



IBFNA

December 2016

Volume 25, Number 2

THE REVIEW

America's Last Best Hope: The Church of Jesus Christ

By Dr. Charles L. Dear, Moderator IBFNA

By the time you read this article, we will have concluded the most horrific election contest seen in a lifetime. There will be many political casualties and parties licking their wounds for weeks and months to come, but the greater damage will be found in the hearts and minds of regular American citizens who have been dispossessed of the historically Christian character of the most unique nation on earth. Though imperfect, it is a nation that has made greater progress in its short period of existence (240 years) than any other nation on earth.

Some will measure the cost of this contest in the millions of dollars spent, but too few will recognize either the current moral temperature of our people revealed in this election, or the coming further marginalizing of Biblical Christianity among our people. Just the prolonged exposure to rhetoric and lies that have inflated distrust and deepened suspicion and division has taken its toll. Perhaps the most expensive outcome will be the further entrenchment of those who would like to see our nation abandon its founding Christian principles, become completely morally relativistic, and ultimately self-destruct. "Some trust in chariots, and some in horses: but we will remember the name of the LORD our God" (Psalm 20:7).

"Government is not the solution; it is the problem." - Ronald Reagan

As government increasingly seizes power in every aspect of our lives, it has made everything more difficult, expensive, and ungodly. Our increasing dependence upon government intervention and programs is not without consequence. It is the path to slavery and loss of all the freedoms purchased at great expense by our forefathers. Even with the possibility of a change in national leadership to something more conservative, the last eight years have moved the ball of liberalism so far down field that it is unlikely we can undo all the damage done and recover many of the freedoms frittered away. Indeed, government is not the answer our world needs.

"Our Constitution was made only for a moral and religious people. It is wholly inadequate to the government of any other." - John Adams

Cultural changes hold no better solutions to preserve our freedoms than do failures in government. The entertainment world has been the foremost catalyst for corrupting young minds, destroying morality, glorifying perversion, and coarsening everyday



INSIDE PAGES

3

BRIEF HISTORY
PART 4

7

ACCC ON NEW
CALVINISM

Membership &
Subscription:

IBFNA

523 E. Godfrey
Avenue

Philadelphia, PA

19120-2123

(215) 887-4844

www.ibfna.org

speech and behavior. We have fallen into a state of lawlessness, where everyone does that which is right in his own eyes (Deut. 12:8; Jud. 17:6), which is a recipe for chaos and violence. Without moral moorings, neither government nor culture offers any hope of recovery.

We have not been able to educate ourselves out of the failures of corrupt government and declining culture. We now have a system of public education, from pre-kindergarten through college, whose curriculum militates against Christianity. Intimidation of students and parents seeking education outside of the government-controlled monopoly is common. Public education is far more an ally of government than a supporter of the family.

So are the churches in our nation doing any better? The best answer is that it depends on what is being done in a church. So many churches are little more than a reflection of the changes described above with religious trappings. For example, the complete acceptance of homosexuality can be seen across the spectrum of mainline denominations. Nor have the cults raised their voices against government intrusion, cultural decline, or educational failure.

So what have we done to stand firm and guide our people through this minefield? Looking back to the election, how did we help our people see this not so much as a matter of politics and philosophical differences as another choice that needs to be evaluated in the light of God's Word? Have we equipped them to deal biblically with the issues raised by such a contest? We might be surprised to find that some of our people actually think socialism is an acceptable alternative to biblical capitalism, because they have come to rely more on the government and its programs and less on God and His Word.

How many compromised and/or contemporary pulpits have grown silent on the subject of a biblical work ethic in the midst of a welfare culture? Do we as separatists and fundamentalists think we are immune to such temptations to avoid certain issues because they would stir up controversy within our congregations? Serious charges, no doubt, but who among us would not agree that people would be better equipped spiritually had their pastors boldly preached the truth as it is in Jesus and persistently proclaimed the great doctrines of the faith (Eph. 4:21)?

To do less is spiritual treason, because we have betrayed the trust of our people and the mandate of our Lord if we fail to faithfully proclaim the whole counsel of God (Acts 20:27). Likewise, those ministries betray the purpose of the church as the pillar and ground of the truth (I Tim. 1:15), by feeding their people psychobabble instead of the Scriptures.

Furthermore, have we lost our voice to speak truth to the powers of government, be they local, state, or national? I think of our spiritual forefathers, like Isaac Backus, who in 1774 was sent by the Warren Association of Baptist Churches in Massachusetts to Philadelphia to appeal to the Continental Congress for religious freedom and relief from oppression on behalf of New England Baptist Churches. Still, our focus should not be confronting government representatives directly as much as it should be teaching the people in the pews biblical principles that they should employ to elect and vote for those who best share those principles.

One of the messages I recently preached in anticipation of the election was "Speaking Truth to Power" from the book of Daniel. While the phrase in modern times was co-opted by the Marxists, it was ably demonstrated by Daniel and his friends as they took a stand for what they believed before the most powerful king in that day.

There are two very important principles evident in their testimony in the midst of a heathen society bent on erasing everything they knew and believed. These were in opposition to Babylonian idolatry and heathen culture: (1) a settled conviction of what is right and practicing it by being obedient to Jehovah God according to His Word; and (2) a willingness to bear bold and unflinching testimony to those convictions in the midst of a hostile and alien society, no matter what the cost.

Daniel's principles were not just a difference in opinions, nor were they a subject for debate. They were rather a difference that contrasted sharply with the folly of a heathen religion practiced by a heathen ruler and nation.

"A murderer is less to fear." — Cicero

Consider what Cicero said over 2000 years ago about treason and betrayal:

A nation can survive its fools, and even the ambitious. But it cannot survive treason from

within. An enemy at the gates is less formidable, for he is known and carries his banner openly. But the traitor moves amongst those within the gate freely, his sly whispers rustling through all the alleys, heard in the very halls of government itself. For the traitor appears not a traitor; he speaks in accents familiar to his victims, and he

wears their face and their arguments. He appeals to the baseness that lies deep in the hearts of all men. He rots the soul of a nation. He works secretly and unknown in the night to undermine the pillars of the city. He infects the body politic so that it can no longer resist. A murderer is less to fear.

A Brief History of Fundamentalism – Part Four

By Pastor Kevin Hobi

By 1929 at the age of 47, J. Gresham Machen had served the Lord on the faculty of Princeton Seminary for 23 years. That spring semester would be his last. Three months prior to his withdrawal from Princeton to form Westminster Theological Seminary, Machen gave the following exhortation to his students:

You will have a battle when you go forth as ministers into the church. The church is now in a period of deadly conflict. The redemptive religion known as Christianity is contending, in our own Presbyterian Church and in all the larger churches in the world, against a totally alien type of religion. As always, the enemy conceals his most dangerous assaults under pious phrases and half-truths. The shibboleths of the adversary have sometimes a very deceptive sound. "Let us propagate Christianity," the adversary says, "but let us not always be engaged in arguing in defense of it; let us make our preaching positive, and not negative; let us avoid controversy; let us hold to a person and not to a dogma; let us sink small doctrinal differences and seek the unity of the church of Christ; let us drop doctrinal accretions and interpret Christ for ourselves; let us look for our knowledge of Christ, not to ancient books, but to the living Christ in our hearts; let us not impose Western creed on the Eastern mind; let us be tolerant of opposing views."

Such are some of the shibboleths of that agnostic Modernism which is the deadliest enemy of the Christian religion today. They deceive some of God's people some of the time; they are heard sometimes from the lips of good Christian people, who have not the slightest inkling of what they mean. But their true meaning, to thinking men, is becoming increasingly clear.

Increasingly, it is becoming necessary for a man to decide whether he is going to stand or not to stand for the Lord Jesus Christ as He is presented to us in the Word of God.

If you decide to stand for Christ, you will not have an easy life in the ministry. Of course, you may try to evade the conflict. All men will speak well of you if, after preaching no matter how unpopular a Gospel on Sunday, you will only vote against the Gospel in the councils of the Church the next day; you will graciously be permitted to believe in supernatural Christianity all you please if you will only make common cause with its opponents. Such is the program that will win the favor of the church. A man may believe what he pleases, provided he does not believe anything strongly enough to risk his life on it and fight for it ["Dr. Machen's Lecture to His Students at Princeton Seminary, March 10, 1929, Three Months Before His Withdrawal," Carl McIntire Manuscript Collection, box 263, folder Machen, J. Gresham (1 of 2)].

Machen described his day as a period of conflict between Christianity and "a totally alien type of religion" that was calling itself *Christianity*. Although Machen was never fond of the term, the Christians engaged in that battle were called *Fundamentalists*. In this series of articles, we began with the roots of this conflict in the American Church. 19th century evolutionary approaches to biblical criticism and a socialist and pragmatic ecclesial mission gave birth to an alien religion under the guise of Christian nomenclature ["A Brief History of Fundamentalism—Part One," *Review* (February 2015)].

Over time four identifiable responses to this modern apostasy from orthodoxy have emerged

from Christian fundamentalism. Mainline fundamentalism (1880-1930) was the first response. As a battle strategy from within the camp, it failed to win the war and save the mainline denominations, in part because it depended heavily on political power and public support ["Part Two," (May 2015)].

Some exceptional men ministering during this period, the Baptist Oliver Van Osdel and the Methodist Arno C. Gaebelein among them, understood that true scriptural obedience in this conflict requires ecclesiastical separation. They were the proto-separatists ["Part Three," (February 2016)].

The second identifiable response to apostasy happened when the separatist convictions of these fore-runners took hold more broadly in American Protestantism, what may be correctly called *separatist fundamentalism* (1930-present). This article will recount some of the history of this second response, a time when men like Machen withdrew from apostasy to form their own denominations, schools, mission agencies, and, where necessary, local churches in obedience to the Bible doctrine of separation.

The third response, New Evangelicalism (1940 - present), and the fourth, New Fundamentalism (1970 - present), come after this second response. What they have in common is a desire to rebalance and moderate the response of the original separatist, the one who, in Machen's words, believed "strongly enough to risk his life on it and fight for it."

Our survey of the fundamentalist history of this second period will touch on three separatist movements that originated in the 1930's: (1) the Independent Fundamental Churches of America, a largely non-denominational effort; (2) the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, a Presbyterian effort; and (3) the General Association of Regular Baptist Churches, a Baptist effort.

The Independent Fundamental Churches of America (IFCA)

The February 1930 issue of the *Moody Bible Institute Monthly* asked a question that had been on the hearts of many fundamentalists for years, "Has the time come for Fundamentalists to promptly and literally obey the emphatic commandment given to believers in 2 Cor. 6:14-18; Eph. 5:11; and 2 John 9-11?" The IFCA remembers its founding as an affirmative answer to that question [<http://www.ifca.org/site/>

[cpage.asp?cpage_id=140043237&sec_id=140007594](http://www.ifca.org/site/cpage.asp?cpage_id=140043237&sec_id=140007594); accessed 11/25/2016].

The early impetus for what became the IFCA was a fundamentalism expressed primarily as non-denominationalism. In March of 1923, the *Arnolds Park Bugle* (Arnolds Park, IA) announced three sessions to be held at the local high school at the invitation of Dr. Robert Lee Kirkland, "to keep alive an interest in the community church question."

Dr. Kirkland, who hoped to plant a nondenominational church in this community, explained the nature of the church planting effort he had undertaken: "The world is getting sick and tired of old methods and is universally asking for the restoration of the church of the New Testament, which recognizes that all [Christian] men are brethren and that no man can set a personal standard for the conduct of another."

The new church hosted a pastors' fellowship in its summer-only wooden tabernacle building in September of that first year, for the purpose of mutual encouragement among men interested in avoiding denominationalism and the problem of modernism that went with it. The result was the American Conference of Undenominational Churches.

Soon, the Lord brought other good men to the ACUC, including some Congregational fundamentalists from the Midwest. Dr. William McCarrell was a Moody Bible Institute graduate called to minister at the Morton Park Congregational Church in Cicero, IL in 1913. Upon arrival he found a church with only 19 members and 6 children that was able to pay its new pastor a mere \$5 per week.

The denominational fathers refused to ordain the young pastor because he had not been educated at an authorized Congregationalist school. Worse yet, the Illinois State Congregational Conference would later pass a resolution to unite with Universalists in the state. That proved to be the breaking point in what had been a tense relationship between this church and its state convention, and McCarrell became one of ten pastors to lead their churches out of the denomination. The church eventually changed its name to the Cicero Bible Church.

In the same year of their departure from Congregational apostasy, Cicero Bible Church hosted the 1930 convention of the ACUC. It was then that the organization's name was changed to the IFCA and its

purpose honed more specifically toward separatist fundamentalism. A resolution titled “Biblical Separation” (1977) articulates well this founding tenet of the IFCA’s original stand for Christ:

WHEREAS, there have been widespread current trends in evangelism on a national level which invite cooperation with non-fundamental persons and organizations and encourage participation in alignments and practices inconsistent with our doctrinal stand and separatist conviction; and

WHEREAS, the Constitution and By-Laws of the Independent Fundamental Churches of America clearly state that Ecumenical Evangelism and New Evangelicalism are movements contrary to faith in that they seek to promote the Gospel by bringing fundamentalists into an unequal yoke with theological liberals and/or Roman Catholics and other divergent groups; and

WHEREAS, these efforts are further characterized by an attempt to accommodate Biblical Christianity and make it acceptable to the modern mind,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that we, the members and delegates of the 48th annual convention of the Independent Fundamental Churches of America meeting at Winona Lake, Indiana, June 25-July 1, 1977, inform and warn our constituency of churches and organizations, that participation in the trends described above and continuation in the same is out of harmony with the Constitution and By-Laws of the Independent Fundamental Churches of America and inconsistent with the standards for membership in this organization.

Early leaders of the new separatist group included J. Oliver Buswell, President of Wheaton College. The new statement of faith pronounced clear affirmations of cessationism and personal separation. In 1942 the IFCA joined other fundamentalist groups as an early part of the newly formed American Council of Christian Churches.

The Orthodox Presbyterian Church (OPC)

The OPC (originally named the Presbyterian Church of America) was founded in 1936 after years of theological battles within Princeton Seminary and

the Presbyterian Church USA. The most recent of these battles had been led largely by J. Gresham Machen with the help of one of his leading young students, Carl McIntire. One author credits this leadership with “setting the mold for the fundamentalist movement”:

“To the five doctrinal fundamentals and the de facto sixth—militancy in expression—they added the seventh, ‘second-degree separation,’ meaning cutting their churches off not only from non-Christians and theological liberals but also from all those fundamentalists who would work with non-Christians and nonfundamentalists” [Markku Ruotsila, *Fighting Fundamentalist: Carl McIntire and the Politicization of American Fundamentalism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2016), 32].

Mainline fundamentalism had fought apostasy in the Presbyterian Church USA since the early 1890’s, when the Presbytery of New York acquitted the notorious Union Theological Seminary professor, Charles A. Briggs, calling for the “peace and quiet of the church” [Brad Gsell, “Presbyterianism and the Reformed Faith: A Historical Background,” *Redeeming the Time*, Vol. 7, No. 2 (Spring 2015), 8].

In 1922, the apostate Baptist pastor of New York’s First Presbyterian Church, Harry Emerson Fosdick, preached the message, “Shall the Fundamentalists Win?” Heeding his call to battle the following year, 1,293 Presbyterian leaders signed the Auburn Affirmation, declaring that the five fundamentals of the faith affirmed by the denomination were mere theories. Tolerance for these doctrinal corruptions at Princeton and on the mission field led ultimately to the obedient separatist stand taken by Machen and his followers.

The General Association of Regular Baptist Churches (GARBC)

Four years prior to the formation of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, the General Association of Regular Baptist Churches was formed as the successor of the Baptist Bible Union, a mainline fundamentalist group that had sought to do battle royal against modernism in the Northern Baptist Convention. Our own IBFNA traces its heritage to these roots. Localized and state-wide separatist associations had been organized among Baptists for some time throughout the 1920’s.

Nationally, however, a splintered mainline fundamentalism was the only response to date to apostasy among northern Baptists. The Fundamentalist Fellowship of the Northern Baptist Convention, a moderate group lead largely by J. C. Masse, often undercut the efforts of the Baptist Bible Union for reform, efforts led by men like T. T. Shields, W. B. Riley, and Oliver Van Osdel. But even within the Bible Union itself there was tension. Important leaders like Riley opposed “come-outers” like Shields and Van Osdel. The inadequacy of Riley’s approach became very apparent when he was scheduled to share the platform with the modernist Fosdick at the 1930 annual convention of the NBC in Cleveland, Ohio. An Ohio newspaper from across the state reported the following in anticipation of the spectacle:

The appearance of the names of Dr. Fosdick and Dr. Riley upon the program is, nevertheless, taken as an indication that there has been a drawing together of the breach which for some years has existed in Baptist, as in other Protestant denominations, between those holding to a rigid orthodoxy and the more liberal theologians [*The Hamilton Evening Journal* (March 20, 1930), 2].

Eventually, men with separatist convictions had had enough of the compromised approach to reform. At the 1932 meeting of the Baptist Bible Union, the delegates voted to change their name to the General Association of Regular Baptist Churches, and the following year the new group found an able leader in Robert T. Ketcham. It would take another five years, but eventually the constitution of the GARBC recognized the inevitable and forbade its member churches from “fellowship or cooperation with the Northern Baptist Convention and/or its auxiliaries” [Kevin Bauder and Robert Delnay, *One in Hope and Doctrine: Orgins of Baptist Fundamentalism 1870-1950* (Schaumburg, IL: RBP, 2014), 260].

Observations

To these early separatist responses could be added that of the Southern Methodist Church and others that came later. Although diverse in their denominational distinctiveness, separatist fundamentalists held common convictions that instruct us with at least three important lessons today.

First, we learn from these early separatists that a passion for a separatist response to modernism

should always be an expression of one’s passion for building Christ’s church. The obedient separatist maintained a jealous love for both the protection and edification of the flock of God (Acts 20:29-32, 2 Cor. 11:1-3). The early leader of the IFCA, Dr. William McCarrell, stood uncompromisingly for truth, and he did so while faithfully and sacrificially pastoring his church for 45 years. The year before they hosted the founding IFCA meeting, God had blessed the Cicero Bible Church with a new building that could seat 1,400 people. Separatism was a first-order concern, but it was not the only concern of these ministries.

Second, the *Moody Monthly* article referenced by the IFCA’s founders asked the right question. When it comes to responding to modernism within Christianity, obedience requires more than politicized efforts at reform; it requires costly separation. The article asked, “Has the time come for Fundamentalists to promptly and literally obey the emphatic command given to believers?”, which question raises another, “When was it ever not the time to promptly and literally obey an emphatic command given to believers?” Denominational politics will always fall short of an obedient response to modernism. Failing to understand this from Scripture is a waste of time, a squandered blessing, and dangerously disobedient.

Finally, the obedient separatist response to modernism always has required what is often today called *secondary separation*. As Machen called his students to battle, he warned not only of the corruption of modernism, but also of the compromise of neutrality. He counseled, “Of course, you may try to evade the conflict. All men will speak well of you if, after preaching no matter how unpopular a Gospel on Sunday, you will only vote against the Gospel in the councils of the Church the next day; you will graciously be permitted to believe in supernatural Christianity all you please if you will only make common cause with its opponents.”

None of these early separatists was ever under the delusion that it was possible to separate from modernists without also separating from otherwise good orthodox men who refused to do so. Secondary separation, in this sense, is nothing new. It has been part of the separatist’s responsibility from the beginning (2 John 7-11), and it explains why it is that these movements would in unison forcibly reject the third response to apostasy a decade or two later, the New Evangelicalism.

The New Calvinism

A 2016 Resolution of the American Council of Christian Churches†

In September 2006, Collin Hansen reported for *Christianity Today* on a new religious movement of professed Christians who took a renewed interest in Reformed theology. At that time, Hansen called the movement “Young, Restless, Reformed” (YRR), but later, he termed it “New Calvinism” and claimed that it was a “revival” of biblical Christianity.¹ By 2009, *Time Magazine* declared New Calvinism to be one of the “10 Ideas Changing the World Right Now,”² and since then, the movement’s popularity has increased. All of this success seemed to validate Hansen’s claim of another spiritual awakening.

Hansen’s three adjectives (“Young, Restless, Reformed”) provide a rather fair description of this movement, and one adjective in particular explains its popularity. Even though most YRR leaders are age fifty or above, New Calvinism is mostly comprised of young adults in their twenties, thirties, or forties, as can be seen in two of the most popular YRR expressions: The Gospel Coalition (TGC) and Together for the Gospel (T4G). To an extent, the movement can also be called *Reformed* in that its constituents are, at a minimum, committed to the five points of Calvinism (TULIP) and appreciate the works of deceased Calvinists like John Calvin, Jonathan Edwards, or Charles Spurgeon.

“Restless” though is the key descriptor of this movement, and it shows why New Calvinism is so popular. New Calvinism is restless in that it is dissatisfied with the godly standards and confessional theology held by previous generations of Calvinists. It is known for being culturally progressive and flaunts itself as such. In its worship, preaching, and evangelism, New Calvinism embraces popular culture, a man-made system of customs which is incapable of bearing the weight and gravity of the Gospel.³ TGC authors, in particular, blog about “redemptive” elements they supposedly have found within Hollywood films, and YRR evangelists in the vein of Tim Keller (TGC cofounder) integrate pop culture in their community outreaches,⁴ hoping to gain a better hearing from their unregenerate audiences. YRR leaders also endorse “worship music” composed by modern, pop-rock hymnists⁵ and “holy hip-hoppers” / “Reformed rappers.”⁶

Pop culture, a vital YRR ingredient, is one of the many characteristics which differentiates New Calvinism from godly Reformed movements, past and present. New Calvinism also refuses to adhere strictly to biblical truths expounded in the confessions and catechisms of historic Calvinism. Unlike most professed Calvinists since the sixteenth century, a number of New Calvinists push beyond the standard creeds and subscribe to Neo-Kuyperian postmillennialism, an eschatological position which claims that God has given His Church an institutional social mandate to redeem culture and promote social justice to help usher in the kingdom.⁷ Unlike the Puritans and Reformed fundamentalists who affirmed chapter four of the Westminster Confession of Faith and the London Baptist Confession of 1689, New Calvinism embraces theistic evolution or joins hands with those who do.⁸ Likewise, in direct defiance of chapter one of both confessions, New Calvinism’s large umbrella⁹ includes non-cessationists.¹⁰ Furthermore, John Piper, the designated “father” of the YRR, has distorted Scripture, the Westminster Shorter

Catechism, and the works of Jonathan Edwards to promote a brand of hedonism that makes God’s glory contingent on man’s pursuit of pleasure.¹¹

Finally, New Calvinism differs from traditional Calvinism in that it refuses to separate from heretics and disobedient Christians. Keller has affirmed Roman Catholic mystics such as Ignatius Loyola, Saint John of the Cross, and Saint Teresa of Ávila.¹² Ligon Duncan and Al Mohler (TGC members and T4G participants) both signed the Manhattan Declaration which affirms that Evangelicals, Catholics, and Eastern Orthodox leaders are all “Christians.” Mohler also had Billy Graham (an ecumenical evangelist) conduct a crusade in Louisville, KY in 2001, just four years after Graham publicly declared that some Muslims, Buddhists, and non-believers who do “not even know the name of Jesus . . . are saved.” Just this year at a “Christian” social justice conference,¹³ Russell Moore (TGC) spoke alongside a Roman Catholic priest (Michael Louis Pflieger) and a progressive “Evangelical” (Tony Campolo), who accepts “Christian gay couples into the Church.”¹⁴ Piper has likewise shared Passion Conference platforms with Beth Moore and Christine Caine (charismatic women “preachers”), and affirmed the ministries of Rick Warren, Daniel Fuller, and Mark Driscoll.¹⁵ Indisputably, the parameters of “Young, Restless, and Reformed” are not sufficient grounds for obedient Christian fellowship and cooperation. Like the New Evangelicalism of past generations, today’s New Calvinism lacks purity protected by a Bible doctrine of separation.

Therefore, the American Council of Christian Churches at its 75th annual convention, October 18-20, 2016, at Faith Baptist Church of Kittery, Maine, resolves to exhort all believers in our Lord Jesus Christ to beware of the leaven of New Calvinism. While some of the writings of New Calvinists can be appreciated with caution, Christ’s people should rebuke and separate from the movement. New Calvinism is a truncated form of traditional Calvinism, syncretized with deviant doctrines and worldliness. Spurgeon, Edwards, and the apostle Paul would not recognize this movement as a revival of biblical Christianity. Finally, we affirm the words of Peter Masters, the current pastor of Spurgeon’s Metropolitan Tabernacle, who said: “You cannot have Puritan soteriology without Puritan sanctification. You should not entice people to Calvinistic (or any) preaching by using worldly bait. We hope that young people in this movement will grasp the implications of the doctrines better than their teachers, and come away from the compromises.”¹⁶ ††

† The resolution is presented here with permission from the ACCC. The IBFNA is a constituent group of the ACCC.

†† Space restrictions preclude listing the extensive footnote matter included in the resolution. The resolution, complete with its footnotes, is available at the ACCC website, www.accc4truth.org.

Independent Baptist Fellowship of North America
523 E. Godfrey Avenue
Philadelphia, PA 19120-2123

COME CHECK OUT THE NEWLY UPDATED IBFNA WEBSITE!

WWW.IBFNA.ORG

Here you can find important information:

Conference information

Review archive

Regular Baptists for Revival archive

Mission statement

Audio of past conferences

Resolutions

Our history

Articles of faith

Constitution

Contact information