

# STRAIGHTWAY

*And straightway they forsook their nets, and followed him [Mark 1:18].*

## CHRISTIAN PURITIES FELLOWSHIP

The Witness Outreach of Foundations Bible College  
P.O. Box 1166 · Dunn, North Carolina 28335

VOLUME 37

MARCH/APRIL 2009

NUMBER 2

### **The End-time Orwellian State and Political Correctness: An Antichrist Primer—Part Two**

Dr. H. T. Spence

In our previous *Straightway* article, we presented the historical background and philosophy of the quest for human “utopia” by men such as Cain, Nimrod, and later, Plato in his work *Republic*. In the last four hundred years, there has been a philosophical and ideological proclivity to sway the populace toward a dependence upon not only a state-controlled government but also, eventually, toward a global one. The twentieth century brought the powers of socialism and communism to the forefront in many countries; these countries were governed through the will

of an individual or an elite, all-powerful body of rulers. Literary writings have increasingly called for all mankind to submit to its societal unit, government, or State. Several of these literary writings have become the blueprint for that which we are presently confronting today, as evidenced in our own country’s ever-escalating submission to greater Federal control of its citizens. Such a view began in the days leading up to the Civil War when the Federal powers pressed to overthrow and control the individual states’ rights and powers. This oppressive ruling power is seen today

*This edition includes a second article*

**The End-time Powers of “Religious Correctness”**

through numerous incidents of the Federal government overturning in the “federal” court system what the individual state courts have passed.

When Plato wrote the *Republic*, some critics declared that men would not tolerate such control of their lives; they also observed that the only way such a government could succeed would require either deception or force. Communism has used both tactics in its conquest of other nations and their governments. When deception failed, they forced upon the people their own philosophical belief. Today, to help bring America under Washington’s control, the manipulative “political correctness” ploy has become the aggressive weapon infiltrating every facet of society. We are on the threshold of such political correctness pressing and molding us for a coming one-world government to be controlled by the man whom the Bible calls Antichrist.

In philosophy the term that designates this centralized power that

governs and controls a people is called the *State*. Let us consider briefly the *State* in philosophy.

### **The Subtle Philosophy Of Control**

The German philosopher Georg Hegel (1770-1831) taught that universal reason reaches its height in a society of free individuals, *each subordinating its individual reason to the universal reason*. In Hegel’s thinking, the individual, if living by himself and exercising his own mind, is not free. Only as he blends himself with the group does he attain to true freedom. Hegel held that history has been striving throughout time toward the realization of a perfect state, a state in which each member so blends himself with the whole that *the will of the whole is his will*. For Hegel, there is a *universal reason* to be discovered throughout history. This reasoning is seen working itself out in one society and then shifting to another. Thus, when one society destroys or conquers another, this universal reason shifts to another group and continues to work itself out. The conqueror becomes the agent of this universal reason. War, therefore, is justified in Hegel’s mind because it is the means by which progress is made.

The communist planners Karl Marx (1818-1883) and Ferdinand Lassalle (1825-1864), along with other early socialists derived certain beliefs from Hegel, especially the idea that *change is but the road to better things*. (This has been the cry of our present

## **STRAIGHTWAY**

O. Talmadge Spence, Founder

H. T. Spence, Editor  
President

Foundations Bible College  
P. O. Box 1166  
Dunn, NC 28335-1166  
800-849-8761

[www.straightwayonline.org](http://www.straightwayonline.org)

---

Provided free of charge but  
contributions are welcome to assist  
with postage and printing.

Administration in Washington.) They held that one type of society that appeared good at one time would inevitably give way to another which would be seen to be better; in essence, a synthesis of opposites. Thus a society based on private property would give way to one in which socialism was supreme. They saw in Hegel a philosophical justification for the new society, which they desired.

When Friedrich Nietzsche (1844–1900) came to prominence in philosophy, he had no use for equality or anything that suggested democracy, and certainly not a Republic. The “will to power” was his dominant idea. In the struggle of the universe, this will to power is expressed; and the most powerful of wills wins and has the right to win. If others are weaker and are unable to survive, that is good, because the weak should be destroyed to make room for the strong. He recognized differences among men and believed that these differences should be magnified. The more powerful should rule, and the weaker should be ruled. Slavery seemed perfectly natural to Nietzsche; and he contended that women, being weaker than men, cannot be expected to have the same rights as men. Thus, he repudiated all that had been held by that long line of philosophers whose constant theme had been the equality of all men and the right of all to share equally in the goods of society. For Nietzsche, society is merely a field in which the strong have a chance to demonstrate their

strength and win their rewards, while the weak are defeated and dragged from the arena to be disposed of completely. To him, since inequality is characteristic of nature and the natural state of man, it is unnatural to replace it with a forced equality. This approach truly was the philosophical height of evolution.

One point of view is basic to the great mass of recent writings that deal with matters of the State. There are those who follow more or less completely the lead of men from Plato to Nietzsche holding that inequality is the natural state of man. Here, each member of the state must take his proper place in the social structure. These men argue that it is perfectly right and natural that some should be rulers and others should be ruled—that the ruled should not question the acts of the rulers. Such writers spurn democracy, socialism, and all other systems of human equality and freedom. Plato saw democracy as the open door to anarchy. He would prefer a philosopher-king as ruler and all others at their rightful places in a tightly organized system. Hegel carried this idea one step further when he held that certain states or groups of individuals were by nature superior to others and therefore should rule them. This, of course, is the basic point of view of all totalitarian systems of government. Hegel declared that only as the individual blends himself with the group does he attain to true freedom. History has been striving throughout

time toward the realization of a perfect state, a state in which each member so blends himself with the whole that the will of the whole is his will. The Hegelian system was adopted by the Prussian state, a former state in Northern Europe, that became a military power in the 18th century; this state eventually formed the modern German empire. Many Prussian thinkers held that the Prussian state was destined to carry forward the realization of universal reason through its eventual conquest of the world.

### **The Education Needed For Control**

To the extreme of the social emphasis in education are the writings of Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778). He held that society warps the child and that its influence is wholly evil. Consequently, he advocated protecting the child from society until he was so completely developed that society could not destroy his inner nature. In his famous book *Emile*, Rousseau outlines the education of a boy in a manner which is natural and spontaneous. Emile, the hero of the story, is to be permitted to develop in accord with his own nature, without interference. Education is protective, a means of shielding the child from the influence of society (and religion) which warps the natural growth of his real self. He believed that the child should be able to do anything he wants to do, with no moral restraints—that he should not be taught about God, the Bible, morals, or anything of the

basics of society. He must be free to do whatever he wants: *freedom* was Rousseau's watchword. Out of this was born the "child-centered" schools. All instruction began with those things in which the child was interested, and moved along as his interests grew.

Educators have supported different presuppositions concerning education. However, they generally fall under two fundamental principles: the control of society or the control of nature upon the child. Which of these should dominate? Should education be a matter of building citizens according to a socially accepted and determined pattern, or should it be a following of the inner nature of the child? Here again was the age-old problem of the individual and the group. Which should dominate? Whatever the ideological foundation, both were strongly against religion and the concept of God being taught to the child.

Johann Gottlieb Fichte (1762-1814) approached education from the point of view of the state. During the 1808 French occupation of Berlin, one of the darkest moments in the life of the Prussian state, he arose to deliver his famous *Addresses to the German Nation*. In these speeches he argued for group unity and social solidarity in order to create a new and strong nation. As a basis for this unity, he advocated a strong system of education which would mold the people into a whole. Education, for him, was to be a means for building a

nation, a state, and populace molded to the ideals of the State.

In contrast, Wilhelm August Froebel (1782-1852) believed firmly that the nature of the child was good and that it should be allowed to grow naturally. Education for him was a process of permitting and making possible this natural growth of the child. Froebel went further than Rousseau in that the child is not merely an individual but also a member of a group. The child must be educated to accept the values of society.

It is the belief today that the State should have absolute control over all education and that the fundamental purpose of education is to train and mold individuals into service and submission to the State. The whole totalitarian educational system in Germany, Italy, and other totalitarian states is of this nature. It is controlled completely by the State, and no one is permitted to do or teach anything except that which will contribute to the building of citizens who will devotedly serve the state in obedience to the will of its ruler.

We continue to witness the powers of the Federal government increasing its control over education to such a proportion that we could see before the end of this present Administration in Washington the outlawing of both private and home schools. This move would attempt to remove any educational approach independent of the State's philosophy. More and

more, through subtle inroads of deceptive manipulation, the Federal government is making mandatory requirements that eventually will eradicate such schooling. If the State views *all* forms of education under their protective canopy, this could eventually include Sunday schools associated with the Church. These too would be viewed aversive to the State. Harbingers of such changes can be seen in the present Administration's desire to force all schools to be accredited by the Federal government.

How will such a takeover in education begin? Will it be through the Federal governments overseeing its need of "national security"? Will this security include the need of the State observing the curriculum to see if anything is being taught that would be against the political correctness of the State? Could such intrusion come through a threatening disease that will necessitate the closing down of schools by the State for health security reasons? In return, to reopen the schools, would new guidelines be implemented with a personal physician appointed to regularly give examinations? Would this then include privately questioning the children periodically on how the home and school are handling discipline and moral situations? All of these scenarios have already been discussed at length by our government. If it becomes law for all schools to become accredited, such accreditation could be forced under the guise of

“quality education,” with guidelines implemented that will make sure political correctness will be the presupposition of all the curriculum taught. Will all forms of education be forced under the canopy of the State in order to control what is being taught? Will this include the subtle closing down of all church schools by implementing taxes on the school itself, and no longer viewing such a school as part of the Church? Thus, with taxes becoming such a burden, will smaller schools no longer be able to stay in the business of education? Yes, the talk behind closed doors is already well under way for the changes to come soon, very soon.

### **The Powers Of Political Correctness**

The concept of “political correctness” is that weapon by the State and the media of our times that seeks to restrict any alternative of expression other than that which is presented by the controlling power. It is clearly evident in our day and time that political correctness will only tolerate those viewpoints that are likeminded, and it definitely will not permit room for any expression of thought that is contrary to the accepted view of the State. This “correctness” has stepped forward as the watchdog to declare what ideas are “correct” and those designated “incorrect.” Then through intimidation or “public policy” it tries to quell and suppress what it deems as the incorrect. This forced and often intimidating ideology comes across

with the belief that such restrictions of speech are for the good of society. It is promoted to be that which eliminates prejudice.

Jerry Adler noted the following in “Taking Offense” (*Newsweek*, December 24, 1990):

[It is not] enough for a student to refrain from insulting homosexuals or other minorities. He or she would be expected to ‘affirm’ their presence on campus and to study their literature and culture alongside that of Plato, Shakespeare and Locke. This agenda is broadly shared by most organizations of minority students, feminists and gays.

In the workforce today, if one goes against political correctness, often he is required to take “sensitivity training” provided either by the company or the school. Such training seeks to correct the thoughts and ideas of the offending individual. The true agenda of such sensitivity training is the reorientation of the individual to the mass’s definition of political correctness.

At this point in America, an individual can be taken to court for an *action* he has committed against the law. However, we are already crossing the threshold where a person could be taken to court for his *thoughts* or for his conscience. He could be imprisoned for not “thinking” right according to the State or for having a conscience educated differently. Such a man will be forced to take “sensitivity training” classes to

reeducate his conscience and thinking in order to “conform” to the thinking of the Political Correctness. It is one thing to “tolerate” the existence of an evil that the State has legalized; it is another thing when we are forced to believe and acknowledge that that sin or immorality is “all right.”

In 1979, Ray Bradbury published the book *Fahrenheit 451*. Within the Afterword of his book, these words appear:

The point is obvious. There is more than one way to burn a book. And the world is full of people running about with lit matches. Every minority, be it Baptist, Unitarian, Isis, Italian, Octogenarian, Zen Buddhist, Zionist, Seventh-Day Adventist, Women’s Lib, Republican, Four Square Gospel, feels it has the will, the right, the duty to douse the kerosene, light the fuse. . . . Fire-Captain Beatty, in my novel *Fahrenheit 451*, described how the books were burned first by minorities, each ripping a page or a paragraph from the books, then that, until the day when the books were empty and the minds shut and the libraries closed forever.

One may wonder why Bradbury gave such a title to this book: It is at 451 degrees Fahrenheit that paper burns! Of what was Bradbury so afraid? It was his prediction that there would come a generation that would burn books in order to conceal the truth.

We are now feeling the powers to suppress thoughts and words before they can be spoken or

written. In recent years, there has been *only* one book banned by the Federal government in all its schools throughout America—the Bible. It is abhorred more than any other book. This one book is against the political correctness of the State, including its immorality. Therefore it is banned not only from schools but also, in spirit, from all society.

With the greater empowerment of political correctness in the last 100 days, we must prepare for what is ahead. We will see political correctness vastly increase in the public (or more appropriately, “government”) schools, the private workplace, and even the churches of America. Often coming in the guise to quell various forms of discrimination, to the contrary, it has become strongly discriminatory and censorial to anything that challenges government social policy.

Though political correctness began within the colleges and universities in America, it has spread through the public media in its various forms. Once any group takes the helm of political power to the exclusion of others, whether that group be carrying a swastika, a hammer and sickle, a peace symbol, or a Bible, then the nonconformists become outcasts and outlaws. Both speech and behavior in America’s general culture are now being placed under the scrutiny of political correctness. Free speech will go quickly in our country in the near future. Any form of expression that is viewed by political correctness as insulting or provoking violence on the

basis of race, color, creed, religion, gender, or lifestyle will be silenced.

May God enable us to keep biblical truth as the powers of political correctness endeavor to forcefully pull us away by threatening our jobs, our positions in life, our acceptance in society, or our very physical bodies. The Bible predicted such days would come; we must be ready to face whatever the cost may be. May God help us in the hour of testing to be “biblically” correct rather than “politically” correct.

**Seventh Annual  
Foundations  
Marriage Conference**

*July 25*

**Tenth Ladies Prayer  
Fellowship**

*August 7-8*

**INMEDIATAMENTE**

Straightway is now available in Spanish – [www.straightwayonline.org/es](http://www.straightwayonline.org/es)

**MARCH/APRIL  
“SERMONS OF THE MONTH”**

SERMONS FROM THE FOUNDATIONS PULPIT  
FOUNDATIONS BIBLE COLLEGIATE CHURCH

DR. H. T. SPENCE, PASTOR

*(January 2009)*

- 1. Arise, Go Over This Jordan*
- 2. The Need of a Canaan Life in 2009*
- 3. Canaan: A Land of Bounty*
- 4. Canaan: A Land of Triumph*
- 5. The Christian Experience in Canaan*
- 6. The Crossing into the Canaan Life*

---

6-Sermon Set (Audio CD): \$16.00 + s&h  
Foundations Ministries • P.O. Box 1166 • Dunn, NC 28335  
800-849-8761 • [www.foundations.edu](http://www.foundations.edu)

**Foundations Ministries**  
**Twenty-seventh**  
**Men's Prayer Conference**

**June 4-6, 2009**

Note that the Prayer Conference is one week earlier this year.



Theme:  
**"Daniel: For Such a Time As This"**  
(Daniel 12:9)

Dr. O. Talmadge Spence, Founder

Dr. H. T. Spence, President

Dr. Dennis Lowry, Vice President

**Meals & Lodgings Hospitably Rendered**

# The End-time Powers of “Religious Correctness”

Dr. H. T. Spence

There are two approaches that must be taken concerning this subject of “religious correctness.” One is from the perspective of the State and the other from the perspective of the Church. In both categories the remnant of Christ living on the earth today will find itself isolated from society and the public church unless it is willing to conform to the “religious correctness” designated by each.

## The State’s View of the True Remnant

There is a growing hatred throughout the world for the concept of a fundamentalist. Before observing society’s view of the fundamentalist, we must with candor declare what a fundamentalist is. Basically existing in all religions, the term *fundamentalist* simply designates an individual who desires to get back to the *fundamental* principles of his religion. The synonymous term *radical* reflects this desire to return to the “root” of a belief system. Thus, amidst the changes in principles and practices of a religion, there is always a remnant within who calls its members back to the “root” or the “fundamentals” of that religion.

Therefore, a *Christian Fundamentalist* is one who desires to get back to the fundamentals of the Christian Faith. He is the genuine Christian; while others have changed and distorted the Christ of Christianity, he has not. The noted liberal Kirsopp Lake wrote in his book *The Religion of Yesterday and Tomorrow* an acknowledgment that Fundamentalism must be viewed synonymously with orthodox Christianity:

It is a mistake, often made by educated persons who happen to have but little knowledge of historical theology, to suppose that Fundamentalism is a new and strange form of thought. It is nothing of the kind: it is the . . . survival of a theology which was once universally held by all Christians. . . . The Fundamentalist may be wrong; I think that he is. But it is we who have departed from the tradition, not he, and I am sorry for the fate of anyone who tries to argue with a Fundamentalist on the basis of authority. The Bible and the *corpus theologicum* of the Church is on the Fundamentalist side.

The fact of the matter is that in our time the root or the original is not desired by society. Mankind is tired of the old; it is looking with eagerness to a *new* thing. Even the contemporary church hates the old paths of Christianity and is longing for some *new* doctrine and way of living.

## The State’s View of the Fundamentalists

Fundamentalists have now been labeled as the troublemakers within society. The words of Ahab have become the State’s consistent charge against the

Christian: "Art thou he that troubleth Israel?" (I Kings 18:17). The saints are always viewed as in the wrong. It is always the Christian who turns "the world upside down" (Acts 17:6, 8); they are the ones who always "do exceedingly trouble our city" (Acts 16:20). Our beloved Lord was accused of sedition. The first Christians were called "enemies of the human race." All manner of evil is said against them falsely. King Ahab only spake "after his kind." He saw that Elijah had been instrumental in bringing down the drought and the terrible famine which accompanied it. He never paused to ask why Elijah prayed for a drought. The herald is often accused of causing the war; this same charge with the same irrationality and perversity is proclaimed today. If John the Baptist comes neither eating nor drinking, they say, "He hath a devil." If the Son of man comes eating and drinking, they say, "Behold a gluttonous man and a winebibber." If we pipe, they will not dance; if we mourn, they will not lament (Matthew 11:16).

In response Elijah went on to say, "I have not troubled Israel, but thou, and thy father's house" (I Kings 18:18). There is no trace of fear in these words by the prophet. The truth has nothing to fear. The trouble and suffering of the world spring out of sin, out of forgetting and forsaking God. If men leave Him out of their thoughts and lives, their sorrows will be multiplied (Psalm 16:4). The French Revolution shows the result of the negation of God. Communism and Nihilism do the same. "There is no peace to the wicked." When the State turns away from God, it will begin accusing the saints for the problems that come. History has proved this to be consistently true.

The bombing of the World Trade Center, along with the deaths of the Branch Davidians by the Federal agents in Waco, Texas, provided the materials for the media to make synonymous *fundamentalists* and *cultists*. The media worked society into a frenzy convincing us that these lunatics should be locked up or somehow restrained. The media labeled these lunatics "fundamentalist" consequently suggesting that any type of fundamentalist was "politically incorrect." When abortion clinics were bombed or burned down, the fundamentalists were blamed. The term has been carefully brought to the forefront suggesting it to be the core of society's problems. The rejection of Christianity continues to grow in our America. To be a Christian, especially a Christian Fundamentalist, is to be stigmatized with a religion of evil.

It is clearly evident that the vast majority of those who control the mainstream media in our country are zealously against God; secular humanism is the norm of that which dominates the newsgathering crowd. Political correctness has made it so that Christians remain the only group that may be publicly defamed with impunity. Have we observed the labeling powers used by the media and the government in describing Christians? Terms like "sectarian," which the dictionary defines as "a narrow or bigoted person," are

used with regularity. Even the United States Supreme Court has used the term synonymously with the word “religious.”

One of the most powerful assaults to date against Christianity and the home has been the rise of sodomy in its homosexual, lesbian, and pedophilia lifestyles. The blatantly offensive book *After The Ball: How America will Conquer Its Fear and Hatred of Gays in the 90's*, written back in 1989 by two sodomites, Marshall Kirk and Hunter Manson, presents a strategy to promote the homosexual lifestyle. There are three areas these authors propose to overcome the nation's view of the threat of homosexuality. The first strategy attempts to *desensitize* American society through consistent media promotion of the sodomite lifestyle. The common maxim “familiarity breeds contempt” may not always be true; rather, it is often true that “familiarity breeds tolerance.” The second strategy is *jammings*, or the forcing of a good concept upon an evil concept to make it more palatable to society. For example, rather than call themselves *sodomite*, they adopt the term *gay* to suggest carefree, abandon lifestyle. This is the identification of what you think is good with something that is bad. In contrast, those who are against their lifestyle are called “homophobic,” which simply is a man hater. They will endeavor to make the Christian belief negative in the sight of society. Concerning their third strategy *conversion*, they noted the following:

By conversion we actually mean something far more profoundly threatening to the American way of life. We mean conversion of the average American's emotions, mind, and will through a planned psychological attack in the form of propaganda fed to the nation via the media.

We are seeing these powers taking hold in TV programs overtly promoting this ungodly lifestyle. More and more the public, government schools are implementing “sexual diversity training” as an effort to force the students to accept sodomy as an equal lifestyle. Anyone who goes against it, and especially Christians, will be viewed as mean and hateful. This form of “political correctness” is out to destroy traditional values, morals, and principles forcing the Christian not only to tolerate the evil lifestyle in others but also to force him to declare that he will accept it as good.

The list of such sins of political correctness is ever growing: sodomy in all of its forms, abortion, transsexualism, transvestism, and all aspects of fornication. The Christian will be hated; the Bible that condemns these evil lifestyles will be banished from society, and all coming judgments upon the earth will be blamed on the Christians. Perhaps this will be the reason so many will be killed in the future. We must remember that John the Baptist was decapitated because of his stand against the immorality of the State's dictatorial king and his mistress. We must also remember that Paul was beheaded by

the State for the preaching of the Gospel. And Christ was crucified by a collaboration of both the State and the established religion of the Jew.

Only those who join the liberal and modernistic concepts of Christianity, only those who capitulate to the Neo-Christianity and *tolerate* the ungodliness of the State, and only those who will join the ecumenical, universalism Christianity will escape the wrath of the State. And eventually the State will finally turn on all religion, just as the Beast devours the Harlot riding its back in Revelation 17. We have observed recently how Rick Warren, a guru of the worldly Mega Church movement, was called upon to give the opening prayer for President Hussein Obama. But when the pressure came upon him from the gay community for supporting traditional marriages in California, he turned and publicly went on record as tolerating and permitting it. Yes, all religions, including Christianity, will be forced by the State to accept all forms of sexual beliefs in their doctrinal faith.

### **Religious Correctness in Christianity**

Another “religious correctness” rising with authoritative power is found within the camp of Christianity. Liberalism and Modernism are the “correctness” of belief in the world denominational systems at this time. Any puritan within its denominational ranks will be ostracized, intimidated, and maligned in character. If he refuses to bow and submit to the religious correctness of his denominational Church powers (the “religious State”), he will be so ill-treated by his superiors with the hope that he will finally submit to the established “correctness,” or he will leave the mother church.

As a young man in my early twenties within a religious system, I was told by its ecclesiastical leaders, “Don’t rock the boat . . . Don’t *you* think; you let us do the thinking for you.” Their classic words that resolved my heart to leave were, “If there is a difference between what the Bible is telling you and what your Church is telling you, you go with the Church.” Such a “religious state” knows how to squeeze its parishioners into the corrective mold. Martin Luther was told, “Who are *you* to question the Church?” Wrong, evil, and error refuse to be questioned. Ecclesiastial leaders may present a nice front on the stage of the conference convention, but will turn in anger when confronted with the Word of God. When leaders become unapproachable, an erosion of heart has already taken place. Slowly, but surely, the religious correctness begins to spread from one generation of leadership to another. When apostasy begins to malignantly breed in a system, there is no antidote for it; it is only fit for judgment.

Religious correctness made its enveloping influence within Neo-Evangelicalism almost immediately at its birth. The subtle, critical approach to the Bible, the desire to broaden the base of “faith” acceptability through

ecumenicity, the open acceptance of contemporary musical sounds and rock music, the decline of standards in dress in order to be received by the world, the theological concept of the Charismatics and their religion built upon existential feelings, etc. all have become a part of the “religious correctness” of our present Christian time in the evangelical world. Neo-Evangelicalism has now come heart to heart with the Charismatic movement. Charismatically owned TV networks have developed warm fellowship with Neo-Evangelical ministries, an integral part of those networks. Perhaps the only religious exercise those ministries do not participate in is speaking in tongues; nevertheless, they are part and parcel of the Charismatic crowd. Contemporary personalities such as Charles Stanley, Robert Schuller, Jack Van Impe, David Jeremiah, and John Ankerberg have no distinction from most of the Charismatics. Back in the latter part of the 1960s, Billy Graham’s participation in the dedication of Oral Roberts University became the prophetic event that told of the coming together of Neo Evangelicalism and Charismatism for the future. This is now part of the “religious correctness.”

Sadly, a “religious correctness” is coming into Fundamentalism. As any “correctness” concept has a growing dislike for those who do not line up with their “correct” thinking, certain actions are inevitable. Denominational leaders and leaders within independent movements tend to respond the same way. There is a spirit and mood that takes over when ecclesiastical powers of influence in leadership become a part of an individual’s ministry. When changes begin to take place in the leadership, in the ministry or its music, its dress, or its course of vision, there is a line that is crossed in the heart. Beyond that line the individual will no longer accept any questioning of what he has done. Anyone who stands in his way will be “blackballed,” will be removed from the inner circle of fellowship, will be talked against, written against, and looked upon as one who will not line up with the trends of the flow. Such “religious correctness” does not care any longer what is done to remove the hindrances and those who voice concern.

Once there are enough personalities and ministries who begin thinking the same pragmatic way, the “religious correctness” is formed, the mold is poured, and all within that fellowship must yield to that correctness. “This is the way we do things; this is the path we have chosen to survive.” “Our forefathers may have done it a different way, but this is the way we are going with it, whether you like it or not.” “If you are not with us in these methods or manner, then we count you as against us.”

What we condemned twenty years ago when Jerry Falwell called himself a *Neo-Fundamentalist*, we now believe to be the appropriate term for the new generation of Fundamentalist leaders. This is “religious correctness.” The blogs are now commending what was once condemned. What was once

declared as “contemporary music” is now accepted. And anyone who will declare otherwise will be labeled as a hindrance to the way Fundamentalism now needs to go. The language is slick, the changes are subtle, and eventually the line of demarcation between Fundamentalism and Neo-Evangelicalism will be erased. Where we once condemned dialoging with the enemy of Liberalism, we now are told that such methodology with the Southern Baptist big boys and the leadership of Neo-Evangelicalism is all right. To win them we must become more like them in our programs, our music, our conventions, and our professionalism toward spiritual things. Yes, the religiously correct way is to present our Bible Conferences and prayer sessions like them. “This is the way it is done, and this is the way you will do it if you are going to be with us.”

## **Conclusion**

When we begin to see happening in the independent ministries of Fundamentalism what happened in the denominations from which we came, it is an alarming sadness to the heart. The voices left within Fundamentalism today that are calling us back to the Bible and back to our honorable legacy are being shunned and isolated from the fellowship of the mainstream. For it seems that what would be viewed as the mainstream of Fundamentalism has over the past twenty years slowly left its divinely appointed course and craftily rerouted itself into the “religious correctness” of the Neo Christianity. The days of powerful preaching, which were marked by honorable stands against the apostasy and clear, pulpit warnings against what was potentially creeping into the house of Fundamentalism, have become a distant memory. When we begin to hear the preaching becoming more generic, when certain subjects are not religiously correct to be dealt with, when we are told in the back offices, “Don’t deal with this in your preaching,” and we live as if the changes don’t exist, we have entered into our own “political correctness.”

The sons of the forefathers have now come to age in leadership. The influence of precious veterans of the spiritual battles of the past has now been silenced. A new breed has come with their new voice, their new heart, their new terminology and vocabulary, their new way of preaching and building of ministries, and their new way of interpreting the Bible. The days of the rough prophets have past; we now are in the days of the polished, non-offensive, smooth delivery of a mutating gospel which is having less and less resemblance to the Gospel preached in former days. A new template of what is correct is now being thrust upon us.

My father, Dr. O. Talmadge Spence, stated years ago, “When prophets are no longer stoned, prophets are no longer prophets.” May God keep the remnant of voices, who may be accused of “rocking the boat,” true to the old, tried path, even if it is not “religiously correct.” Their voices are our only hope for biblical revival before the coming of the Lord.

**Christian Purities Fellowship**  
P.O. Box 1166  
Dunn, North Carolina 28335

NON PROFIT ORG.  
U.S. POSTAGE  
PAID  
DUNN, NC  
PERMIT NO. 26

**ADDRESS SERVICE REQUESTED**