



IBFNA

March 2013
Volume 21, Number 3

THE REVIEW

Innocence Taken; Innocence Cast Aside

by Pastor Charles Dear, Moderator *IBFNA*

The unspeakable tragedy of so many young children slain in Newtown, CT touches the heart of everyone. It is not just about the presumed safety in a school building or the trust of parents for others to watch out for their children's welfare. It also confronts us with the reality that evil is real, it is among us, and it thrives in the hearts of men, whose twisted motives drive them to strike at the most vulnerable among us in order to inflict the most suffering and anguish among all those who have survived, both far and near. It is that picture of such young innocence that sharpens the pain we feel when those young lives suddenly come to an unfulfilled end. Jesus spoke about offending little ones, particularly those who believe in Him:

But whoso shall offend one of these little ones which believe in me, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea. Woe unto the world because of offences! For it must needs be that offences come; but woe to that man by whom the offence cometh! (Matt. 18:6-7).

As the second most severe attack upon children in our country's history, the benefit of 21st century communications brought the news immediately to the whole world, evoking tremendous outpouring of emotional responses. Some of these responses challenge the fundamental principles on which this nation was founded. They bring to mind the quotation from Benjamin Franklin: "Those who would give up essential Liberty, to purchase a little temporary Safety, deserve neither Liberty nor Safety." The hard truth is that we cannot be a free people without accepting some risk of danger; because, while we know that evil is ever present, no man can control it completely. That means there will always be a measure of risk for all of us, from the youngest to the oldest. Tragedy is a difficult reminder that we live in a broken world, inhabited by fallen men, and under the dominion of Satan. The evidence of his control in our world confirms what Jesus said to the Pharisees of His day:

Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. *He was a murderer from the beginning*, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it (John 8:44).

The event at Sandy Hook Elementary School is but another poignant reminder of the reality and incarnation of Evil among us. In recent years there have been several mass murders that have taken place in a variety of locations, including schools, military bases, and malls. Those who believe in the innate goodness of man in the face of such tragedy foster a measure of naiveté. Events such as these undermine the hope that man can be perfected apart from God and the faith that we can create a utopian environment where such violence would never be a threat again. With the focus of protests against the means used (guns), significantly less attention has been paid to the nature of the perpetrators and the cause and effect of their actions. Unhappy childhoods and difficult home situations are the new norm,

(CONTINUE ON PAGE 2)



INSIDE PAGES

3 "TRIBUTE"

3 "HEART OF REVIVAL"

4 "THE ACCC"

6 "FUNDAMENTALIST REACTION"

Membership & Subscription:

IBFNA
523 East Godfrey Ave
Philadelphia, PA 19120
(215) 745-3906
www.IBFNA.org

and where there is no opportunity to portray Christianity as radical or extreme, the media never considers spiritual backgrounds in these contexts. However, the influence of psychotropic medications, especially given to young people, deserves closer scrutiny than has been received thus far. In a report by psychiatrist Dr. David Healy, a correlation was found between a number of perpetrators of mass murder and the psychotropic drugs they were taking.¹

Not only did this event rob the children of their innocent lives, it also robbed the families and people of Newtown, CT of their sense of security. Even the media barrage that followed the event for weeks afterward took away from their ability to privately mourn their losses apart from the world's gaze. "Things like this do not happen here" was a common refrain coming from Newtown. Perhaps that was true sometime in the past, but that tragic day confirmed the reality that evil has no geographical boundaries and limitations. Evil seeks out the unwary and vulnerable, just as evil cares not for the pain inflicted, neither the damage done nor the lives changed forever thereafter.

As tragic as it is when innocence is ripped away from children through violence, there remain broader questions about the squandering of the innocence of children in other situations, which have not received media exposure or generated a public outcry. They are hidden from public view. Still worse, they are supported by public opinion, opinion shaped by the media. For example, in the recent 40th anniversary observance of *Roe v. Wade*, the staggering number of 50,000,000 unborn children murdered ("legal abortions") received less than a glancing notice from the media. The children murdered in Newtown were remembered with the publication of their photos and names, but are the lives ended in abortion in the sterile environments of hospitals and clinics any less innocent?

Lest we think there is a significant difference in the level of violence between shooting school children and medically performed abortions, consider the ugly details about how abortions, including partial-birth abortions, are performed. In January of this year, the names and faces of three third-trimester abortionists were published as courageous heroes in spite of the fact that they had no problem killing unborn children that might have survived under better circumstances. No death-threat is justifiable. If we mourn what kind of lives five- or six-year-olds might have lived, how much more those who never even experienced birth?

How much innocence has been taken away from kindergarten-age children in public schools by mandatory sex education? Early indoctrination of children to accept "alternate lifestyles" has laid the groundwork for godlessness. School nurses are prepared to counsel students, who are uncertain about their gender identity, about their options.² The distribution of morning-after pills has multiplied significantly in New York secondary schools, creating a future market

for the services of such organizations as (Un)Planned Parenthood.³ The schools are not obligated to notify parents about any of these things, unless of course, your child needs an aspirin.

Lest we think, "this never happens here," like the people in Newtown, consider two news items published since the beginning of this February: (1) A Lutheran Church preschool was shut down after a teacher discovered a child performing an act on another child. The child performing the act had done the same thing with at least one other child.⁴ (2) In Mexico an eight-year-old girl became the new record-holder for being the youngest mother of a living child. The previous record-holder was a nine-year-old mother.⁵

Should the death of young children, brutally murdered, be mourned? Definitely! Should the shattered innocence of young children by public institutions be equally heinous in our view? Absolutely! The youngest among us continue to be deprived of their childhood. We can do nothing for the children who died and precious little for their surviving families, but we can defend those still among us. Jesus looked upon the innocence and easy trust of children as an example of the kind of faith that saves: "Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God" (Mark 10:14b).

Our ministries must always seek the protection of children from all the predators that would do them harm. We face an uphill battle against those forces that impose unbiblical values and practices upon children often at taxpayer expense. We cannot remain naive or ignorant of the evils that threaten the welfare of children and that hinder the opportunities for them to hear the gospel of Christ. Our ministries must be outposts for biblical morality in this 21st century pagan society.

References

¹ <http://www.wnd.com/2013/01/top-psychiatrist-meds-behind-school-massacres/>.

² <http://www.nasn.org/Portals/0/positions/2012pssexual.pdf>.

³ http://www.nypost.com/p/news/local/city_secret_school_birth_control_39jedC7GufuBW20ps7nvZI.

⁴ (<http://losangeles.cbslocal.com/2013/02/05/children-allegedly-engaged-in-sex-acts-with-each-other-at-carson-preschool/>).

⁵ <http://www.13wham.com/news/local/story/9-year-old-gives-birth-mexico/IqOmyU8uB0ObtF-5Fcuk1A.csp>.

A Tribute to a Faithful Soldier of the Cross

The apostle Paul marked his home-going with contented satisfaction, "I have fought the good fight; I have finished my course; I have kept the faith. Henceforth, there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at that day. And not to me only, but to all them also that love his appearing."

Brother Jerry Huffman has arrived home with the same assurance. Faithful pastor and godly separatist, Brother Huffman was best known by many for his watchman work with the *Calvary Contender* paper and website (<http://home.hiwaay.net/~contendr/>).

Dr. Ralph Colas, who knew this brother well, wrote the following tribute to him on behalf of the American Council of Christian Churches:

"We always knew where Jerry stood, for he stood for the old Faith. One of his outstanding characteristics was dependability. He served the Lord and did so with

his whole body, soul, and spirit. Jerry knew that 'obedience is better than sacrifice.' He demonstrated kindness and grace to those who disagreed with his stand for the Truth, but he never would yield to the siren songs of ecumenism and religious confusion embraced by others. Jerry possessed a staunch conviction and quiet manner that inspired confidence in his judgment.

"We who had the privilege of working closely with Jerry Huffman saw an individual whose life was marked by the fruit of the Spirit, which is 'love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, and temperance or self-control.'

"We rejoice in the assurance that Jerry is absent from the body and present with the Lord. It is our prayer that the Lord will sustain his dear family as they wait for that day when the Rapture will reunite them with their loved one to be forever with the Savior, Whom they love and serve."

The Heart of Revival: A Study of Nehemiah 9:1-3

By Pastor Greg Ward

A revival sent by God had broken out among the children of Israel who returned to Jerusalem from exile. Their hearts began to change as they discovered that it was a God-appointed time of rejoicing on the calendar. So they rejoiced and found strength in the Lord. When the Feast of Tabernacles was complete, they gathered yet again. Their lives were already showing signs of revival toward God. As we see their hearts in the midst of revival, it is an example for our seeking God's blessing of revival upon our hearts, our churches, and our nation.

The Nehemiah account was not written for those who experienced the working of God that day. They were there. God had this written to record something about Himself and His will for future generations of believing Israel. It was to teach Israel about worship and prayer. It would encourage Israel to have the same heart and to walk in obedience to the Lord. It would provide the hope to post-exile Israel that God would fulfill His promises regarding covenants and the promise to put a new heart within them.

Nehemiah 9 is dominated by one of nine recorded prayers in this book. This one in particular stands out with several unique features, including its focus on the need for revival. But the underlying heart of the prayer is even more important than the content of the prayer itself. The first three verses, especially the verbs, give us a glimpse of what that heart was like. Let us consider several facets of the heart that is being revived by God.

First, they had an *afflicted heart* (v. 1). They voluntarily gathered. There was no tribulation or siege. There was no governor or king forcing them to assemble. They came of their own accord with a heart of mourning and grief as evidenced by their fasting, wearing sackcloth,

and having dust on their heads. They willingly afflicted themselves with the uncomfortable clothes and dress of mourning. This was common not only for mourning death, but also for mourning sinfulness. It was a fruit of repentance, which called out for God's mercy in place of His just wrath upon sin. When Jonah preached to Nineveh, "Yet forty days and Nineveh will be overthrown," the Scriptures say, "Then the people of Nineveh believed in God; and they called a fast and put on sackcloth from the greatest to the least of them" (Jon. 3:5).

What we see here is revival. There were a number of occasions when the people turned back to God during the time of the judges and under certain kings, but rarely is the heart-felt response of the people as clearly expressed as it is in Ezra and Nehemiah. Here we see hearts impacted by God. The question for us is whether we want God's impact upon our heart. Do we really want revival? Even for the children of God, it begins with a heart that is willing to respond to conviction of sin.

Second, they had an *active heart* (v. 2). Their heart brought forth actions of repentance. The first action is that Israel *separated* themselves from all foreigners. This occurs several times in Ezra and Nehemiah. This was to preserve the ethnic integrity of the nation as God had commanded them. This separation had nothing to do with simply disliking someone. It was a separation of religious commitment. It was a renouncement of heathen associations and heathen customs. Neh. 10:28 makes it clear that it was a separation of obedience unto God. We would recognize this as biblical separation from the world. They also *stood* in reverence. This position expressed their heart. They were willing to take a stand and be counted with those who were following the Lord. They

(CONTINUED FROM PAGE 3)

confessed their sins. The Hebrew root, *yadah*, relates to acknowledging something, often in praise or thanksgiving. The Hithpael stem, used here, indicates confession of sin, often national sins confessed in a public gathering (*TWOT*, s.v. 847.0). The people gathered to acknowledge their own sin and the sin of their preceding generations, which had brought the nation to this point. Recognition of unworthiness comes into right focus with an understanding of God's holiness and gracious kindness. The context also shows us that it was an acknowledgement of God in worship as well. The people had a heart that brought forth righteous actions.

Third, the people had an *acquiring heart*. They stood for three hours while the word of God was read. What would cause one to stand for three hours and listen? When was the last time you were part of a congregation that did that? I wonder whether there were nurseries and children's programs. We do not know. But I suspect that everybody, no matter the age, recognized that God was doing a great work in hearts and participated in attentive listening to the word of God. They must have had a genuine

hunger for God's will and His promises. Certainly, God's true word is the foundation for any genuine revival. A proper response must be preceded by proper thinking, which must be fed real truth. Other responses of thinking, actions, and emotion can be right, but without God's truth feeding them, they end with no true accomplishment for God. In addition, God's word can be ingested in more than small snacks. The people had a lengthy feast of God's word. Have you recently feasted on God's word?

Finally, the people had an *adoring heart*. The response of their heart was to worship God. This verb often has the connotation of bowing down deeply in worship. It is an expression of a humble, contrite heart and of reverence before Almighty God. The remainder of the chapter is a recitation of worship. It is an intensive, heart-felt expression to the Lord.

As we witness the hearts of the children of God as they are revived by Him, what we see must set the standard for our hearts if we desire God to work in a similar way in our time and place. All of these conditions of the heart of revival are imperative.

The ACCC: Watching for Wolves

By Dr. Ralph Colas, Executive Secretary of the American Council of Christian Churches

The admonition, "Ralph, I do not see how you as a Baptist can be a part of an interdenominational organization like the American Council of Christian Churches," was included in a letter I received a number of years ago. The letter came from a friend who had attended seminary with me. He had learned that I had accepted an invitation to become the Executive Secretary of the American Council of Christian Churches (ACCC).

In my immediate reply, I underlined that the ACCC was NOT an interdenominational organization but rather a multi-denominational one. There is a big difference between interdenominational, non-denominational, and multi-denominational churches or group of churches.

Under an interdenominational banner, everyone surrenders some belief so common ground can be reached. You give up something that is important to you, and I will do the same. By this method we can then begin to work together. A classic illustration of this was seen in Promise Keepers, which found a broad base upon which to stand by issuing a call for everyone to "break down the walls of denominations."

Non-denominational is almost a misnomer, just like *Grape Nuts* cereal is neither grapes nor nuts. This has become the "way to go" during the past years. By doing so, church leaders believe more people will be attracted to their church. (Baptists are not the only ones who have done this. The Christian and Missionary Alliance denomination and a number of Charismatic churches have too.) Years ago, in Kansas City, MO, there was a store called, "The Store Without a Name." Did it have a

name? Of course it did. A denomination is a name, and it describes a group's beliefs.

Multi-denominational indicates that various churches and groups of churches are identified as being together. No one gives up their distinctiveness, while we all agree with the doctrinal statement and must meet certain requirements. No one in the ACCC can be a part in any way of the National and World Councils of Churches. But neither can they be identified with the National Association of Evangelicals, nor the World Evangelical Alliance (WEA), which claims to represent 335 million Christians. Of course, if an individual or a church agrees with the Charismatic movement, they are excluded also.

As a multi-denominational organization, the ACCC does not plant churches, send out missionaries, or hold evangelistic services together. But the ACCC is ready to assist churches when hindrances come their way. The ACCC is a council and not an association. This means it is issues-oriented. We deal with issues that affect all who are fundamentalists.

The ACCC purpose statement identifies its reason for existing: "The American Council of Christian Churches is a fundamentalist, multi-denominational organization whose purposes are to provide information, encouragement, and assistance to Bible-believing churches, fellowships, and individuals; to preserve our Christian heritage through exposure of, opposition to, and separation from doctrinal impurity and compromise in current religious trends and movements; to protect

churches from religious and political restrictions, subtle or obvious, that would hinder their ministries for Christ; and to promote obedience to the inerrant Word of God.”

The ACCC was born in 1941, and God has preserved its witness for nearly 72 years. It can be illustrated with an object like a snow plow. The purpose of a snow plow is to open, and then keep open, the roads for other vehicles to use. The ACCC has been used by the Lord to assist local churches carrying out their God-given responsibilities. At times zoning boards, influenced by NCC/WCC leadership, sought to keep a fundamentalist church from even constructing a building. The ACCC, like the snowplow, got involved, and now in those places a testimony for Christ exists.

Fundamental News Service, which is our publishing name, enables us to have official press credentials. These credentials provide access to report on various religious gatherings. The ACCC has reported on NCC/WCC assemblies, National Association of Evangelicals and National Religious Broadcaster conventions, Promise Keepers rallies, Urbana Mission conferences, and Jesus Marches to name but a few. People have been alerted to the dangers of false doctrine, and help has been made available to pastors and churches who found themselves in a struggle for their own survival. Years ago there were several dependable sources providing up-to-date information about wolves in disguise entering the flock and deceiving many. Those doing so today are very few, but the ACCC is one of them.

Since 1941 the ACCC has been an endorsing agency for chaplains. There are ACCC chaplains serving in the Armed Forces on active duty, reserves, Civil Air Patrol, prisons, and hospitals. Requests come to the ACCC from our government’s Endorsing Board for us to send them additional chaplains.

The ACCC has assisted several American Baptist Churches in leaving that apostate group. It has also been used by the Lord to help a United Church of Christ church vote to exit from that very liberal denomination and its association with the NCC and WCC. Pertinent information is often shared as requested regarding various religious denominations, such as the Southern Baptist Convention, the Conservative Baptist Churches, the Baptist General Conference, along with other church bodies.

The ACCC remains in sharp contrast to the National Association of Evangelicals (NAE) which was begun in 1942, one year after the ACCC was organized. From its beginning days, the NAE has been an inclusive organization inviting local churches still remaining in the NCC/WCC to join them. While claiming to represent 42,000 churches and more than 30 million evangelicals, the fact is that the NAE has repudiated biblical separation for more than six decades. The fruit of that unbiblical position was made evident in a very clear way in 2004 when Dr. Robert Schuller, an apostate, was invited to speak and given two standing ovations at their 62nd Annual Convention, which was held in the New Life Church, Colorado Springs, CO, where the then NAE President served as Senior Pastor. Dr. Ted Haggard’s moral failures are well known. Before being exposed, he was a charismatic leader, who at a meeting with other high-profile

charismatics suggested that any difference between Pentecostals-Charismatics and the evangelical world “was quickly becoming irrelevant.” The NAE was the very organization that gave credibility to the Pentecostal-Charismatic community.

The “half-way house position” of the NAE is seen in their support of a federal marriage amendment to forbid same-sex marriages. However, the evangelicals are divided among themselves over granting benefits to same-gender couples. Richard Cizek, former NAE Vice President, said, “We have to be willing to adopt a principle at times called ‘less is more,’ so we would accept civil unions on a strategic if not a moral level.” So instead of a clear call on both important issues, the NAE will surrender one. The ACCC has issued resolutions which express the precept that both are wrong—same sex marriages and benefits to same-gender couples. Homosexuality is sin, and no Christian organization should encourage such relationships by any manner or means.

The ACCC underlines that the Bible teaches separation from unbelievers and erring brethren. To us, doctrinal purity is vital to the work of God. As a result, when we see religious error, we must draw attention to it instead of ignoring it. The ACCC exposes compromise even though it is not a popular task.

At times pastors and churches may conclude that they are standing alone in the battle for the faith and truth. However, all across our nation and abroad there are those who refuse to compromise biblical principles.

Since 1941 the ACCC has emphasized that Jude 3 teaches God’s own to earnestly contend for the faith. That assignment has not been reversed.

A former state representative of the Iowa Association of Regular Baptist Churches, Rev. Robert Gardner, put it so aptly when he often declared, “Every Christian should practice separation. Every church should stand for separation. Every pastor should preach separation.”

The ACCC continues to fulfill its task, because God’s Word forbids alliance with those who put experience above the Scriptures and with those who hold membership in the apostate ecumenical movement. We must do God’s work in God’s way if we want God’s blessing. Obedience is better than sacrifice, size, reputation, wealth, or scholarship. If any of those come with obedience, that is fine, but without obedience they are empty.

Someone has written with words like apples of gold in pitchers of silver, “A preacher must not only feed the sheep so as to instruct them how to be good Christians, but also he must keep the wolves from attacking the sheep and leading them astray with false doctrine and error, for the devil is never idle. Nowadays, there are many people who are quite ready to tolerate our preaching of the gospel as long as we do not cry out against the wolves. But though I preach the truth and feed the sheep well, that is still not enough unless the sheep are also guarded and protected so that the wolves do not come and carry them off. The wolves can tolerate a good pasture for the sheep. He likes them better for their fatness. But what he cannot endure is the hostile barking of the dogs!”

A Fundamentalists' Reaction to *Four Views on the Spectrum of Evangelicalism*¹

By Pastor Kevin Hobi

It is widely known that *evangelicalism* has become a very broad term. Editor Colin Hansen wrestles with the problem this creates for evangelicals in his introduction to *Four Views on the Spectrum of Evangelicalism*: “We are everything, so we are nothing. If the descriptor *evangelical* cannot stand on its own, then it has little use. There is no coherent movement, only an endless collection of self-styled labels created by Christians for their Facebook profiles” (9).

The purpose of the editors and authors of this book, in response to these conditions, is to avoid losing “a rare opportunity to demonstrate unity and mission outside the local church,” “to shore up evangelicalism by highlighting common beliefs and fostering respectful disagreement where necessary” (10), and “to navigate . . . differences and preserve the meaning and mission behind the name we each claim” (17).

The authors entrusted with this demonstrating, shoring up, and navigating are Kevin T. Bauder, a self-described fundamentalist, R. Albert Mohler, a self-described confessional evangelical, John G. Stackhouse Jr., a self-described generic evangelical, and Roger E. Olson, a self-described postconservative evangelical (17). This article will attempt to explain briefly the disappointment I felt as a fundamentalist reading this book in terms of the book’s method, tone, and conclusion.

Method

The Zondervan Counterpoints Series has become a popular way for the latest generation of theological students to quickly grasp and assess differing views of a theological topic. The well-known format begins with a position paper from each author, which is followed by a critique focused on that position from the other authors.

While offering different views on the subject they address, the authors adopt the common purpose of the book mentioned above, namely to demonstrate unity, to shore up evangelicalism, and to navigate their differences as they claim a common name (17). When a brother uses the label *fundamentalist* and adopts a common ecclesial cause with men, who at best neglect biblical separation and at worst repudiate fundamental doctrines, he necessarily mitigates those convictions and neglects these doctrines. It is a disturbing reality of our postmodern world that this can be done while advocating what Dr. Bauder calls “separation over separation” (38-40). Dr. Mohler’s confusion is understandable, when he writes: “Perhaps I misunderstand how this principle [separation over separation] would operate, strictly applied, but I think I have observed enough to know that some fundamentalist leaders might even charge Kevin with violating this principle by participating in this project” (55).

One underlying assumption of the book’s method is the existence of a basic commonality among the four authors and the positions they advocate, which is divisible into sub-categories by features that are less important.

Said differently, the book’s title is not *One Theologically Correct and Three Theologically Deficient Views of Evangelicalism*. The reader must conclude that such a title would have been inappropriate for what is being attempted here. Therefore, the book communicates that Drs. Bauder and Olson are the same in a major sense as evangelicals, and distinguishable in a lesser sense as components of evangelicalism’s spectrum.

This eclectic and irenic nature of the book’s methodology introduces a political regulatory principle to the task of answering already politically-sensitive theological questions, which often tempts the authors away from a thorough-going scriptural treatment of the task at hand. Anecdotal evidence suggesting this can be found in the book’s Scripture index (217). Of the roughly seventy-five Scripture references included in the book, twenty-five of these occur in the introduction to the book, and forty-four occur in Dr. Bauder’s first chapter defining fundamentalism. The remainder of the book’s eighteen major sections utilizes only a handful of passages, and often in only an incidental way. Argumentation based on history, logical analogies, and personal experience provides the basis for many of the book’s theological conclusions, not a careful exegesis of relevant texts.

Dr. Mohler’s appeal to the difference between the historical, phenomenological, and normative senses of evangelicalism (70-74), his reference to set theory as the key for understanding “evangelical identity” and its boundaries (75-77, 95), his *triage* analogy for identifying varying levels of importance among Christian doctrines (77-80), and his personal experiences with the Southern Baptist Convention, the *Evangelicals and Catholics Together* effort, and the *Manhattan Declaration* (80-86) illustrate this characteristic of much of the book. Consequently, conclusions formulated this way lack the authoritative force of *Thus saith the Lord*. Although this approach is often informative and enlightening, it suffers from a deficit of scriptural authority.

Tone

Four Views on the Spectrum of Evangelicalism is a book about ecclesiastical separation, and anyone familiar with this doctrine in a biblical sense understands the importance of tone to this category of theology. Related New Testament teaching came to local churches on what may have been tear-stained parchment bearing messages written from passionate hearts jealous for the care of God’s people (2 Cor. 11:2). Jesus used one tone when dealing with the false doctrines of the Pharisees (Matt. 23:1-36), and another when restoring Peter from his errant failures (John 21:15-23). We would have a very different picture of our Lord were the tones He struck on these occasions reversed. The tone of the authors often signals weakness in their positions.

For example, Dr. Bauder’s advocacy of fundamentalism begins the book with a distinctive tone.

With his coining of the terminology, “cryptozoology of the theological world,” he manages to describe the evangelical-world’s view of his position in a way none of his evangelical co-authors seem willing to. With blushed face he apologizes for his position’s failure to produce “a critical history of fundamentalism.” Ashamed he admits, “Nor is any sustained, scholarly, theological explanation of core fundamentalist ideas available” (19). The apologies are so sweeping, each requires a footnote explanation that attempts to disallow reasonable exceptions to his claims.

Bauder explains fundamentalism’s primary motive (unity and fellowship of the church) only after first correcting mistaken past views of his movement (that the purity of the church was primary) (21). He then explains the importance of *gospel* to this unity and fellowship (23), before lucidly and dispassionately explaining why a fundamentalist is a unique kind of evangelical. He correctly explains that Roman Catholicism “is a system of religion that mixes faith with works in the application of salvation” (31), and that confusion created by efforts, like the *Manhattan Declaration*, is “alarming” (33), but he is careful to temper these critical remarks by admitting, “Traditionally, its [Roman Catholicism’s] view of God and its understanding of the person of Christ are correct” (33).

More passionate is Dr. Bauder’s criticism of what he calls hyper-fundamentalism. He condemns utilization of the King James Bible as the only acceptable English version as *anti-biblical*, whereas fundamentalists with a correct view of preservation have understood historically that misunderstandings in this area are misguided attempts to defend the inerrancy of scripture. He mentions that loyalty to organizations and leaders is a bane of hyper-fundamentalism, whereas fundamentalists who remember the relationship between Paul and Timothy are more careful about not being ashamed of their spiritual heritage (43; 2 Tim. 1:8).

Dr. Bauder claims that association should not be a consideration related to separation, and then with a sweeping *ad hominem* pronouncement he declares that the movement does not receive criticism well (43). With these four the reader is only half-way through the comprehensive list of ills so troubling to this one who claims to write for the cause of fundamentalism. Anti-intellectualism, rabbit trails, involvement in politics, and backstabbing round out the list (44). The editor, Dr. Naselli, must have been truly grieved as he read this lobbing of “verbal grenades,” as I was, but evidently not grieved enough to object to their publication here (208).

Conclusion

A number of troubling conclusions reached in the book cannot be addressed comprehensively here. Some of these are quite sweeping. For example, the apostle Paul mentions *gospel* as one of three core doctrinal concerns of the faithful separatist (2 Cor. 11:4), and there are negative consequences for regarding it as the only one (Bauder, 23). *New Evangelicalism* is propped up as the savior of American Protestantism from intellectual obscurantism and cultural disaster, and this misunderstanding of the disastrous consequences that the movement has brought to Christ’s church borders on revisionist history (Mohler, 50). The idea that religious dialogue between Christians is never “a bad thing” and that it ought to happen between both Christians and the world’s religions expresses the ecumenical liberalism fundamentalists once passionately opposed (Olson, 184). The book is a sad example of this kind of dialogue.

Perhaps the most damaging conclusion to fundamentalism, a theme that runs throughout the contributions of Drs. Bauder and Mohler to the book and is best expressed in the book’s final chapter, is that there should be a convergence of fundamentalists with confessional evangelicals in spite of their differences regarding separation over separation. Dr. Naselli explains: “In a broad sense, this book presents two views on evangelicalism rather than four. Views 1 and 2 (fundamentalism and confessional evangelicalism) are close to each other as are views 3 and 4 (generic and postconservative evangelicalism), and the distance between views 1-2 and 3-4 is significantly greater than between views 1 and 2 or 3 and 4” (214).

While this conclusion may be true in regard to some areas of theology, it is not so in regard to the Bible’s teaching regarding separation over separation. Here there is great distance between view 1 on the one hand, and views 2, 3, and 4 on the other. Fundamentalists, of course, have seen this conclusion before with Jerry Falwell’s publication, *The Fundamentalist Phenomenon*. The leaders of our movement identified that drift as pseudo-fundamentalist, and our ministries and institutions profited from their courage. Today calls for a new courage from us not only to theorize about, but also to practice separation over separation. May God find us faithful.

Reference

¹ *Four Views on the Spectrum of Evangelicalism*, by Kevin T. Bauder, R. Albert Mohler Jr., John G. Stackhouse Jr., and Roger E. Olson, edited by Andrew David Naselli and Collin Hansen, published by Zondervan Press, 2011.

COME CHECK OUT THE IBFNA WEBSITE!
<http://www.ibfna.org>

Here you can find important information regarding the IBFNA along with an archive of *The Review*.

Independent Baptist Fellowship of North America
523 East Godfrey Ave.
Philadelphia, PA 19120

“FOUND FAITHFUL”

1 CORINTHIANS 4:2

MOREOVER, IT IS REQUIRED IN STEWARDS THAT A MAN BE FOUND FAITHFUL.

IBFNA FAMILY CONFERENCE WILL BE HELD

JUNE 18 - 20 2013 AT

THE FARMSTEAD INN -- SHIPSHEWANA, INDIANA