

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 39

JANUARY/FEBRUARY 2011

NUMBER 1

The Postmortem of Historic Fundamentalism Part One

Dr. H. T. Spence

We have entered another year in the twenty-first century, and it is taking us further away from the marked presence and influence of Fundamentalism of the previous century. The 1999 World Congress of Fundamentalism gave concerned evidence of crucial changes that have now come to pass. The present generation of professing Fundamentalism, knowing nothing of Historic Fundamentalism, only experiences a new Fundamentalism that is a product of compromise and corrupting change. The former line of separation between true Fundamentalism and Neo-Evangelicalism has now

been erased. One may enter a Fundamentalist church now and find it comfortably taking no stand against the apostasy, evidenced by its contemporary music, its “up-to-date” Neo-Christian Bible versions, and its casual dress standards. Although the message from the pulpit may be “evangelically” sound, it is generically constructed to be non-offensive and acceptable to any independent or denominational church, possibly even some Catholic churches.

The terms *Fundamentalist* and *Evangelicalist* have so long now been considered synonymous, it is

This edition includes two articles on
The Postmortem of Historic Fundamentalism

now convenient to cast aside the word *Fundamentalist* altogether and embrace *Evangelicalist* as our only identification.

The Postmortem of Fundamentalism

It is the purpose of this *Straightway* issue to give a “postmortem” of Historic Fundamentalism. Some may not agree with the fact that the public message of Historic Fundamentalism is dead. They would rather believe that it simply has shifted emphasis and vision to accommodate the Postmodern era, since (they conclude) all movements must adapt to changing winds and tides to keep afloat. Nevertheless, it must be acknowledged again that the leading voices and schools of Fundamentalism have changed and blended their allegiances with the Neo-Evangelicals in all aspects of professing Christianity. For the enemies of our former leaders, the present generation of Fundamentalism crafts a clever defense. We are now persuaded that the former generations

“misunderstood” these enemies—that they could not see that we all were of the same heart and mind.

Contemporary Fundamentalism now freely introduces us to the frontiers of compromise that the Neo-Evangelicals pursued during their decades separate from Fundamentalism (beginning in the late 1940s). The Neo-Evangelicals are opening their hearts to us, seeking a “spirit of reconciliation” between the once separated movements. It is not that they have changed in any way. While what was once written against them by a former generation of leadership in Fundamentalism remains firmly true, it is also evident that they have deepened in their apostasy. This new breed of Fundamentalist leadership has secretly admired and embraced Neo-Evangelical literature, music, and church-building techniques; they now are ready to become a part of that stream of major Evangelicalism. This Evangelical persuasion is more accepted by the world because it has so much of the world within its system. For the most part present-day Fundamentalism is tired of the battle against the apostasy, believing it is a major part of the rejection by the Church world. Thus the very word *apostasy* has become conspicuously absent in their conferences, their schools, and in their allegiances.

Oh, what will the “postmortem” of Fundamentalism reveal? What diseases laid hold on its life to bring

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

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

its public demise? Is there any hope of another movement that God will raise up to preserve the Truth in this End Time of the Last Days to take the place of fallen Fundamentalism? What term should be used now since the term *Fundamentalism* is now being assimilated into Evangelicalism? These are all very important questions that must be addressed at this critical hour of what we believe to be the final church age before the coming of Christ for His saints.

Decades of Warnings

As Neo-Evangelicalism boldly left the Fundamentalist movement in the late 1940s, there were a number of voices almost immediately rising within the ranks of Fundamentalism to warn its own constituents of the potential infiltration of the Neo-Evangelical philosophy. They sounded the alarm that such thinking and carnal approaches to “Christian” living could invade the God-appointed movement of Historic Fundamentalism and bring its downfall, even though the Neo crowd had departed. Most of the alarms went unheeded and, consequently, today we have crossed the point of no return. How often we have referred to the following warning of history itself: any movement of God will be *Bible-based* in its first generation leadership; *neutrality* will plague the second generation leadership; *compromise* will take hold of the third; and, *apostasy* will be the final poison to take hold of the movement in the fourth generation leadership.

Dear reader, we are there; we are well into the fourth generation leadership. The only antidote of hope is for the remnant to look to God and His grace, Word, and Spirit as to what we now must do.

The Warning Against Secular Acceptance

What have been these warnings? Neo-Christianity declares that if we are accepted by the world and its standards, then God is with us. How sad it is that the Fundamentalist universities, in their slick, promotional magazines, always present their faculty and students receiving “secular” awards or secular promotions and accolades as if the Christian must strive to be accepted by the world’s standards. God did not give us our talents and abilities to use in promoting the world and its secularism. There has also been a pressing for Christian school leaders and teachers to attend “secularist” universities to secure a degree that will give greater “clout” to the school before the world. We have lost the insight that the Christian is *not* in competition with the world; the world’s education and true Christian education are on two different roads, leading into opposite directions, with two different goals for education. To force our students to believe we are in competition with the world’s educational system is to destroy biblical Christianity in their lives. These leaders and teachers graduate “*mistrained*” rather than “*untrained*,” taught that the secular

way is compatible to true Christian philosophy. The product of such so-called “Christian” training will not make the student a strong Christian; rather he will be more of an “accommodating” Christian with the world. I have seen in my travels throughout the world that such graduates from Fundamental schools are destroying the “harvest” rather than helping the harvest. They are spiritually weak, compromising, and again, accommodating to the world.

The Warning About Our Dress

Another warning that was given to Fundamentalism throughout these recent decades concerns the fashion of dress. Our schools used to have dress standards that “adorned” the doctrine of Christ. But now there is little difference between the dress on the “Christian” campus and that of the secular schools. At one time pants were not permitted on the young ladies; but then it was permitted in the dorms, then in physical activities, then any place on campus, and now such attire is permitted downtown. Shorts have become the norm of dress for both men and women in the sports arena. Another intentional change has been the “casual” attire for worship. It is non-offensive to the world. Even the publication covers of Fundamental music have inaugurated the “casual” posture for the young men: no tie and casual clothing. What started all of this? This “look” came from Neo-Evangelicalism which adopted it from the world. They

wanted “the look” to blend in with the world—a gospel that is non-offensive.

There is also a dialectic application concerning the principles of dress: I have seen youth groups representing Fundamental schools getting out of their “official” school vans with sloppy and casual dress that is an insult to the testimony of Christ. Then, for their Sunday “performance” there was a little more conservative look accompanied by their plastic smile and watered-down testimony. This is *not* historic Fundamentalism.

The Warning Against Hatred of Separation

How often faculty and staff members of Fundamentalist colleges and universities have told us that they are not permitted to use words such as *apostasy*, *separation* or other terms of former days of Historic Fundamentalism. Such words and concerns are viewed as the “unsaid” words. Biblical Separation now is merely a historical truth of the former Fundamentalists. Harold Ockenga, reputed to be the coiner of the term “Neo-Evangelicalism” and a father of the movement, observed that the difference between Fundamentalism and Neo-Evangelicalism is the difference between *separation* and *infiltration*. Today, contemporary Christianity boasts of Hollywood stars or professional sports heroes who profess to be Christian. Such a person seems to make God greater in the contemporary Christian world’s

eyes. Years ago when conservative Christianity was biblically based, such individuals would leave such a profession knowing that one could not be a professional in such a context and still be a Christian. The compromises that such a person would have to make would not permit such duplicity. What grief came to the remnant a few years ago when the picture of Magic Johnson was cited on the front cover of the *BJU Review*. This man, with all of his deplorable living, was given front cover among professing Fundamentalism. What dialectic Christianity does such a picture promote among the weak, shallow teens?

The banner of “ecclesiastical separation” has now become a forbidden phrase. Years ago, faculty members of Fundamental schools were writing books against the Southern Baptist Convention and other apostate denominations. Yet now we are hearing of SBC ministers and teachers being the guest speakers at Fundamental churches, schools, and conventions. We are inviting the enemies of God and their subtle ploys of compromise to come among us as men of conquest. Are they secretly laughing at us as we are being drawn and enamored by them? It is evident they are marching into our schools and conferences and being accepted as our future hope. These modern-day Gibeonites have stolen our hearts and minds; we have accepted them as “bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh.” The Neo crowd has no

problem with conservatives joining them as long as they become a part of the Neo thinking and manner. While the theater, dancing, and drinking were shunned in the past as destructive vices, we now are witnessing such on Fundamental campuses.

The Warning Against Positivism

Popular maxims and slogans made by the Neo-Christianity twenty years ago that were condemned by our leaders are now being quoted by our present leaders to promote the need of change and crossover. Some fifteen years ago in a regional Congress of Fundamentalists where my father and I were among the guest preachers, all of us were told by the host pastor in his office that we were not to deal with any issues of controversy, but simply be positive and “preach Christ” alone. This was stated more than one time in private meetings of the Congresses throughout the last decade of Fundamentalism in the twentieth century. My dear father was told before he spoke at the World Congress in London, in 1990, that he was not to deal with the controversy of Jack Hyles. All of this reminded me of the ecclesiastical leaders within the denomination; they muzzled the preacher if his words were contrary to the political correctness of the church. The last words I heard from an ecclesiastical leader within the denomination we left were, “If you believe that the Bible contradicts the denominational policy, you must submit to the denomination.” Many

would not have been that bold, but such committed leaders believe the principle of the statement.

Though many Fundamentalists dare not claim the title “Protestant,” especially our Baptist brethren, yet every Christian must be a “protester” to the apostasy and worldliness. We all must still “protest” the Roman Catholic Church, although such a stand is becoming less and less popular in the Evangelical camp. We must still protest the cults, including Mormonism. Has the popular conservatism of men like Mitt Romney and Glenn Beck caused a greater leniency toward this cult?

We must remember that the Gospel has both its positive and negative side, and both must be preached in balance. Like the rose on its stem, Christianity with its message of grace would cause many to be attracted to it; however, such a fragrant message would ultimately destroy it. God has placed thorns on this rose stem to protect the grace message, “teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world” (Titus 2:12). Biblical Christianity demands Biblical Separation, even to the point of separation from disorderly brethren. There is no true Gospel being preached without the God-appointed protection of biblical separation.

How often we hear preachers say, “We are to simply preach Christ and Him crucified.” Such a statement

is their way of demanding that we are to stay away from any stand for Christ and His Word, simply keeping the message objective, not personal. But where is this statement found in Scripture? It is found in First Corinthians 2:2, “For I determined not to know any thing among *you*, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified.” Here, the apostle Paul was writing to a very carnal and worldly church, and to this church (“you”) the message of Christ’s crucifixion was needed. It was the message of the crucifixion of the world and of the flesh. If such men who limit this statement would truly preach the truth of this phrase, they would strongly be condemning the world and the flesh that have become the master powers of the institutional Church today. How regularly is this passage taken out of its biblical context?

While the “love” of God has taken center stage in the proclamation of the Gospel, the justice and judgment of God, the need of repentance and turning away from sin have been obscured. This will ultimately lead to Universalism—for God loves all, so “they say.” Yet His love does not save us; it is His grace. How often we are told that we must “bait the hook” in order to get people to come to Christ. Yet, Christ’s Gospel is fished with a bare hook; the individual must want to be caught and be told of what it will cost him to become a Christian. We cannot corrupt the message or falsify the message to get the fish. Converts must, through

God's drawing and godly sorrow working repentance, take the bare hook and become identified with the most hated person in history, the Lord Jesus Christ. The days of martyrdom are coming back, and the converts of our time must be ready to meet such days with Christ, with joy, and without compromise.

The Warning Against Numbers

An increase in numbers attending church today has been the great desire of Neo-Christianity. They do not believe in Christ's building His Church (Matthew 16:18) any longer, but in this Postmodern time God needs help from us. He needs our gimmicks, our programs, our buses, and our subtle tactics of deception to bring the people in. Compromise evangelism is the norm now and whatever it takes to "build" the church, the end will justify any means available. John R. Rice talked about the need of baptizing at least 300 a year in order to be a success. We are living in a competitive world, and it is evident that the church is in competition with the world to see who can draw the greater crowd. Such evangelical pressure has forced the evangelical world to accept rock music and all of the other styles of the world's music in order to accommodate the world's desire to attend the church.

The Warning Against False Teachers

We have been warned by God's men for decades of the rise of false

teachers from the outside and from within. In the early years there was the warning against Billy Graham and his subtle ways amidst his "evangelical" message. Through the years Mr. Graham has fallen deeper into the apostasy with the public declaration to Robert Schuller that even Buddhists and Hindus are in the Body of Christ. We were told by a former generation of Fundamental leaders that Mr. Graham was the greatest betrayer of Christ and His Gospel in the twentieth century. And yet there are those in Fundamentalism who believe he is a "Christian." If this were true, then we will have to declare that Judas will be in heaven, perhaps reversing Christ's anathema of His betrayer.

Our present day Fundamentalist students are being heavily drawn to men like John MacArthur and John Piper. Though for the most part John MacArthur presents a fundamental doctrinal message, his ministry is against biblical separation. John Piper is another minister that the Fundamentalist seminaries are permitting to be the "pied piper" of Christian Hedonism. The teachings of these men have become an infatuation to the young, immature student. It will be, at the beginning of the crossover, the more "conservative" Neo-Evangelicals, through their Bible teachings, that will sweep the students into the vortex of the Neo-persuasion. Once they leave the school and seminary, they *will* be Neo-Evangelical.

From conversations I have had with faculty in Fundamental schools, the percentage of their students drawn to the writings and theology of such men is staggering. It is evident that the schools have not dealt with Neo-Evangelicalism and its heretical teachings. The tentacles of this end-time heresy have now invaded the halls of learning in our seminaries, and the magnitude of its force of influence proves there is no turning back. Our schools are becoming the product of Neo-Evangelicalism without so much its being taught in the classroom, but simply by its not being dealt with at all.

I remember my years in several seminaries where the teachers, both in undergraduate and graduate studies, warned us about such men and their deceptive teachings. They warned us that these men pretended to be fundamental in their words and doctrine, but their practice was not of Scripture and amounted to a corrupting of the Gospel, producing another gospel. Just as our nation no longer has statesmen, our seminaries no longer have teachers who defy the popular and the invading enemies among their students. They are silent on the matters, and perhaps the school policy is to muzzle the teacher from saying anything. We have gone so long in being non-offensive that even the Devil in a few years may be accepted in the message of Universalism. We must even be careful in “quoting” from such enemies, even the so-called “conservative” ones, so that we do not

put them in an endorsing light; students most likely will take this “positive” view as an acceptance of the man.

Conclusion

The postmortem view of the corpse of public Fundamentalism proves that a number of spiritual, theological, and practical diseases have taken over the movement through the subtlety of leaders whom we trusted. They kept shooting the poison into the mainstream of this beloved movement with the intention of killing it or creating another movement. Though a large number of men left Fundamentalism back in the late 1940s and 1950s, there was a small group of like-minded ones that stayed in the movement. Over the years they have grown in number, talking behind “the barn,” or infiltrating the college classrooms with their teachings, and now they have become the majority of the movement crossing over into Neo-Evangelicalism.

In our next article we want to continue this postmortem autopsy and view with tears what has brought the public death of Historic Fundamentalism. [S]

Foundations Bible Collegiate Church

Sunday Services

Prayer, 9:00 AM, Bible Class, 9:30 AM

Morning Worship, 10:30

Prayer, 5:30; Evening Worship, 6:00

Midweek Service

Wednesday Evening Service, 7:00

The Postmortem of Historic Fundamentalism

Part Two

Dr. H. T. Spence

How often crucial moments come to a movement like Fundamentalism to test if it will be deterred from its appointed course. Although there were symptoms appearing in the 1970s when my dear father and I entered the Fundamentalist movement, it was not until the 1980s that such moments of concern became more and more evident. We had completely left the Pentecostal denominational system with its ecclesiastical leaders, its contemporary music, and its heavy leanings toward an existential Christianity. Sad to say, we began to see similar symptoms appearing in Fundamentalism. My father, who had been a puritan in the denominational system, knew that one could not purge an apostasy. One's only recourse is to make an exodus from the system and to begin again upon the Word of God.

It may be that all movements, amidst their strengths in God and His Word, have some weaknesses, even in their beginning. Apparently Fundamentalism, amidst its once strong ecclesiastical and doctrinal separation, was weak in personal separation. The places in the world their adherents attended for entertainment, their dress standards, cosmetics, jewelry, mixed swimming, and a number of other "personal" matters with the world and the flesh

were not consistently addressed in their public message. This became spiritually costly as the years unfolded. Such areas, we were told, fell under the label of "soul liberty." The sad reality of such a view is that if the "flesh" dominates the heart and life, then it will sympathize with the world, producing a message that tolerates the flesh and the world.

There were a few men I heard in those early years that warned us about such things, but it was not part of the public proclamation of Fundamentalism. Thus, the movement became vulnerable to these powers that eventually led to compromise with the world in music, dress, and casual lifestyles of the world. The forms of worldly music, the latest fashions of the world's "look," the world's colloquialisms, etc. all eventually became the enticing desire of most Fundamentalist young people. Even the entertaining programs of the world began to be brought into student activities, yet with a "Christianized" twist. It must even be acknowledged that some of the "traveling" church ministries inculcated programs and activities into their repertoire that were imitations of the secular TV shows, catering to the fleshly side of teenagers. Such gimmicks of comic and folly were part of their Gospel presentation. This

became a Gospel “dumbing down” parallel to the public school “dumbing down” we were decrying. Children’s church implied that worship was not a family matter; children were not to sing the traditional hymns and sit through a sermon in a formal manner. Therefore, today our churches are now witnessing the product of all those years: grown children with no more than a storybook knowledge of the Bible. As a result, Fundamentalist college students are so immature in their natural living, so immature in their creativity of things “for God,” and so immature in their concept of what a Christian is. We have let them dress “any-old-way” in coming to church or to church functions. They have become walking billboards for the world in clothing advertisement of secular names and logos. The Fundamentalist youth basically dress now as the world does; there seems to be no line of demarcation. We should have been setting the standard in spite of the world’s persecution, yet we have succumbed to their mold of dress. We have pampered them in being “cool” for God and “hip” for Jesus. They are now consumed in mental and emotional problems that deeper teachings could have remedied if presented in their earlier years.

As we view the sub-cultural youth of our society today, who will take leadership tomorrow? What we see in the secular world is paralleled in the institutional Church. The one-sided diet of evangelism programs has produced great deficits of spirituality

and depth of heart among these youth. They are now entering our pulpits with no deep relationship with God.

The Warnings of the Past Continued

Service to Christ presupposes that a person is genuinely born again and gives evidence of that conversion. Nevertheless, Fundamentalism began using people in its choirs, orchestras, music specials, athletic programs, etc. who were not saved or who did not have evidence of godly fruit. They were used in the church to “encourage” individuals toward Christian service rather than establish a standard for worship.

How often the contemporary comes into the vocabulary of young Fundamentalists and they are not corrected. The contemporary clichés have become a part of the vocabulary. “Jesus Christ is my coach now,” or “I found Christ to be my natural high,” or “Jesus is the Awesome of my life.” Such clichés demean our Saviour; they foster disrespect for God and make Him an alternative of the world, dragging Him down to the level of the world. Such clichés at times border on the side of blasphemy and even the risqué. We need to keep our language of God in the context of the Scripture, and if needs be, explain it.

Although Church history gave us a stronger, biblical view of “eternal security,” the twentieth century brought to Fundamentalism a new

view, producing a false assurance to such carnal living. The crucial view of the Elect was the perseverance of the saints, not simply that one “believed” sometime in the past. John 10:27 declares, “My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me.” Each of these verbs is in the present tense: they hear and continue to hear, I know and I continue to know, and they follow and continue to follow me. Anytime the command to “believe” on Christ is given in the New Testament, it is always in the present tense (continuing to believe), not the aorist tense (meaning once for all). John 10:28 also states, “And I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand.” It is to the *them* of verse 27 that such eternal life is given, for *they* shall never perish.

Today we are hearing more and more of a universalistic security being preached that is not biblical. Our forefathers were honorable in declaring the Neo movements within Evangelicalism as non-Christian, and not being true to the Word of God. But today, our present leaders are calling them “Christian” and fellowshiping such organizations. The Word of God becomes the litmus test of whether an individual or organization is truly Christian. Though John the Beloved gave us the truth of “Ye must be born again,” he also was the one who gave the test of whether an individual is born again (read First John 2:29; 3:9; 4:7; 5:1; 5:4;

5:18). Not everyone that says he is a Christian is one, and I must through the Word of God discern who is a Christian and who is a false one. In John 10 we are not only given the test of who is a true shepherd but also who are of the true sheep of Christ.

The Warning Against the Music

How often over the years the warning concerning the music has come from the preaching and pen of a number of men. My father believed that we had already lost the battle against Contemporary Christian Music in Fundamentalism. We were warned about Patch the Pirate music, Majesty Music, and now we have had a whole generation raised on this kind of music, and we are reaping a whirlwind. We warned in our own book of *Confronting Contemporary Christian Music* of the ethereal, surrealistic sound that had taken over Fundamentalist music; the men were sounding like women, and even the women had lost their quality, classic sound of days gone by. We were warned of the “easy listening” sound that was invading the Fundamentalist music fifteen years ago. Where did it come from? It came from the Neo-Evangelical sound. We warned of Ralph Carmichael and his music that already had plagued the Pentecostals, but there were young music teachers stepping forward with their recordings bringing Mr. Carmichael into the Fundamentalist music. This became a powerful influence in the years to follow. Bill Gaither and all of his

music had permeated the Pentecostal and Charismatic world; Southern Gospel music was the hallmark of the Pentecostals. But we were shocked after having left the Pentecostal movement to see leading Fundamentalist music teachers promoting this music. Bill Gaither's Homecoming videos and DVDs are in the homes of many Fundamentalists. Within their church hymnbooks you will find Bill Gaither, Dottie Rambo, and others who have lulled us into the contemporary sound.

We were told by Frank Garlock in the 1970s that the "music" is the message, and that the music of CCM was the music of the world. It does not matter what lyrics are placed with the music; the music is telling us something different than the "Christian" words. Even with Scripture placed to such music, it is still of the world. You cannot carry the ark of God upon the cart of the Philistines; death will ensue! How did we get to this point in Fundamentalism that most listen to contemporary music (and many do not know it is contemporary)? Oh, the plague in Christian schools of students filling their MP3 players with such music. Much of the music coming from the recordings of Fundamental quartets is filled with "the sound" of the world. Although some of it may not have the beat of the world, it often copies the "style" of the "Doo Wop" and other "sounds" of the world. This proves that even Fundamentalist music is fast

becoming entertainment rather than worship. "The Look" of the world has taken over, and "The Sound" of the world has become "trendy" in Fundamentalist music.

The years have proved that the pulpits of Fundamentalism and the colleges and universities did not deal with the music problem. There were those in the 1960s and 1970s that said something about it. But most preachers were ignorant of it and left it up to the "music" director to be the authority of what was right and what was wrong. The problem began when we trusted certain men to write our music; we trusted that they knew biblical philosophy for writing music; we trusted that they knew how to keep the world out of the music; we trusted that they would not slowly take us down the path of dialectically mixing the music. Yes, we trusted them; yet how often music composers "listen" to "new" music in order to get "fresh" ways of writing. The elasticity of their music begins to stretch more and more into the contemporary. This is like the realistic art teachers who keep calling the student from the real and eventually requiring him to draw the surrealistic and the abstract, giving argument to the innocent student that this will make him a better artist. Similarly, the music teachers ask the student to write music with certain styles just so he will be knowledgeable of them and to give him a broader perspective of the variety of musical styles. After all, the student is told, music is amoral.

When our Fundamental schools begin broadening the acceptance of various styles of music, it is the announcement that such styles are permissible for the Christian. When the male vocal ensemble Chanticleer came to Bob Jones University, there were a few students who were concerned and voiced their concern. Members of the group were clearly identified in the San Francisco Bay Area with the sodomite community. It was not the music that was the concern; it was the lifestyle of its members. When the group came and sang, when they provided a few private music lessons, what did this promote to Christian youth? Will any be influenced by the dress style and lifestyle of such a group?

There is also the promotion of Bluegrass music among the students in concert. Bluegrass pioneer Bill Monroe characterized his music as Scottish, blues, and jazz. He was inducted into the Country Music Hall of Fame, International Bluegrass Music Hall of Honor, and Rock and Roll Hall of Fame. This eclectic, dialectic style of music ought to inform us about this type of music. Though some may categorize Bluegrass music as folk or a “cultural” music, yet it is not a music that promotes the higher ideals for a life in God. The carnal man will flourish under such music.

Once the world is invited within the sanctity of God’s people, the accepted eclecticism will begin to

expand. We were grieved over the recent Valentine’s Day concert “Celtic Sounds: Songs of Love” given by the Academy of Arts at their Logos Auditorium in Taylors, South Carolina. It was promoted as a program featuring traditional Celtic classics as well as “gorgeous sacred love songs with a Celtic flare.” The secular group Celtic Woman has contributed to making Celtic music especially popular here in America. Although many today are enchanted with the pagan Celtic past, the music of these secular productions is more in keeping with New Age music. The entire production of the “Celtic Woman” from Ireland is with a mixture of past and present music.

To promote their imitation of Celtic Woman, the Academy of Arts placed on their website (as well as *YouTube*) their version of the 1988 pop song “The Orinoco Flow” by the contemporary artists Enya Brennan (music) and Roma Ryan (lyrics). Some of the words such as “hear the power of Babylon” were changed to “see the sights of Babylon.” The entire last section was revised with parts omitted or either reworded: no mention of Rob Dickins, Warner Bros., or Ross Cullum (all associated with the productions of Orinoco Studios) whose names are mentioned or referenced in the original text. The seven young ladies in the Academy of Arts music presentation certainly knew the stage manner of the “Celtic Woman” concerts. The song begins with a very heavy beat from the piano,

and then the orchestra brings in the full sound accompanied by drums—classic New Age styling. How is it that those who seem to have such great concern for the family do not discern this? “Fundamental” family movements such as Vision Forum have paved the way for a broader spectrum of accepted music for the Christian.

We need to ask the question, “Why are we teaching our Fundamentalist young people these songs, promoting New Age music?” I am being frequently asked about Jon Schmidt (a Mormon) and his “classic New Age” music. We ought to see that this “entertaining” music does not edify the Christian. If it is condoned for listening and performing, then it will become part of the composition for Fundamentalist music.

Such music has also been a part of the poison pumped into Fundamentalism to bring about its demise. It has become dialectic in substance now; its purity is gone; we are now heading into the fifth generation leadership, and they have no knowledge or memory of the purity of the past. The spirit of many today is the cry, “Good riddance.”

A final note needs to be observed in regard to the broadening scope of Fundamentalist music. For whom are we writing our music, and to what extent do we want to be accepted by the religious world? We were saddened by the fact that Dan Forrest, the Department Head

of Music Theory and Composition at BJU, has orchestrated a selection for the Mormon Tabernacle Choir. Dr. Ron Staheli, the head of Choral Music at Brigham Young University, requested Forrest to orchestrate Staheli’s “Carol of Joy” (text by Eileen Berry). National Public Radio presented this work on Christmas Day 2008. Mr. Forrest was also delighted that they sang his “Oread Farewell.” On his web blog, September 27, 2007, Forrest expressed the following:

In the last couple days, Dr. Ron Staheli contacted me and asked if I’d orchestrate “Carol of Joy” (Beckenhorst 2007) for inclusion on their big annual Christmas program this year! It’s a huge honor, and we’re thrilled about the musical opportunity. The resulting recording will likely be one of the best performances of my music I’ve had!

His 2007 premier of “Arise, Shine,” based on Isaiah 60, was performed at Carnegie Hall, Robert Schuller’s Crystal Cathedral, and the Lincoln Center. Following the Carnegie Hall premier (2-11-2007), he returned to BJU where a ForrestFest of his works was performed to honor his 30th birthday.

Yes, the music coming from Fundamental schools has clearly embraced the spirit of ecumenicity. It rejoices in being accepted by a broader audience. It truly seeks no clear spiritual identification from the world’s prestige of Carnegie Hall or even the aesthetic excellence of a cult like Mormonism!

The Warnings Against Change

Several years ago there was a move among professing Christian colleges to change their names deleting the word *Christian* and/or the word *Bible*. At the time when the changes were made, these were liberal schools; we were glad for them to get rid of their hypocrisy. Now we are reading of schools in Fundamentalism changing their names for various humanistic reasons. It is evident the climate is drastically changing in America; an ill-wind is strongly blowing against any educational institution that is marked by the word *Christian* and the word *Bible*. We were sad to hear that Northland Baptist Bible College, which is located in Dunbar, WI, has changed its name to Northland International University. This will certainly, at least in name, rid itself of the offensive word and place it into a dubious context before the world, blending in with the rest of the world's universities. Their website already shows the contemporary sound of their music, and now perhaps this will be the final step into the Neo-Evangelical arena. They state that the school wants to "prepare students for worship and music globally."

Along with these changes have come the Neo-Evangelical guest speakers and faculty. The lineup of speakers included Rick Holland, back in October of 2010, who is the executive pastor at Grace Community Church, where John MacArthur is senior pastor. Mr. Holland is the

appointed director for the "Resolved" conferences, on which their website clearly indicates their Neo-Evangelical persuasion. It is interesting to note that Dr. MacArthur is featured on that website wearing faded jeans and untucked shirt with the contemporary instruments of CCM behind him. All of this is the marking of Neo-Evangelicalism. The president and NIU administration met with John MacArthur and acknowledged that they agreed on the most "substantial issues of life and ministry." There is also Southern Baptist professor Bruce Ware, who teaches on the graduate level at NIU. No doubt other schools will follow suit.

The list continues even in changing denominations such as the Free Will Baptist. The presentation has now been laid on the table for a vote to change the name of their Nashville, Tennessee campus from Free Will Baptist Bible College to Welch College. We are now in the fast lane of such trendy and popular changes. In recent years Fundamental schools pursued accreditation (though in the past they denounced the need of it); now the trend seems to be to change the college name to blend in with the world.

The Warning Against Being Accepted by the World

The first time Dr. Bob Jones III went on *Larry King Live* and gave several changes that would be taking place at the University, my father was in the final stages of Lou Gehrig's

Disease and unable to speak due to the debilitation of the disease. When I played him the video recording of it the next day, he wept through it all; and shaking his head in grief, he wrote down on paper: "This is the beginning of the end." So many believed it was a golden opportunity of witnessing of Jesus Christ to Larry King and the world; however, my father knew it was the death of something precious. Fundamentalism was now seeking to be accepted by the world.

In the 1960s, the NASV authoritatively began to be used in graduate classrooms of Bob Jones University. It was not only the selection of a new English version, but it was also the commencement of a battle against the beloved King James Version. This all came to fruition when their press published the crucial book *The Mind of God to the Mind of Man*. The tides have now taken the University into the acceptance of the ESV and truly have opened the door for the students to accept basically any contemporary version they desire. Many of the students have taken this liberty to choose the NIV as their Bible. Dr. Don Jasmin and other alumni members have with consistency called their beloved alma mater back to their birth landmarks—but to no avail. History has proved there are certain identifications with God that you cannot reject without powerful consequences. Anyone that despises holiness, in reality despises God (I Thessalonians 4:7, 8).

Conclusion

Many schools have chosen the way of carnality for their Christianity; this choice often was to pragmatically prevent their imminent demise. Though the King James Version was not verbally inspired, we believe it has been honored by God to be the culminating version of several forerunners in His providence. It has been this English Bible that has fought Roman Catholicism and the Protestant apostasy. It is the only English Bible God has used with such magnitude in the fight against these two foes. However, this warhorse has been maligned and condemned not only from without but also from within fundamental Christianity. I am firmly convinced that no church or school can stand spiritually by defaming in the sight of God this providential translation in the English tongue. Standards will depart, music will degenerate, truth will vanish, and lives will be abandoned to carnality and the powers of the contemporary. It is inevitable!

Historians have claimed that George Washington died as a result of the blood-letting of thirty-six ounces from his body; in essence, he bled to death. What will the annals of eternity declare about the demise of Historic Fundamentalism? Was it poisoned to death by the corrupt powers and influences of men who secretly left off communion with God and consequently sought to deceptively and deliberately change

Fundamentalism, wedding it to its archenemy of Neo-Evangelicalism? Or was it bled to death, ounce by ounce over the years, believing all that originally gave it spiritual life was no longer needed?

We weep over the death of perhaps the last biblical movement of God

before the coming of His Son in the clouds. Will God now turn His attention toward the scattered remnant who are seeking to truly abide in Him and not in worldliness? [Let us now consider this truth concerning the Last-Day remnant.]



INMEDIATAMENTE

Straightway is available in Spanish – www.straightwayonline.org/es
Sermons by Dr. H. T. Spence with Spanish translation are available on the website. You can also join the mailing list by visiting the website or contacting Foundations Bible College.

“SERMONS OF THE MONTH”

SERMONS FROM THE FOUNDATIONS PULPIT
FOUNDATIONS BIBLE COLLEGIATE CHURCH
DR. H. T. SPENCE, PASTOR

(January 2011, Opening of Second Semester)

1. *The Earnest Work of Building a Life*
2. *The Building of a Life*
3. *Opposition to the Building of a Life*
4. *Sanctifying the Work*
5. *The Gates of Jerusalem for the Christian Life*

5-Sermon Set (Audio CD): \$14.25 + \$4.00 s&h
Foundations Ministries • P.O. Box 1166 • Dunn, NC 28335
frecorecordings@foundations.edu • 800-849-8761 • www.foundations.edu

To purchase material found in *Straightway*, contact:

Foundations Bible College

P.O. Box 1166 • Dunn, NC 28335-1166

910-892-8761 • 800-849-8761 • (Fax) 910-892-9322

www.foundations.edu • email, fbc.bookstore@foundations.edu

Have I Changed in My Views And Walk with God?

*"In preparing my own heart for this new year, these are questions
I have written down for my own life in spiritual inventory."*

Dr. H. T. Spence

1. Am I still in communion with God, or have I convinced myself over the years of absence of prayer and Bible reading that I do not need these things in my life to be a Christian?
2. Have I come to believe that a rather good, moral life is all I need to be saved and go to heaven?
3. Have my principles changed over the years in raising a family, of where my children go and what they do?
4. Have I discarded certain standards in the past several years believing they are no longer needed to protect me from this age and sin?
5. Do I have a more tolerable heart towards sin in my life and in others? Am I willing to let the dealing with sin go for the sake of peace and harmony?
6. Am I more tolerable to compromise in my life and towards those who compromise the truth of God?
7. Do I see today, as I did years ago, my generation and its subtle influence to lead astray?
8. Have I been so long in the atmosphere of the contemporary that I do not really see what is wrong with today's contemporary music?
9. Has my heart changed in its hatred towards the world, the flesh, and the devil?
10. Am I more tolerable about the world's clothing?
11. As a minister of the Gospel, has evangelism become more my concern than the building of the character of the saints and warning them of the age in which we live?
12. Do I see the changes that have come concerning the modern English versions, and what concern do I have for those who are changing to them?

13. Do I interpret the will of God as to the conduciveness of circumstances rather than the Scriptures?
14. Am I being deceived to think that Neo-Evangelicalism is the way God now wants the church to go for this generation?
15. Amidst the need of maturing, am I as strong today as I was years ago against sin, error, and anything that will subtly draw me or others away from God?
16. Has this generation's view of money and business affected me in seeing truth and the evil of compromise?
17. Do I still love to hear strong, Bible preaching or have I changed in this hunger?
18. Have I changed in my love for the memory of God's men and women, for what they taught me to believe and live, and for the strength of their preaching? Or do I revere their memory but have changed and compromised what they taught me?
19. Do I find myself becoming more acceptable by the Neo-Christianity crowd and ministers that several years ago I would not have even associated with?
20. Have I, since I have gotten on the field as a missionary or in a church, backed down on my preaching of sanctification and the need of "Walking in the Spirit" and preaching against the power of the flesh?
21. Do I find myself talking against true men of God and the true music of God and giving in to the more acceptable political approach to having a ministry and living a "Christian life"?
22. Have I allowed my view of a Christian to be tainted by the contemporary view of a Christian?
23. Am I no longer taking a stand against things I took a stand against years ago?
24. Would I be willing to take a stand against the changes I see taking place in ministries that in former days did take a stand but are no longer doing so?