where he was a Rhodes Scholar in the 1980s. He is a widely recognized scholar in jurisprudence and is especially knowledgeable in the history of how religion
affected politics in the founding of America.

Written at a scholarly but accessible level, Dreisbach’s book is about the Bible’s influence on the founders’ political discourse and their experiment in republican self-government. He explains that being influenced by the Bible did not mean that an individual was favorable toward shaping policy by it, much less that he was even a Bible believer. But it meant, in Dreisbach’s perspective, that he was biblically informed and that his politics were to some degree affected by Scripture. He gives examples from the Founding Fathers’ journals, letters, conversations, and speeches, that answer questions such as, What importance did the founding generation attach to the Bible as a practical, sacred guide to the issues and challenges that confronted them? . . . How did they use the Bible in their political discourse? . . . Which biblical passages appealed most to this generation? and so on. His hope is that this interdisciplinary study of history, religion, biblical literature, law, and political thought will provide insights into the place and role of Christianity in general and the Bible in particular in the founding of the American republic and its public institutions.

Mark Noll writes that the book is a landmark investigative triumph. From the standpoint of a preacher, I don’t think you’ll find a source of more or more pertinent illustrations for sermons about the place of the Bible in our nation’s early history. For instance, contrasting Americans with their counterparts in England and France, Benjamin Franklin wrote to pastor Samuel Cooper about his intention to translate and print one of the Bible’s illustrations for sermons about the place of the Bible in their political discourse; what importance did the founding generation attach to the Bible as a practical, sacred guide to the issues and challenges that confronted them? . . . How did they use the Bible in their political discourse? . . . Which biblical passages appealed most to this generation? and so on. His hope is that this interdisciplinary study of history, religion, biblical literature, law, and political thought will provide insights into the place and role of Christianity in general and the Bible in particular in the founding of the American republic and its public institutions.

It was not necessary in New England where everybody reads the Bible, and is acquainted with Scripture Phrases, that you should note the Texts from which you took them; but I have observed in England as well as in France, that Verses and Expressions taken from the sacred Writings, and not known to be such, appear very strange and awkward to some Readers; and I shall therefore in my Edition take the liberty of marking the quoted Texts in the Margin.

Or again, Gouverneur Morris, a delegate from Pennsylvania to the Constitutional Convention, testified,

The reflection and experience of many years have led me to consider the holy writings, not only as the most authentic and instructive in themselves, but as the clue to all other history. They tell us what man is, and they, alone, tell us why he is what he is: a contradictory creature that, seeing and approving what is good, pursues and performs what is evil. All of private and of public life is there displayed. Effects are traced, with unerring accuracy, each to the real cause. . . . From the same pure Fountain of Wisdom we learn that vice destroys freedom; that arbitrary power is founded on public immorality.

Or again, John Jay, first Chief Justice of the US Supreme Court, gave as his opinion that the Bible is the best of all Books, for it is the word of God, and teaches us the way to be happy in this world and the next. Continue therefore to read it, and regulate your Life by its precepts.


Regardless of what one thinks of Calvin’s theological positions, this is a highly informative (and sometimes inspirational) book for those who are concerned about the present state of the American pastorate. What happens when ministers band together for mutual encouragement and especially for mutual accountability for high pastoral ideals? What challenges do they encounter without and within themselves? What are their successes? What are their failings? What are the possibilities for their impacting both churches and culture?

In the 1540s John Calvin organized the ministers of Geneva’s three city churches and those of a dozen country churches into a formal body called the “Company of Pastors.” Manetsch has painstakingly researched the unpublished registers of Geneva’s Consistory (church council/court) to uncover the history of this body over the course of nearly seventy-five years. His research documents meticulously (in seventy-six pages of footnotes) the Company’s pastoral philosophy, practices, challenges, successes, and failures. Encompassing the ministries of 135 men grouped into four identifiable periods, Calvin’s Company of Pastors is a unique window into what can happen when really earnest men band together under uncommonly strong and sanctified leadership.

Of necessity, I suppose, the book begins a little ponderously with detailed explanations of Geneva’s reformation and the Company’s structural organization. But by the third chapter, “The Pastoral Vocation,” interesting anecdotes begin to surface, beginning with the account of Pierre Des Préaux, censured by the Company for, among other things, habitually inviting himself over for free meals at his parishioner’s dinner tables. The chapters which follow, “Pastors and Their Households,” “Rhythms of Ministry,” “The Ministry of the Word,” “The Ministry of Moral Oversight,” “Pastors and Their Books,” and “The Ministry of Pastoral Care” are rich with facts and anecdotal windows into the pastoral office as it was practiced in the ongoing reform of Geneva’s churches and society.

One of Manetsch’s objectives is to show the consequences of this body of men’s embrace of the Reformation’s formal principle, sola Scriptura. His
research demonstrates that it gave gravitas to the office of preacher.

That earnestness goaded the Company into taking its pastoral office with a seriousness that it would be almost impossible to duplicate in a similar body of ministers today. Their expectations of themselves were prodigious.

On Thursdays at noon, they met in the Consistory for several hours to address disciplinary cases. On Friday mornings the ministers convened in the Auditoire for the weekly Congregation, a meeting of clergy and laypeople to discuss questions of biblical exegesis and theology. Immediately following the Congregation, Geneva’s ministers retired to their private chambers for the weekly session of the Company of Pastors to discuss the business of Christ’s church. . . . The ministers’ regular schedule was further crowded with weddings and baptisms . . . household visitations, spiritual counsel of parishioners, personal study and sermon preparation. In addition, many of Geneva’s city ministers were assigned ancillary duties related to religious education or pastoral care in the city: some served as military chaplains or professors at the Academy, others were appointed to visit the hospital and prison, or to administer the city’s “bourse” for poor students and immigrants. And on top of everything else, nearly one in six of Geneva’s ministers was a published author.

The various practices summarized in this paragraph are one by one fleshed out descriptively by Manetsch, sometimes in considerable detail and generally with interesting anecdotes.

One of the more instructive facts about the Company, at least to me, was its effort to resist change. Evidently, when Calvin lay dying, he summoned the city’s ministers to his bedside for goodbyes and some final suggestions. They included his exhortation to be on their guard against pressure to change: I beg you also to change nothing and to avoid innovation, not because I am ambitious to preserve my own work . . . but because all changes are dangerous and sometimes even harmful. The Company evidently took Calvin’s warning to heart. Even at a distance of some forty years after the great Reformer’s death in 1564, the Company rejected proposals from the people concerning things as benign as changing the time and location of certain of their gatherings. The magistrates complained that it was difficult for even the most devout laypeople to remain in one place for two-and-a-half hours without budding, especially during the bitter cold of winter. The Company responded that, Changes and novelties have always been dangerous. Once the door is opened to changes, it is not easy to close it. Certainly something to think about before deliberately dismantling our church’s traditional services and practices.


Alec Motyer (1924–2016), former principle of Trinity College, Bristol, and author of several outstanding Old Testament commentaries, closed out his writing career with this volume on the Psalms that is, in my experience, a really fine tool. It reminds me of Derek Kidner’s commentary on the same book—brief, pithy, unusually insightful.

Motyer’s notes are based upon his own translation of each psalm, to bring you as near as I can to the Hebrew of the original. Each psalm is headed by Motyer’s own title and divided according to his understanding of the structure. Often the titles are quite memorable. For instance,

Psalm 1: The Great Decision and Its Fruits
Psalm 8: The Power of the Powerless
Psalm 11: Not Flight but Faith
Psalm 31: At the End of One’s Tether, a Place called Prayer
Psalm 40: Needs Met, Needs Continuing
Psalm 85: Times Change; God Unchanged

Throughout the translation Motyer distributes numerals keyed to notes arranged in side columns to the right of the translation. It’s a nice, neat format, easy to follow, and allowing the reader to keep both text and commentary in view simultaneously. Frequently Motyer’s translation is so helpful that no further comment is needed to elucidate meaning. When he does add commentary, it is to the point and unencumbered. On for God be still, my soul (62:5), he writes, The verb [be still] includes both silence (from speech), and stillness (from motion), expressive of confident waiting “for God” to act. Explaining the similes of smoke and wax (Like the scattering of smoke you scatter them; like the melting wax in front of a fire, 68:2), he says simply, Two similes: “smoke,” what is insubstantial; “wax,” what is vulnerable.

Occasionally the author elongates his comments to deal with something of critical importance. For instance, on Psalm 109, which he calls the most outspoken and “violent” of the imprecatory psalms, he takes extended issue with commentators who believe that it contradicts the spirit of Christ and the gospel. This is an unthinking reaction, he begins. The paragraph which follows includes the mature reflection that this is the way divine justice works. David was realistic enough to ask explicitly for it, rather than, as we would have done, pray blandly, “Please, Lord, will you deal with this situation.”

Motyer combines the Psalms in small clusters that amount to seventy-three days of reading. At the conclusion of each day’s reading (whether one psalm or several), he inserts a page entitled “Pause for Thought,” in which he either provides more general analysis than that found in the notes or else draws applications.

For comparison’s sake, I just now counted the number of authors I have on the Psalms: over fifty. But there are four or five that I nearly always reach for...
first: Calvin, Kidner, Ross, and Spurgeon. Even though Motyer’s comments probably would be generally the briefest within that select circle, I’m certain that he’ll be joining it frequently.


I regret that I don’t know how to tell you where to buy this book. A quick check of Amazon shows a few third-party sellers, but all are offering the 2013 first edition rather than the improved second edition (2016). One is asking over $1000 for his copy. Hmm. Well, I can’t say that either edition is worth quite that much, at least to me, but they’re worth a lot!

It’s hard to know how to describe this book. I can at least explain that it’s just as it’s titled. The maps are satellite images, and there are over eighty of them that almost all fill the large (8 × 11¾) right-hand pages—while their corresponding left-hand pages consist of unusually useful historic, geographical, and archaeologi- cal comments by a conservative Bible believer.

Eugene Merrill, professor of OT at Dallas Theological Seminary, writes, This is a must have. Todd Bolen, author of the Pictorial Library of Bible Lands, says it deserves to be the Israel field guide for the next generation of students, young and old. Richard Rigsby, former director of Talbot School of Theology’s Bible Lands Program, testifies, I own sixteen separate Bible atlases, and I can say unequivocally Bill Schlegel’s Satellite Bible Atlas is the one I recommend.

I’m not an expert on Bible geography, but from my limited exposure, I agree. I think I paid something like $75 for my copy this past May. I wouldn’t take several times that if I couldn’t get another.


Respected Baptist historian Thomas Nettles’ contribution to the shelves of biographies on C. H. Spurgeon is a fifteen-year, magnificent double-columned portrait. Although not written in the tone of a hagiography, Nettles loves the man whose ministry he describes.

The distinctive features of this biography are two. First is the emphasis. Nettles’ main object is a presentation of the pastoral theology of the great preacher. To achieve this, the author has related Spurgeon’s life chronologically, but within that sequence has focused most of his eighteen chapters upon particular aspects of Spurgeon’s ministry, such as “Theological Content and Method,” “The Challenge of Church Life and the Governance of Worship,” “Use of Evangelists,” and “Literature about Right, Wrong, and Truth.” However, in featuring each emphasis, Nettles has endeavored to highlight the ways in which revealed truth governed Spurgeon’s philosophy of ministry and responses to the issues of his day, in keeping with what he preached just a year before his home going in 1892.

I would have every Christian wish to know all that he can know of revealed truth. Somebody whispers that the secret things belong not to us. You may be sure you will never know them if they are secret; but all that is revealed you ought to know, for these things belong to you and to your children. Take care you know what the Holy Ghost teaches. Do not give way to faint-hearted ignorance, lest you be great losers thereby.

The second distinctive feature is a unique addition to the body of Spurgeon literature: Nettles’ primary reliance upon the twenty bound volumes of Spurgeon’s magazine, The Sword and the Trowel. The magazine averaged some fifty pages every month from 1865 to 1892. Nettles explains his choice to feature this material.

It provides on ongoing commentary on the literature of the day, his views on the life of the church, reports on the multitudinous benevolences that he sponsored and supported directly as well as many others with which he had sympathy and sought to encourage others to support. Much of his personal life—joys, conflicts, and suffering—shows up in the notes included in a section noted as “personal.”

Nettles has also relied upon a collection of letters gathered by Spurgeon’s son, Charles, and has done substantial research into the preacher’s sermons.

I’m not yet finished with the book, but when I completed the chapter on the Downgrade Conflict, I rose up wishing that every pastor in fundament alism and evangelicalism would read it and apply it. It’s almost forty pages in length (double-columned, remember)—I would think that its lessons would settle a good bit of the ongoing debate over whether separation from ministries which refuse to be governed entirely by revealed truth is imperative.

I’ve written of only six titles, but they’re substantive; nothing lightweight here or of merely passing interest. Each of these books is a major contribution within its field and will be consulted by serious students for decades, I feel sure. Perhaps there’s one that will catch your attention and become, in some delightful way, a stimulus and aid to your ministry in the New Year.
Bring . . . the Books

Thomas Watson was born about 1620 and educated at Emmanuel College, Cambridge, which in that day produced many Puritan preachers. He preached sixteen years at St. Stephen’s, Wallbrook (London), and was ejected for nonconformity under the reign of Charles II (1662). In 1672 Watson became pastor of Crosby Square (London) and was assisted in ministry there by Stephen Charnock, who preached his famous series “The Existence and Attributes of God” there. Thomas Watson entered glory while praying July 28, 1686.

This collection of sermons was first published in 1692 after Watson’s death, though they were probably preached some twenty years earlier. The Banner of Truth edition is based on an 1890 revision made by Rev. George Rogers, principal of the Pastors’ College (founded by Spurgeon), for the students there. It includes a brief survey of Watson’s life by Spurgeon. This 1890 edition was reprinted by Banner of Truth in 1958 and further revised in 1965. This revised edition runs to 316 pages.

These are sermons on the doctrine taught in the Westminster Shorter Catechism (1649), Questions 1–38, with a great emphasis on Questions 4 (ten messages) and 36 (five messages).* Watson’s The Ten Commandments by Banner of Truth completes the sermon series. You may want to read at least this part of the catechism if you are unfamiliar with it, so that you can follow which questions Watson is addressing in which message. Watson’s task is similar today to a pastor preaching through a church’s Statement of Faith. Spurgeon states that among all of Thomas Watson’s works, “his Body of Divinity is, beyond all the rest, useful to the student and the minister.” Though Spurgeon does not, I will venture some reasons his assessment is true.

First, Watson was a master of Scripture knowledge. His constant quotes from a broad range of texts, including regular explanations of the original languages, makes these sermons more biblical than Presbyterian.

Second, Watson was also a master of pithy summations.

- Of God’s incomprehensibility: “Adore where you cannot fathom.”
- Of holiness: “Association begets assimilation.”
- “They have no cause to be proud that live upon the alms of God’s mercy.”
- “Prayer, as it comes from the saints, is but weak and languid; but when the arrow of a saint’s prayer is put into the bow of Christ’s intercession it pierces the throne of grace.”
- “Christ incarnate is nothing but love covered with flesh.”
- “God judges not of our duties by their length, but by the love from which they spring.”

Third, Watson displays vast learning. He quotes extensively from classic Greek, Latin, and Medieval authors. He draws illustrations from numerous fields of science, geography, the arts, etc. He was also conversant with the Church Fathers, frequently quoting Augustine and referring to a broad range of other authors such as Plutarch, Melanchthon, Origen, Pythagoras, Chrysostom, Luther, Jerome, Latimer, Tertullian, Aquinas, Beza, and Anselm.

Fourth, Watson is devotional and pastoral in his application of these biblical truths to the Christian’s daily life. One of the great gains of reading Watson is his warmth of heart. His constant reference to “uses” of these doctrinal truths evidences his pastor’s heart in preaching.

Fifth, Watson is not afraid to confront erroneous views common in his day such as those of the Quakers (97), Arminians (197), or Catholics (Papists, 197).

Perhaps a few cautions are in order also. (1) The catechism, and therefore the sermons, are grounded in Covenant Theology (see sections III, 1; IV, 1). But I suggest that reading carefully through these sections gives us a better understanding of the texts upon which this theological system is grounded. (2) The ancient language can be difficult. From things “bespangled” to things “besotted” or “bemiracled,” it can be difficult at times to understand. What, for example, is “contumacy”? (3) Watson uses now-outmoded practices as illustrations, which can be difficult to understand. For example, he refers to blood-letting (108), the court of chancery (118), “cordials,” and even unicorns (216)! (4) Watson frequently quotes Latin, though it is usually translated for the reader. (5) There is of necessity in this kind of sermonic collection some overlap and repetition, which is more noticeable when the messages are read successively.

In spite of these drawbacks, I recommend a careful reading of Watson’s work. His long section on Question 4 of the catechism (“What is God?”) is worth the price of the book. I would recommend that it be read a few pages at a time, so that one sermon is covered about each week. There is much wisdom of presentation, depth of theological understanding, and warmth of ministry here.

As stated above, the remaining questions of the catechism are addressed in sermonic form in a second Banner of Truth publication, Watson’s The Ten Commandments. Together, the sermons number 176.

Bud Talbert lives in Beaumont, Alberta, Canada. He is president of Foundation Bible College in Edmonton, Alberta, and pastor of Preaching and Teaching at Lighthouse Baptist Church.
The apostle John is the only biblical author to use the term “antichrist” (1 John 2:18, 22; 4:3; 2 John 7). Because of the wording of these expressions, some have questioned whether John believed and taught that a personal Antichrist would come one day. The statement in 2:18 sounds like he spoke of a personal antichrist: “Children, it is the last time: and as ye have heard that antichrist shall come, even now are there many antichrists; whereby we know that it is the last time.” As a careful study of 1 John shows, these many antichrists are the false teachers with whom John contends, who deny that Jesus has “come in the flesh” and that he is “the Christ.” In fact, the last statement is used along with “antichrist” in 2:22—“Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? He is antichrist.” That verse speaks of an individual or even individuals but does not focus on the future Antichrist. The same ambiguity is found in the use of “antichrist” in 4:3—“Every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come.” That verse speaks of a “spirit” of antichrist, not of antichrist himself, though of course these “spirits” were found working in persons who were false teachers. The final reference in 2 John 7 speaks of deceivers who have entered into the world who do not confess “that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. This is a deceiver and an antichrist.” Once again John has in view contemporary false teachers, not a future Antichrist.

So, did John really believe in the future coming of a personal “Antichrist” who would lead the final great opposition to God’s program on earth during “the last days”? The answer is a resounding “yes.” The situation seems to be that John introduced the term in 2:18 with a personal signification that was quite familiar with his readers, and then he proceeded to use the term in other ways so that he could warn the readers that the future Antichrist’s spirit and doctrine were already working in the world. A key factor is that John assumed that his readers already understood who and what the antichrist represented. Alfred Plummer in his commentary on 1 John gives three points supporting John’s personal reference. All three of these points strongly favor that John held to the view of a coming personal antichrist.

1. The origin of the doctrine is found in the Book of Daniel: 7:8, 19–27—“the little horn” of the fourth kingdom. The “little horn” in 8:9–14, 21–26 comes out of the third (Grecian) kingdom and is a precursor of the future “little horn” who comes from the fourth (Roman) kingdom. Most agree that the horn of Daniel 8 speaks of Antiochus Epiphanes who typifies the future antichrist; the “willful king” in 11:36–39 goes well beyond what was true of Antiochus Epiphanes, who was the subject of the teaching of chapter 11:21–35. Daniel speaks about “the abomination of desolation” and refers several times to the period of 3½ years, 42 months, or 1260 days as the time during which the wicked ruler exercises his power. Jesus referred to the Daniel passages in Matthew 24:15 (cf. Dan. 9:27; 12:11).

2. The teaching of the early church fathers consistently presents the Antichrist as an individual person. Plummer comments that “it is quite clear that the Church of the first three or four centuries almost universally regarded Antichrist as an individual” (pp. 158–59). Surely this belief was held by the apostles themselves—among whom of course is John—even though the apostolic writers were reticent in their written comments concerning the Antichrist.

3. Other NT teachings support the idea of a personal antichrist. In addition to the various references to the coming of “false prophets” and “false teachers” (e.g., Matt. 24:3, 24; 2 Tim. 3:1), there are two passages that provide a detailed description of the coming hostile world leader: Revelation 13 and 2 Thessalonians 2. John’s descriptions in Revelation 13 clearly show that John thinks of the same person presented by Daniel. Second Thessalonians 2 shows the identification of John’s Antichrist with Paul’s “man of sin/awllessness.” Antichrist means either one who opposes Christ or one who seeks to replace Christ (both ideas likely combine in one view). Note that Paul’s “man of sin . . . opposes and exalts himself above all that is called God or that is worshipped.” He even puts himself forward as God. Both 1 John and 2 Thessalonians 2 speak of previous instruction; both mention a preceding apostasy; both connect this apostasy with the Second Coming; both describe the person as one who is a liar and deceiver; both connect his activities with Satan; both mention that his spirit is already at work in the world. Surely Paul’s “man of sin” is an individual; it follows, then, that John’s must be personal also.

John does not use the article with “antichrist,” so the emphasis is on the character of the coming person known as Antichrist who appears during the Tribulation Period; John speaks of him in the Book of Revelation without using the title. Yet John does speak of a specific person. The present tense “is coming” is futuristic and implies that the process is underway that will culminate in his personal presence someday.
God’s Power Is Restrained

USS Constitution (aka “Old Ironsides”) was authorized in 1794 and launched in 1797. The fabled ship was named by President George Washington. Today it is moored in Charlestown Navy Yard, Charlestown, Massachusetts, and is the oldest commissioned navy ship in the world. Old Ironsides is a wooden-hulled, three-mast, heavy frigate designed to provide protection for American merchant ships. On board the Constitution are 32 long guns weighing 5600 pounds each. The long guns were designed to shot 24-pound cannon balls a distance of over 1200 yards. Gunners were trained to put wax plugs, which hung on the end of their neck scarfs, into their ears before lighting the fuses. Even with the ear protection, most of the sailors who fired the cannons on board Old Ironsides would forever lose their hearing. Not only were the sailors’ ears at risk as they manned the guns—their very lives were at risk. The recoil of the guns was so great that to be behind the gun when it leapt on the deck of the great ship meant almost certain death. Compounding the problem was the fact that the guns were on wheels so that they could be pulled back from their turrets in order to be reloaded. To protect the crew the great guns were tied to the deck with huge ropes. Every member of the crew had great respect for the long guns and even greater respect for the ropes that kept them secure.

Unrestrained power instills unimaginable fear. God’s power is so great that by the word of His command He set the stars in the heavens. God’s power is so real that with the dust of the ground He prepared a body for man. God’s power is so awesome that Christ gave a single command and silenced the raging sea. How great it is to know that God’s power is restrained by the cords of His grace and the ropes of His mercy. If it were not so, the power of God’s wrath against sin would leap from heaven and destroy every sinner. “It is of the Lord’s mercies that we are not consumed, because his compassions fail not. They are new every morning: great is thy faithfulness” (Lam. 3:22–23).

God’s Anger Is Real

On the 8th of July in 1741 Jonathan Edwards preached Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God to those who were gathered before him in Enfield, Connecticut. Opening his manuscript, he read the powerful words that he had prepared to convince his audience of the anger of a Holy God. While the congregation interrupted his message often, Edwards labored to bring forward the point that God’s anger is real. Here are just a few of his words:

The bow of God’s wrath is bent and the arrow is ready on the string and justice bends the bow at your heart and strains the bow and it is nothing but the mere pleasure of God, and that of an angry God, without any promise or obligation at all that keeps the arrow one moment from being drunk with your blood. . . . The God that holds you over the pit of hell, much as one holds a spider or some loathsome insect over the fire, is dreadfully provoked. . . . His wrath toward you burns like fire. He looks on you as worthy of nothing but to be cast into the fires. He is of purer eyes than to bear to have you in His sight.1

Romans 1:18 says, “The wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness.” In fact, “God is angry with the wicked every day” (Ps. 7:11). The only way to escape the wrath of God is to know the Son of God (see John 3:36).

God’s Judgment Is Sure

On the 31st of May in 1889, 20 million tons of water broke out of the South Fork Dam, which was holding back Lake Conemaugh, a recreational lake owned by rich and famous people such as Andrew Carnegie and Henry Clay Frick. A wall of water sixty feet tall and travelling over forty miles per hour was sent racing toward Johnstown, Pennsylvania.

The earthen dam holding back Lake Conemaugh had been completed in 1853. By 1889 it was in desperate need of repair. Days of rain inspired club officials to order hasty repairs, but it was too little too late. The swollen waters caused the dam to disintegrate. Seeing that disaster was imminent, club officials sent riders down into the valley to evacuate residents. But since flooding was such a common occurrence in the Johnstown area, most of the valley’s residents paid little heed to the dire warnings. The few who decided to respond to the warnings simply moved their belongings to the second floor of their homes as they had done in the past and settled down to wait for the storm to pass.

At 3:10 p.m. the South Fork Dam washed away. Helpless officials of the South Fork Fishing and Hunting Club watched as the wall of water went roaring down the valley toward Johnstown. The towns of South Fork, Mineral Point, Woodvale, and East Conemaugh were swept away by the raging tide as it gathered debris,
including rocks, trees, barns, houses, railroad cars, and animals and people, both dead and alive. When the water reached Johnstown at 4:07 p.m. it looked like a rolling hill of death nearly thirty feet high and a half a mile wide. The water quickly carried the northern half of the city away, tearing apart over 1500 buildings.

It took only ten minutes for the waters of Lake Conemaugh to move through Johnstown. When survivors combed through the carnage they found that 2209 people were drowned or crushed to death. There were a few survivors who were washed up with numerous dead bodies several miles down the valley. At the old Stone Bridge in Johnstown, debris that had piled up over forty feet high caught fire. Eighty flood survivors died in the awful conflagration. Families were torn apart, children perished, and unsuspecting victims were swept away. Many lawsuits were filed against the wealthy owners of the swank South Fork Fishing and Hunting Club for negligence, but none was successful. Historians are in complete agreement that the tragedy was compounded because the residents of Johnstown paid little attention to the warnings that they were given.1

God’s Word is filled with warnings of judgment. “The wicked shall not be unpunished” (Prov. 11:21). Eternal life and eternal damnation will be determined by how God’s warnings are heeded. No one dare be careless. Almost two thousand years ago Jesus said, “Behold I come quickly” (Rev. 22:12). Now is the only time we have to get ready!

God’s Wrath Is Propitiated

Around the world, people of varied religious backgrounds go to extreme measures to appease their gods. Jeremiah 32:35 says that the Jewish people actually offered their sons and daughters as sacrifices to Molech. By offering something of value to the god of their choice, propitiation (a peace offering which purchases favor) is sought.

While travelling in Southern India, I encountered a most terrible sight. From the windshield of our van I saw bright lights and heard loud music playing very late at night. As we approached the scene we found the street filled with people. My guide explained that we had come upon a Hindu Dervish (a religious celebration). Much to my horror, I looked into the air and saw a man impaled and hanging from a rod by hooks that had been pressed through the skin of his back. He was being spun in the air by his fellow worshippers in order to appease the Hindu gods.

While visiting Myanmar I saw Buddhist worshippers gathering at the famous Shwedagon Pagoda. They carried coins, fruit, breads, and carvings as propitiation offerings to their Buddhist gods. Thousands of pilgrims filled the courts of the temple. Each had something to bring. Everyone was seeking propitiation (a peace offering). Over five hundred years ago the Incas climbed to elevations of 15,000 feet to offer their children on the summits of the Andes Mountains. These Incan sacrifices were found in 1954 in the Chilean mountains. To date, over 115 sacred Inca burial sites have been excavated on over thirty mountain peaks. Frozen children bear testimony to the fear with which the Incas lived as they sought to bring offerings of propitiation to their gods.1

First John 4:10 says, “Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins.” God lovingly provided an offering of propitiation for the sins of the world when He sent His Son to die for our sins (1 John 2:1–2). Romans 3:23–26 reminds us, “For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; To declare, I say, at this time his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus.”

God Answers Prayer

Trinity Baptist Church of Concord, New Hampshire, set aside one Sunday each year as a “Sacrifice Sunday.” Year after year a “prayer goal” was set, and year after year the Lord showed Himself mighty by specifically answering the prayer. Each year the deacons would gather. Every deacon would write a prayer goal on a blank sheet of paper. The average would be calculated and announced to the church as a “prayer goal.” Then, a certain Sunday would be selected and announced as “Sacrifice Sunday.” The church family would be asked to pray specifically that the goal would be met and that they would do their part. The offering would be received, counted, and announced on the day designated. It was impossible for anyone to add to the offering once it was received. Here are the results of the offerings that were received:

- in 1989 we prayed for $30,000, and the offering received was $32,000;
- in 1990 the goal was $35,000, and the offering was $35,500;
- the goal of 1991 was $57,000, and the offering was $57,000;
- in 1992 we prayed for $70,000, and the Lord brought in $71,500.

In a period of ten years our collective prayer goals were $554,000, and the offerings received totaled $599,900! Our Lord told us to “ask and it shall be given”! 

---

1 http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1053&context=etas (pp. 17–18)
2 David McCullough, The Johnstown Flood (Simon and Shuster, 1987).
3 www.pbs.org/wgbh/nova/ancient/ice-mummies-inca.html

Dr. Chuck Phelps pastors Colonial Hills Baptist Church in Indianapolis, Indiana.
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From the time James M. Gray took up the editorship of the [Moody Bible] Institute's magazine in 1907 to the advent of World War I, he devoted much space in it to critiques of liberal religion and of social and political progressivism. —Joel A. Carpenter

About the only hopeful people we meet nowadays are the premillenarians. —James M. Gray

The New Testament offers precise and elaborate specifications of the events preceding the inevitable end of the world, and a fair reading of them must lead any rational man to conclude that those events are now upon us. —H. L. Mencken, May 1932

In 1917 several professors of the University of Chicago Divinity School launched an attack against the “premillenarians.” They accused the millenarian movement of disloyalty, for its leaders were preaching that the current conflict was not “the war to end all wars,” [and] that the kingdom of God would not come through moral progress. —Joel A. Carpenter

By eliminating fundamentalism from any sustained treatment in the narrative [of American history], American historians have betrayed a secular and progressivist bias that, as one critic pointed out, has led them to try to write Americans beyond their religious backwardness as quickly as possible.

—R. Laurence Moore/Joel A. Carpenter

Fundamentalism represents a resurgence of ancient practice, which began not with Martin Luther but at Pentecost. Fundamentalism is apostolic, and the doctrine of justification goes back to Paul. —William Ward Ayer

Religious fundamentalism is rooted in apostolic doctrine, Medieval-Reformation theology, and American revivalism. Since 1920 it represents an interaction against twentieth century liberalism and modernism, particularly against the teachings of science and . . . higher criticism in Biblical research. —Louis Gasper

Within the span of one generation, between the 1890s and the 1930s, the extraordinary influence of evangelicalism in the public sphere of American culture collapsed. . . . Many leaders of major Protestant denominations attempted to tone down the offenses to modern sensibilities of a Bible filled with miracles and a gospel that proclaimed salvation from eternal damnation only through Christ's atoning work on the cross.

—George M. Marsden

We have at times gotten so low down that we talked as though the highest compliment that could be paid Almighty God was that a few scientists believed in Him.

—Harry Emerson Fosdick

Compiled by Dr. David Atkinson, pastor of Dyer Baptist Church, Dyer, Indiana.
The four-volume set The Fundamentals—A Testimony to the Truth was first published in 1917. It was a series of essays by Bible-believing leaders that “set forth the fundamentals of the Christian faith.” The publication of these volumes was one of a series of events that resulted in the development of the fundamentalist movement. The setting for the publication of those volumes and the events that followed shortly thereafter go back to the development of theological liberalism years earlier.

From Astruc to the Higher Criticism
Jean Astruc (1684–1766) first developed the theory that “behind the Pentateuch are four source documents, called J (Yahwist), E (Elohist), D (Deuteronomist), and P (Priestly Code).” In his 1753 publication, “Astruc himself did not intend to deny Moses’ authorship of Genesis, but his work opened the modern era of critical Biblical inquiry.”

We can identify Friedrich Daniel Ernst Schleiermacher (1768–1834) as the “father of theological liberalism.” In his writings he denied the possibility of the supernatural. He also denied the inspiration of Scripture and argued that it must be interpreted as any other human document. Another major development was the publication of Charles Darwin’s book The Origin of Species in 1859. In the years following, the Higher Criticism developed in Germany with the writings of Karl Graf and Julius Wellhausen. It spread across Europe and to the United States. As a development of Astruc’s earlier work, the Higher Criticism embraced an evolutionary approach to history and denied the possibility of the supernatural. This system denied divine origins, the Creation account, and the historical accuracy of God’s Word.

Liberalism’s Distinctives
J. I. Packer lists the major distinctives of theological liberalism:

1. God’s character is one of pure benevolence—benevolence, that is, without standards. All men are His children, and sin separates no one from His love. The Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man are alike universal.

2. There is a divine spark in every man. All men, therefore, are good at heart and need nothing more than encouragement to allow their natural goodness to express itself.

3. Jesus Christ is man’s Savior only in the sense that He is man’s perfect teacher and example. We should regard Him simply as the first Christian, our elder brother in the worldwide family of God. He was not divine in any unique sense.

4. Just as Christ differs from other men only comparatively, not absolutely, so Christianity differs from other religions not generically but as the best and highest type of religion that has yet appeared.

5. The Bible is not a divine record of revelation but a human testament of religion, and Christian doctrine is not the God-given Word that must create and control Christian experience.

Those who believed the Bible boldly preached and defended it. They raised their protests against liberalism. In 1878 the Niagara Bible Conference published a Confession of Faith. It listed fourteen articles.

1. The verbal, plenary inspiration of the Scriptures in the original manuscripts
2. The Trinity
3. The creation of man, the fall into sin, and total depravity
4. The universal transmission of spiritual death from Adam
5. The necessity of the new birth
6. Redemption by the blood of Christ
7. Salvation by faith alone in Christ
8. The assurance of salvation
9. The centrality of Jesus Christ in the Scriptures
10. The constitution of the true church by genuine believers
11. The personality of the Holy Spirit
12. The believer’s call to a holy life
13. The immediate passing of the souls of believers to be with Christ at death

Foundations of Fundamentalism
Fred Moritz
14. The premillennial Second Coming of Christ 

Liberalism came to dominate Baptist schools in the north. The University of Chicago was controlled by liberals from its July 9, 1890, founding. The Northern Baptist Convention was under the control of liberals from its founding in 1907.

**Fundamentalism's Response**

In 1909 Lyman and Milton Stewart, brothers and co-founders of Union Oil Co., invested $300,000 to publish *The Fundamentals*, a series of articles written by leading theologians who wrote on the basic principles of the faith. Those articles were published in four volumes in 1917.

Liberalism invaded the denominations, and those who stood for Scripture fought against it. Presbyterians faced the onslaught of liberalism, and in 1910 the General Assembly of the Northern Presbyterian Church adopted the “five fundamentals” including (1) the inerrancy of Scripture, (2) the virgin birth of Christ, (3) the substitutionary atonement of Christ’s death, (4) His bodily resurrection, and (5) the authenticity of miracles.

“In 1920 the fundamentalists within the Northern Baptist Convention were so deeply concerned about the liberalism in that group . . . that they called for a meeting of fundamentalists before the next annual meeting of the convention. This meeting was held at the Delaware Avenue Baptist Church in Buffalo, New York.”

It appears that as a result of this meeting the word “fundamentalist” came into popular usage. Curtis Lee Laws served as editor of *The Watchman Examiner*. He reported on the Buffalo meeting in the July 1, 1920, edition of that publication, writing, “We suggest that those who still cling to the great fundamentals and who mean to do battle royal for the fundamentals shall be called ‘Fundamentalists.’” Historian David Beale states that Laws coined the term with his statement.

As a result of the Buffalo meeting, the National Federation of Fundamentalists of the Northern Baptists came into existence. “In 1946 it changed its name to the Conservative Baptist Fellowship. After 1967 it took the name Fundamental Baptist Fellowship International, and in recent years added the word ‘international’ to its title.” In 2017 FBFI voted to change its name to “Foundations Baptist Fellowship International.”

**Conclusion**

The publication of *The Fundamentals* was a major development in the struggle for the truth and against the errors of liberalism. Bible believers had published the Niagara Confession in 1878. The Stewart brothers conceived of the publication of *The Fundamentals* as early as 1909, and their project came to fruition in 1917. Those volumes are still in print and timeless in their application. Bible-believing Baptists took the name to themselves in 1920 at the first meeting of what is now the Foundations Baptist Fellowship International. Curtis Lee Laws coined the term for broader usage that same year.

We thank God for courageous leaders of the past who stood for the fundamental doctrines of the Word of God.
“FOURTH TERROR ATTACK OF DAY; ASSAILANT STABS IDF SOLDIER IN AFULA.” The Jerusalem Post headlines on October 8, 2015, almost caused me to have a “terror attack.” In just another week our daughters Catherine and Jenny were scheduled to volunteer on an Israeli moshav (farm co-op), only half an hour away from Afula in Kfar Kish. Suddenly, from the excitement of planning this trip, our daughters now had a difficult choice to make—to go or not to go to Israel.

Back in 2008 our family had fallen in love with Israel on our first tour with Shalom Ministries Inc. Since then, Catherine and Jenny have been to Israel multiple times. In 2015, however, rather than going on an organized tour, they wanted to experience the culture and spend time with the Israeli people to have opportunities to witness. The plan was to harvest olives as volunteers for an Israeli family whom they had never met, with the condition that they find their own transportation and provide their own food while in the country.

Earlier in 2015, Jenny had become good friends with an Israeli lady and her children who had moved to Greenville for three years with the husband’s Israeli company. The family had since gone back to Israel and were on the list of people to visit while in the country. Not just to visit, however; the purpose of this trip was to continue helping these dear friends understand that Jesus is their Messiah.

Much planning, effort, and money had gone into preparing for this trip, and now this string of terrorist attacks made us all wonder whether they should proceed. How many times through the years had we heard Pastor Vaughn preach, “Don’t undo in the darkness what you’ve done in the light.” As a family, we had truly believed it was God’s will for them to take this trip. Now when things were a little scary, we needed to trust God. After much prayer and counsel, we saw them off with just a little concern for their wellbeing. (In reality there are probably as many murders in the Upstate of South Carolina as you hear from news reports in Israel.)

Unplanned Opportunities

The first night in Israel their host took Catherine and Jenny to the local market to buy food for the week. It was a hurried trip, as it was closing time for the shops. They grabbed fresh produce and pasta quickly and hurried back to the third-floor apartment of the home that they were to stay in for the week. The next morning they woke up to frozen eggs, frozen salad, frozen everything. The refrigerator wasn’t working properly, and most of their food was ruined. As a result, their host couple invited them to join them for their next meal and ended up having them eat all their meals with them, giving them wonderful opportunities to discuss why they were in Israel and why they loved the Jewish people so much. They became fast friends through what initially seemed like a disaster.
Understandably, my husband Roger and I were a little on edge those two weeks while Catherine and Jenny were gone. We communicated with them somewhat, but the time difference and their heavy work schedule limited that. We had to trust God. The week before they left I had taken a Facebook challenge to memorize Isaiah 12 over several weeks—just a challenge someone had put “out there” on social media. However, it was just what I needed. My memory cards went with me everywhere. When my mind wanted to worry about my girls, I would grab my verses and diligently work on memorizing God’s Word.

**Ordained Opportunities**

Back in Israel, Catherine and Jenny worked very hard harvesting olives by hand. Because of drought, the olives weren’t producing enough oil, and Catherine and Jenny had to quit harvesting olives and transition to being landscaping laborers in their host’s primary business. It was hard manual labor, but as a result they were invited into homes for coffee and answered lots of questions about why two American girls were working so hard. They fed their frozen carrots to a Jewish neighbor’s horse. The neighbor in turn shared his sweet potatoes with them after hearing that South Carolina had lost much of its sweet potato crop to major flooding. He wanted to make that connection with them. Catherine and Jenny certainly got a good dose of everyday living in that small Israeli community, while God gave them many opportunities to share their faith with the people of Kfar Kish.

Over the weekend, their Jewish friend and her children who had lived in Greenville and other of her Israeli friends came from Haifa to visit, meeting them at nearby Mount Tabor to go hiking for the day. One of the ladies assumed that since Catherine and Jenny were Christians that they must also be Catholic. An ancient mikveh (ritual bath) at the Church of the Transfiguration on Mount Tabor presented a wonderful opportunity for Catherine to explain the difference between being a Catholic and being a Christian by simply sharing her testimony and what baptism meant to her. When the friend heard that Catherine was a Baptist, she exclaimed, “I love the Baptists. They saved my grandfather during the Holocaust.” It was a powerful reminder to Catherine that seventy years earlier, God had ordained this very moment when she would be able to give an unsaved Israeli a clear presentation of the gospel even from those horrible circumstances in the Holocaust.

No one can orchestrate circumstances like God does. He is always up to something good in our lives. We don’t need to fear the reports of terror or our uncertainties, but we do need to follow God’s leading, knowing that He has a plan and that His plan is good. Currently Catherine and Jenny are about to leave for their third volunteer trip. Rather than that “terror attack” I experienced the first time they left, this time my mother’s heart can’t wait to see what God will do in and through them.

Malinda Duvall serves as Office Manager for FBFI as well as Managing Editor for FrontLine magazine.
Our recent New York City FBFI Regional Fellowship was held on September 12. It was hosted by Heritage Baptist Church pastored by Matt Recker, but we met at Grace Baptist Church in Franklin Square, pastored by Kent Sager.

Chaplain Joe Willis, CH (COL) USAR RET, FBFI Endorser, was our guest speaker. He challenged us from Ezekiel 22:30 to stand in the gap, and he applied this passage to the chaplaincy and the need for godly chaplains to stand in the gap for God’s glory. It was a great blessing to see how God has raised up many chaplains in the FBFI to stand in the gap in all the branches of our military as well as in local hospitals and police and fire departments.

Chaplain Willis also spoke on “Mentoring Men for Ministry” and encouraged us to (1) be the examples in our homes; (2) ask our children, “Who has your heart?”; and (3) encourage our children to consider the ministry.

A helpful panel discussion with Chaplain Willis and Pastor Jim Bickel, moderated by Matt Recker, challenged us to guide young people to consider the ministry without pushing them. Pastor Bickel seeks to be a “God-Chaser” in his home and encourages his children to pursue God as well.

The varied backgrounds and ministries of the attendees highlighted the work God is doing in New York City: these included new pastors stepping into established works, a brother preparing to launch out and plant a new church in the Bronx, new youth pastors just entering our urban world, deacons, and other faithful men and women serving God all across our city.

Special thanks to the food ministry team of Heritage Baptist Church led by Deacon Ashook Ramroop, who coordinated a delicious luncheon. Faithful servants from Heritage helped to serve the breakfast, and the lunch that was enjoyed by all.

Men came from New Jersey and New York State—including all the boroughs of New York City and Long Island—for this fellowship.

As keynote speaker, Pastor Dan Unruh from Westside Baptist Church in Greeley, Colorado, did a great job of encouraging pastors. Members of Charity Baptist Church were gracious hosts, providing snacks and a sumptuous meal on Tuesday.

Our one-day spring meeting will be April 13 at Manzano Baptist Church. The host pastor will be Mark Zahn. We will meet at 11 and conclude at 3. A lunch will be provided.

Caribbean Update

As we all know, Hurricane Maria devastated the islands of Dominica and Puerto Rico in September of this year. As these photographs attest, the storm’s devastation did not bypass Pastor Johnny Daniels’s church and school ministries. His Bible college was destroyed, and his church and primary/secondary school buildings suffered heavy damage. As a result, his annual October preaching conference, at which many FBFI pastors have spoken, was necessarily canceled this year. Please, as you remember Puerto Rico in prayer, also remember Pastor Daniels and his people.
Theology's Role in the Rise of Nazism
Continued from page 16

more radical ‘Higher Criticism.’ The Higher Critics argued. The Neo-Orthodox assume. The former attacked the historical facts of the Christian faith; the latter now by-pass them as not vitally necessary to Christian faith. There is brilliantly presented new emphasis, but the inner attitude of mind toward the Bible and the historical facts of Christianity and the miraculous is practically the same as that of the older Modernism.”

Neo-orthodoxy was too little, too late to reshape the German conscience, nor was it the genuine article. The great need both then and now is for a fresh assertion of God’s authoritative Word, which is “quick” (alive) and “sharper than any twoedged sword” (Heb. 4:12). Its gospel is the power unto salvation “to the Jew first, and also to the Greek” (non-Jew) (Rom. 1:16). As dispensationalists, we understand that we shall never “usher in the kingdom,” but neither are we to hide our light under a bushel or deny by our inaction the transforming power of God’s Word.

After seventeen years as a missionary in South Africa, Dr. Kevin Brosnan assumed his current ministry as a field administrator with Baptist World Mission in 2009. He and his wife, Tamara, have four adult children. Kevin holds BA, MA, and MDiv degrees from Maranatha Baptist University and a DMin from Bob Jones University.

5 Also known as Dialectical Theology, the Barthian “crisis” refers to the bridge of faith between an irreconcilable thesis and antithesis, i.e., judgment and grace. Thus, Barth’s concept of theological truth was existential rather than propositional.
6 Charles Ryrie provides an important insight when he writes, “Barthians generally align themselves with the liberal school of biblical criticism. Yet they often preach like evangelicals. This makes Barthianism more dangerous than blatant liberalism” (Charles Ryrie, Basic Theology [Chicago: Moody Publishers, 1999], 75).
9 Earle Cairns, Christianity through the Centuries (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 433.
Beyond Separation
The “Accursed” Principles—Part 2

“Let him be accursed.” This instruction in Galatians 1:6–9 gives a mandate that goes beyond separation and requires a posture of total agreement with God toward those who deliberately attempt to alter the gospel, regarding them as “accursed”—devoted by God Himself to His own divine judgment.

I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel: Which is not another; but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ. But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed [present imperative]. As we said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed [present imperative]. Galatians 1:6–9

It seems to so easily escape us that God is God, and He alone is God. God is God, and He alone has the prerogative of setting the bounds of right and wrong, truth and error. If we are to love and serve Him, we must be totally committed to Him and His Word. And we must do more than merely accept the parameters of ministry laid out in His Word. We must fully embrace them!

In reality, there are many who deliberately set themselves against God, His Word, and His gospel. This is a theme carried throughout the Scriptures. We find several occasions in the Old Testament that give clear illustrations of what it means to “let him be accursed.” The root meaning of “accursed” in both Old and New Testaments is “devoted.” And in our present context, “let him be accursed” means let him be being devoted completely to divine judgment. Following are two Old Testament examples of this concept.

The first is God’s commandment to Moses. The inhabitants of the Promised Land were to be regarded as having been devoted to God’s personal divine judgment. Note the graphic instructions in the following text from Deuteronomy 7. (I have added personal explanation in brackets.) In this text the Hebrew word charam is translated in verse 2 as “utterly destroy”.

When the Lord thy God shall bring thee into the land whither thou goest to possess it, and hath cast out many nations before thee, . . . seven nations greater and mightier than thou; And when the Lord thy God shall deliver [give] them before thee; thou shalt smite them, and utterly destroy [destroying you shall utterly destroy] them; thou shalt make no covenant [treaty, alliance, pledge, agreement] with them, nor shew mercy unto them: . . . But thus shall ye deal with them; ye shall destroy their altars, and break down their images [pillars, obelisks], and cut down their groves [carved wooden images], and burn their graven images [idols] with fire. For thou art an holy people unto the Lord thy God: the Lord thy God hath chosen thee to be a special people unto himself, above all people that are upon the face of the earth. Deuteronomy 7:1–2, 5–6

The second involved the conquest of Jericho under Joshua’s leadership. The sin of Achan imposed dramatic consequences on the whole nation. At issue was Achan’s direct act of disobedience in failing to regard the city and its inhabitants as “devoted completely to God’s divine purposes.” He chose to “do his own thing” instead. The text speaks for itself!

And the city shall be accursed [charam], even it, and all that are therein, to the Lord: only Rahab the harlot shall live, she and all that are with her in the house, because she hid the messengers that we sent. And ye, in any wise keep yourselves from the accursed thing [charam], lest ye make yourselves accursed [charam], when ye take of the accursed thing [charam], and make the camp of Israel a curse [charam], and trouble it. But all the silver, and gold, and vessels of brass and iron, are consecrated [charam] unto the Lord: they shall come into the treasury of the Lord. So the people shouted when the priests blew with the trumpets: and it came to pass, when the people heard the sound of the trumpet, and the people shouted with a great shout, that the wall fell down flat, so that the people went up into the city, every man straight before him, and they took the city. And they utterly destroyed [charam] all that was in the city, both man and woman, young and old, and ox, and sheep, and ass, with the edge of the sword. . . . And they burnt the city with fire, and all that was therein: only the silver, and the gold, and the vessels of brass and of iron, they put into the treasury of the house of the Lord [devoted to divine service, not destruction]. . . . But the children of Israel committed a trespass in the accursed [charam] thing: for Achan, the son of Carmi, the son of Zabdi, the son of Zerah, of the tribe of Judah, took of the accursed [charam] thing: and the anger of the Lord was kindled against the children of Israel. Joshua 6:17–21, 24; 7:1

So, whether you are looking at the Old or New Testament, the one who serves the Lord must be both sensitive and obedient to the pleasures, plans, and purposes of God—totally!

* These examples are included to demonstrate the idea of being accursed in the Old Testament setting. As Baptists in the New Testament dispensation we believe in the separation of church and state and therefore believe that no religious institution should have the power of life and death over anyone. But recognizing false teachers as accursed and placing ourselves under the direct supernatural judgment of God is still a New Testament concept.

Dr. David C. Innes has served the congregation of Hamilton Square Baptist Church in San Francisco, California, as senior pastor since January 1977.
Lexiles, Seuss, and the Bible

Last year my eldest son received a “Lexile” reading level score from his school. The Lexile system has been extremely successful, in large part because the people behind it had the brilliant idea of putting up a nice website that grades countless books for reading difficulty and therefore helps parents and teachers find suitable reading material for the children in their care.

But there’s a small problem, and it’s right at the top of the Wikipedia article on Lexile: “The Lexile framework uses quantitative methods, based on individual words and sentence lengths, rather than qualitative analysis of content to produce scores. Accordingly, the scores for texts do not reflect factors such as multiple levels of meaning or maturity of themes.”

Yes, folks—books in the Lexile system are graded by a machine that cannot read. Lexile scores are generated by a computer, and no matter what it’s doing, it’s not reading. Computers could read all the books in the world, but they’d score zero on comprehension every time. Only humans can do that.

It’s almost meaningless to assign a “reading level” to a book as simple as *Horton Hears a Who*. When I read that book to my kids, I have more fun than they do—because I have an adult sense of the multiple levels of meaning. I know through much vaster linguistic experience than they have that the rhyming of *chirp* and *twerp* and of *working* and *shirking* is world-class brilliant. Seuss’s neologisms—words he invented—are also pitch perfect (“He shouted out ‘Yop!’”). They get him out of rhyming jams without feeling like *dei ex machina* (i.e., cheating). I’ve noticed these things in part because as a dad I’ve been subjected to horrific knockoffs that crudely aped the Seuss style and fell utterly flat. Everything I’ve just described is “reading,” and yet kids and computers miss it.

A lot of very smart people put Lexile together, and I do not doubt that it is useful for what it was designed to be: a rough-and-ready measure for adults who don’t have time to make their own judgment about a given book.

Now here’s my hidden point in all this: in the all-important matter of teaching our children to read the Bible, we can’t trust to reading-level analyses. We’ve got to make evaluations for ourselves as to whether a given portion of Scripture is difficult for them and in what ways. That means personal investment, not just outsourcing. We should be very sensitive to the limitations of children, and suffer them to come to Jesus (“‘Dad, what’s ‘suffer’ mean?’”) by coming along with them (Deut. 6:7).

Dr. Mark L. Ward Jr. is the author of Authorized: The Use and Misuse of the King James Bible.
Editor’s Note: This column has been featuring a highly condensed version of T. D. Bernard’s The Progress of Doctrine in the New Testament. The goal is to acquaint the reader with Bernard’s insight into the NT “at a glance” and to whet the appetite for a fuller reading of Bernard’s classic 1864 Bampton Lectures. This final installment presents Bernard’s last lecture, on the book of Revelation.

The Apocalypse

It had been the promise of the Lord to his disciples that the Holy Ghost, whom he would send to them from the Father, should not only lead them into all the truth, but also show them things to come: and we find the promise fulfilled in both its parts. As the Epistles respond to the assurance, “He shall lead you into all the truth,” so does the word, “He shall show you things to come,” find its distinct fulfillment in the Apocalypse.

This book bears the same relation to the last discourse in Matthew, which the Epistles bear to the last discourse in John. Sitting on the Mount of Olives with Jerusalem spread before him, and questioned as to the sign of his coming and of the winding up of the age, he gave the outlines of a prophetic history, which contained the substance, bore the character, and must rule the interpretation, of the later and larger revelation.

“The revelation of Jesus Christ which God gave unto him, to show unto his servants the things which must come to pass,” is a repetition of that assurance on which all the Gospel rests, “I have given unto them the words which thou gavest me.”

The Apocalypse Affirms the Conquest of the NT Kingdom

The former Scriptures have revealed the Lord Jesus Christ as the Savior, not only of individual souls, but also of “the body, the Church.” The Church is not so much for the sake of the individual, as the individual for the sake of the Church. Its perfection and glory, its full response to the work of Christ, its realization of the purposes of God, constitute the end to which the existence of each member ministers. This line of thought runs through the Epistles, and forms a distinct advance upon that which works out the development of personal salvation. I have now to point out that it is not perfected in the Epistles, but in the Apocalypse. The sense of sharing in a corporate existence, and in a history and destinies larger than those which belong to us as individuals, tends to throw the mind forward upon a course of things to come. When present things in a measure disappoint us, we turn more eagerly to the brighter future, and look beyond the darkened foreground to the light which glows on the horizon.

Thus we arrive at this book as men who not only personally are in Christ, but who also, as members of his body, share in a corporate life, in the perfection of which they are to be made perfect, and in the glory of which their Lord is to be glorified. Brethren, I would that this state of mind did exist more extensively and distinctly among us. I think we must all feel that the piety of our day encloses itself too much within the limits of individual life.

That I should be pardoned, saved, and sanctified—that I should serve before God, and be accepted in my service—that I should die in peace and rest in Christ—that I should have confidence and not be ashamed before him at his coming—these are worthy desires for an immortal being, and for these the Gospel provides. But it provides for more than these; making me the member of a kingdom of Christ, and the citizen of a city of God. There ought surely to be a consciousness within me corresponding to that position; there ought to be affections which will associate me in spirit with that larger history, in which my own is included, and which will make me long that the kingdom of Christ should come, and the city of God be manifested. The blessing, ascribed to him that reads, and those who hear, the words of this prophecy, can belong only to those who read it and hear it thus.

I have now to point out some leading characteristics of its doctrine, in order to show what are the satisfactions which it provides. These characteristics, though distinguished from each other, will yet all be found to combine into one. The doctrine of the book is a doctrine of consummation.

The Apocalypse Displays the Consummation of NT Doctrine

The Cause of Consummation—The Sacrificial Atonement of Christ as the Lamb

The cause of the consummation is the atoning death of Jesus. Is this an advance in doctrine? Has not the nature and efficacy of the great sacrifice been already sufficiently disclosed? Yes, in its bearing on personal salvation; but this book exhibits the connection between the personal and the general salvation. The personal salvation for each several soul has been expounded in the Epistles as found in Christ Jesus, and more particularly in our redemption to God by his blood. In these writings the sacrifice and propitiation...
of his death are ever before our eyes, as the cause of our restoration and the source of all our other blessings.

When, in this book, we pass on from the personal to the general life, and are to see the victory secured, and the kingdom brought in, we may perhaps expect that the Lord will now appear only with titles of majesty, as the conqueror and the king. It is not so. The opening doxology, “To him that loved us and washed us from our sins in his own blood,” strikes the note of all which is to follow. When the historic vision begins, one is sought who may open the sealed purposes of God and conduct them to their end. “Then I beheld, and lo! in the midst of the throne, and the beasts, and the elders, stood . . . a Lamb as it had been slain” (Rev. 5:6–10), and his appearance wakens the song, “Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; and hast made us unto our God kings and priests: and we shall reign on the earth.”

So the vision proceeds, and from the beginning to the end, through the long conflict, and in the midst of the glorious issue, there is still one title for him who conquers, and judges, and reigns. It is the Lamb who makes war and overcomes; and from the wrath of the Lamb kings and nations flee. It is the Lamb in whose blood his servants also overcome; in whose blood they have washed their robes; before whom they stand in white raiment; and to whom they ascribe salvation. In the Lamb’s Book of Life the names of the saved are written. The Holy City is the bride, the Lamb’s wife. The Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it, and the light of it; and the river of the water of life flows forever from the throne of God and the Lamb. In the peculiar title, thus studiously employed, and illustrated by the repeated mention of the slaying and the blood, we read the doctrine, that the ground of the personal is the ground of the general salvation, that the place which the sacrifice of the death of Christ holds in the consciousness of the believer, is the same which it also occupies in the history of the Church, and that he conquers for us, and reigns among us, and achieves the restoration of all things, because he has first offered himself for us, and is the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world.

The History of Consummation—The Resolution of Earth’s Events from Heaven’s Throne

We have here, in the next place, a doctrine of the history of the consummation; besides a prophetic record of the facts of the history, we have an exposition of the nature of the history. The book is a revelation of the connection between things that are seen and things that are not seen, between things on earth and things in heaven; a revelation which fuses both into one mighty drama. We are borne to the courts above, and the temple of God is opened in heaven, and we behold the events on earth as originating in what passes there. There seals are broken, trumpets are sounded, and vials are poured out, which rule the changes of the Church and of the nations.

The Coming of Consummation—The Appearance of Christ

The book is a doctrine of the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. “Behold he cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see him” (Rev. 1:7). That is the first voice, and the keynote of the whole. The Epistles to the seven Churches all take their tone from this thought. The last voices of the book respond to the first, and attest its subject and its purpose: “He which testifieth these things saith, Surely I come quickly. Amen. Even so come, Lord Jesus” (Rev. 22:20). Whatever else the Christian desires is bound up in this prospect.

The Victory of Consummation—The Conquest of Christ over All His Enemies (and Ours)

The doctrine of the coming is in itself a doctrine of victory, and that theme characterizes the apocalyptic teaching. “In the world ye shall have tribulation, but be of good cheer, I have overcome the world.” These were the last words of the Lord’s last discourse. In the Apocalypse this spirit is still more distinctly felt; for there the virtual victory becomes a visible victory, both for the Lord and for his people. Every promise in the seven Epistles is addressed “to him that overcometh,” and the last Epistle unites the victory of the servant with the victory of the Lord: “To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me on my throne; even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father on his throne” (Rev. 3:21). We are told of those who “overcome by the blood of the Lamb” (Rev. 12:11), until in the last crisis the conquering armies of heaven sweep into sight, following the Victor who has “on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, King of Kings and Lord of Lords” (Rev. 19:11–16).

The Judgment of Consummation—The Condemnation of All Evil

But victory for one side is overthrow and condemnation for the other; so that we have here also a doctrine of judgment. “The prince of this world is judged.” That saying
might stand as the summary of a large part of the book. I need not recall by particular citations the manner in which this line of teaching is carried out in the Apocalypse. The opening proclamation of the coming notifies its effect on the world: “Every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him, and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him” (Rev. 1:7). Things do not melt quietly into the peace of the kingdom of God. There is a crash of ruin, and a wine-press of the wrath of Almighty God, and a lake that burns with fire and brimstone. He who does not accept the reality of the world’s rebellion and ruin, and of the wrath and judgment which it brings, must certainly reject this whole book from the canon and, with it, must tear away large and living portions of every preceding book of Scripture.

The Restoration of Consummation—A New Heavens and New Earth of Unmixed Righteousness

The coming of the Lord is not the last thing which we know. After the victory has been won, and the judgment has dealt with things that are past, the final results appear, and the true life of man begins. The doctrine of the book is ultimately and pre-eminently one of restoration. This is the point where the whole teaching of Scripture culminates. There is to be a perfect humanity; not only perfect individually, but perfect in society.

Conclusion

The survey which has been made in these Lectures has now carried us from the beginning to the end of the New Testament. We have seen that this collection of various and occasional writings presents to us a gradually progressive scheme, fully wrought out in its several stages, and advancing in a natural order of succession.

Gospels. First a person is manifested and facts are set forth, in the simplest external aspect, under the clearest light, and with the concurrence of a fourfold witness. This witness also is itself progressive, and in the last gospel the glory of the person has grown more bright, and the meaning of the facts more clear.

Acts. Then, in the Book of Acts, Christ is preached as perfected, and as the refuge and life of the world. The results of his appearing are summed up and settled; and men are called to believe and be saved. Those who do so find themselves in new relations to each other; they become one body, and grow into the form and life of a Catholic Church.

Epistles. The state which has thus been entered needs to be expounded, and the life which has been begun needs to be educated. The Apostolic letters perform the work. Questions raised by earlier revelation are answered, the faith once delivered to the saints takes on more definite and defined shape, and we learn what is the happy consciousness, and what the holy conversation, that belong to those who are “in Christ Jesus.”

Revelation. Lastly, as members of the body of Christ, we find ourselves partakers in a corporate life and a history larger than our own. We feel that we are taken up into a scheme of things, which is in conflict with the present. Therefore our final teaching is by prophecy, which shows us, not how we are personally saved and victorious, but how the battle goes upon the whole; and which issues in the appearance of a holy city, in which redemption reaches its end, divine promises fulfilled, and man is perfected in the presence and glory of God.

If this doctrine is not of the world, every step that it takes in advance must make that fact more plain. In following the advancing line of doctrine in the Scriptures, we diverge further and further from the world’s paths and habits of thought. Only the written word of God, confidingly followed in the progressive steps of its advance, can lead the weakest or the wisest into the deep blessedness of the life that is in Christ, and into the final glory of the city of God.

Perhaps in some minds this needful confidence may be strengthened, by a review of the books of the New Testament in the light in which they have now been placed. When it is felt that these narratives, letters, and visions do in fact fulfill the several functions, and sustain the mutual relations, which would belong to the parts of one design, coalescing into a doctrinal scheme, which is orderly, progressive, and complete, then is the mind of the reader in conscious contact with the mind of God; then the superficial diversity of the parts is lost in the essential unity of the whole. The many writings have become one Book. The many writers have become one Author. From the position of students, who address themselves to the works of Matthew, of Paul, or of John, we have risen to the higher level of believers, who open with holy joy “the New Testament of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ,” and, while we receive from his own hand the book of life eternal, we hear him saying still, “I have given unto them the words which thou gavest me.”
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Wilson's Globalism and the League of Nations
(Continued from page 9)

one-world political union embodied in the League of Nations for God or against Him? To answer the question, we must recognize that Wilson's thinking concerning globalism was rooted in beliefs and philosophies that are contrary to the Word of God. Darwinism rejects the Creator God. Postmillennialism denies the teaching of the Scriptures concerning the last days and makes man, rather than Messiah, responsible for bringing in the kingdom. Eugenics perverts the nature and condition of man and provides philosophically for the concept of an unbiblical super-race. Woodrow Wilson's worldview was Christian in name only, erring from the clear teaching of the Word of God.

To answer the question, it would also be wise to consider how Bible-believing Christians in Wilson's day viewed his presentation of globalism and the League of Nations. James M. Gray, president of Moody Bible Institute from 1904 to 1934, stated concerning Wilson's proposal, “It is almost certain to produce the very injustice, hostility and controversy among the nations which it proposes to prevent. Our knowledge of human nature and our acquaintance with history leads us to believe this, without speaking of the Bible.”

Though referring to the League of Nations, his words certainly are appropriate in describing the influence of the United Nations in our own day.

Finally and ultimately, to answer the question, we must go to the Word of God. The key issue in our consideration is the identity of the individual(s) or group(s) which will bring about a one-world utopia. According to President Woodrow Wilson’s Darwinist postmillennialism, mankind will bring in the kingdom. His view of a humanistic global government is consistent with that which the Bible teaches the Antichrist will attempt to establish in the last days. The Scriptures, however, make it clear that a universal kingdom of peace will be brought about only by the coming of the true King, Jesus Christ.

The Old Testament prophet Daniel presented a chronological panorama of world kingdoms, each except the last doomed to failure. The final, everlasting kingdom will be initiated and ruled over by the Messiah as King. Likewise, the entire New Testament Book of Revelation was written to point out man’s futility in opposing God’s government and climaxes in chapters 19 and 20 with the coming of Jesus Christ to war against and conquer the satanic rulers of the world system under Antichrist.

Any federation of humanistic philosophy and government which seeks to bring about God’s kingdom without the King is both satanic and futile. Wilsonian Darwinist globalism is alive and well on planet earth; one hundred years after the Fourteen Points were presented, genuine believers in the Word of God continue to cry, “Even so, come, Lord Jesus!”

Bud Steadman is the executive director of Baptist World Mission, an agency facilitating nearly three hundred missionaries in forty-eight countries. Prior to joining the administration of BWM in 2009, he served as a senior pastor in North Carolina and Indiana.


2 Ibid.
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How We Should Live

First and foremost, all believers should live their lives for Christ. The apostle Paul said in Philippians 1:21, "For to me to live is Christ, and to die is gain." This is our primary goal in life! Nothing else will ever satisfy us; living for ourselves will never satisfy us. With this truth as the foundation of our living, there is a threefold aspect of how this is to be carried out.

First, we should live in light of eternity. My father used to hire a man to plow our fields in West Virginia. This man had a mule, and he would put blinders on the mule’s eyes so he would be able to see only what was right in front of him. This was so the animal wouldn’t be distracted by his surroundings and start plowing crooked. Likewise, the Lord wants us to put on spiritual blinders so that we won’t be distracted by the things of this world. In the book Pilgrim’s Progress by John Bunyan, the main character, Christian, had his eyes locked on the eternal Celestial City. The Bible says of Abraham in Hebrews 11:10, “For he looked for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God.” Living in light of eternity was the goal of Abraham. It was also the goal of the apostle Paul. Under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit he wrote in 2 Corinthians 4:18, “While we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen: for the things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal.” This should be our mindset as well!

Second, we are to love in light of eternity. First Corinthians 13:13 says, “And now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three; but the greatest of these is charity.” Love must be based on what the Lord taught in John 14:15: “If ye love me, keep my commandments.” Our love must be scripturally based. Here are some examples of what our love should look like.

Philippians 1:9: “And this I pray, that your love may abound yet more and more in knowledge and in all judgment.”

1 Thessalonians 1:3: “Remembering without ceasing your work of faith, and labour of love, and patience of hope in our Lord Jesus Christ, in the sight of God and our Father.”

Hebrews 10:24, “And let us consider one another to provoke unto love and to good works.”

Hebrews 13:1, “Let brotherly love continue.”

1 John 5:3, “For this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments: and his commandments are not grievous.”

Jude 21, “Keep yourselves in the love of God, looking for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ unto eternal life.”

The cry of our hearts should be that we want to love the Lord and others with biblical love in light of eternity.

Third, we are to labor in light of eternity. First Thessalonians 1:3 states, “Remembering without ceasing your work of faith, and labour of love, and patience of hope in our Lord Jesus Christ, in the sight of God and our Father.” It is a wonderful, comforting truth to realize that our labor will endure when it is done for Christ. First Corinthians 15:58 reads, “Therefore, my beloved brethren, be ye stedfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labour is not in vain in the Lord.”

Recently I came across an article that deeply touched me as I read it. It is entitled “My Commitment as a Christian” and reads as follows:

I’m a part of the fellowship of the unashamed. I have the Holy Spirit’s power. The die has been cast. I have stepped over the line. The decision has been made. I’m a disciple of His. I won’t look back, let up, slow down, back away, or be still. My past is redeemed, my present makes sense, my future is secure. I’m finished and done with low living, sight walking, small planning, smooth knees, colorless dreams, tame visions, mundane talking, cheap living, and dwarfed goals. I no longer need preeminence, prosperity, position, promotions, plaudits, or popularity. I don’t have to be right, first, tops, recognized, praised, regarded, or rewarded. I now live by faith, lean on His presence, walk by patience, lifted by prayer, and labor by power. My face is set, my gait is fast, my goal is Heaven, my road is narrow, my way is rough, my companions few, my Guide reliable, my mission clear. I cannot be bought, compromised, detoured, lured away, turned back, deluded, or delayed. I will not flinch in the face of sacrifice, hesitate in the presence of the adversary, negotiate at the table of the enemy, ponder at the pool of popularity, or meander in the maze of mediocrity. I won’t give up, shut up, let up, until I have saved up, stored up, prayed up, paid up, preached up for the cause of Christ. I am a disciple of Jesus. I must go till He comes, give till I drop, preach till all know, and work till He stops me. And when He comes for His own, He will have no problem recognizing me. My banner is clear.

Wow! What tremendous focus and dedication of laboring in light of eternity. May the Lord stir our souls to live, love, and labor in light of eternity.

Evangelist Jerry Sivnksty may be contacted at PO Box 141, Starr, SC 29684 or via e-mail at evangjsivn@aol.com.
evolutionary postmillennialism were dealt a death blow. While they would not have known this in 1915, the rest of the century would see more than 100 million people killed by governments. Optimism was dead! The utter devastation and waste of life in the Great War dealt a blow to conservative postmillennialism. It could no longer be argued that the world was getting close to the great peace and prosperity of the Kingdom.

A basic fault of postmillennialism was its method of interpretation of Scripture. In order for even the conservative theologians to find fulfillment of millennial promises in the Church Age, it was necessary for them to use a non-literal system of interpretation for prophecy. A strictly literal interpretation of prophecy leads to premillennialism.

A New Form of Liberalism

The humanistic liberalism of the past began to disappear. Liberals found that their philosophy and theology were impractical. They did not produce converts or inspire benevolence. There was need for a return to biblical ground and more realism in dealing with human sin. Philosophy also began to adjust itself to a world of real sin and strife. So a new form of liberalism (neo-liberalism) developed. It held to a new appreciation of sin, of divine sovereignty, of human weakness, and the recognition of a possible catastrophic end of the world and ultimate judgment of God. This theological and philosophical adjustment, however, did not produce converts to postmillennialism. It was much easier to adopt the less-specific view of amillennialism (the belief that there is no specific millennium, or thousand-year reign of Christ).

A lecture given by a Professor H.M.B. Reid at the closing of the 1915–16 school year at the University of Glasgow, Scotland, reveals just how much of a toll the Great War took on the hearts and minds of liberal teachers and their students. He asserted that the faculty needed to turn away from the modernistic theology they had been teaching and get back to the “essence of religion” which is the “truth of the incarnation.” He urged the faculty to return to an emphasis on the supernatural, moving away from the “remolded basis of theology after Schleiermacher [the leading philosophical voice in a Christianity that no longer looked to the Christ of Scripture for salvation]” to once again play “the Church’s winning card.” He desired the faculty to study the Living Christ. The figure of the resurrected Jesus Christ and “martyr’s graves” was a major theme in his lecture.

Postmillennialism still exists today, but it is a minor position. It has little biblical support, and for those who reject a literal reading of Scripture, especially of prophecy, the amillennial position is more attractive and realistic. Positively, the collapse of postmillennialism and the rise of literalism in the interpretation of Scripture led to the popularizing of dispensational premillennialism.

Dr. Larry Oats is the dean of the seminary at Maranatha Baptist University in Watertown, Wisconsin.

3 Previous wars between Christians (Civil War, Revolutionary War, Thirty Years’ War, etc.) could be easily ignored due to the evolutionary nature of Christianity. There had not been a major war between Christian nations in more than a decade.
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