

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 43

JULY-SEPTEMBER 2015

NUMBER 4

Postmodernism, Post-America

Dr. H. T. Spence

Who would have suspected ten years ago that which we are facing now in our society? Our country is accelerating at unprecedented speeds toward necessary changes to merge with other nations to establish a New World Order for the coming “Man of Sin” and for Satan’s final kingdom to face God and His Son. The “Day of Man” is coming to its prime vision in history. Any sense of innocence and simplicity in the former natural life of human existence in America is becoming but a dim memory. All of humanity is being forced to accept new concepts of thought—a new language, a new economy, a new

approach to education, and a new concept of government—that is intelligently molding a new America and world. It is evident that God’s will is permitting man to have his free season of unrestrained disobedience; this willfulness will finally lead to a global confrontation with Christ before heaven ultimately sets up its righteous kingdom on earth.

This issue of *Straightway* will first consider the “powers that be” and then conclude with a needed view of Post-Fundamentalism. A fourfold view of our contemporary will necessitate understanding post-modernism, post-America, post-religion, and post-Fundamentalism.

This edition includes two more articles

Postmodernism and Post-Religion
Postmodernism and Post-Fundamentalism

Postmodernism: The Present-day Movement

Postmodernism is often defined in today's literature in terms of modernism or modernity. Simply declared, postmodernism is thinking "after modernism" or after the "age of reason." Yet because of its bold denial of language and definitiveness, there is confusion about whether it is a concept or a practice. Perhaps the reason for the inability to define its "principles" or forms and concepts is that it is very fluid in its movement. Postmodernism truly is an ideological defiance and abhorrence of absolutes, principles, and standards; it aggressively discards these words in order to embrace non-reason. It seeks to make the irrational rational, the insane sane, the illogical logical, the ugly beautiful, the heretical truth, the immoral moral, and the abnormal normal.

While there are many terms associated with postmodernism, no

single, definitive philosophical term seems adequate. Postmodernism is the belief or concept that metaphysical views of absolutes and eternal principles have failed humanity; it believes that the Enlightenment's hope of reason (the concept of "modern") has also failed mankind; it even concludes that the former approaches to the economy and government in the context of modernization have all become futile in hopes to assist mankind. Therefore, contemporary thinking has embraced the absurd and insane as a viable belief system. Postmodernism forcefully declares that all accepted concepts and pre-suppositions of the past are futile and worthless; ironically, it even casts away all language and terminology used to define mankind's beliefs in history.

Postmodernism tries very hard to reject a description of itself as embodying any set of timeless ideals. It is an ever-changing philosophy existing only for the "now" and the "present"; it is not viewed as any other time period, past or future. It despises history; it despises the future; it despises facts, knowledge, and anything that makes life and belief concrete and perpetual. It insists on being recognized only as a set of viewpoints embraced at a given moment of time and only justified by the circumstances at that moment.

Because postmodernism is only a

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.**

new form for the older philosophy called existentialism, it defies any established terminology to define or describe it. Postmodernism can be found in every area of literature, academic disciplines, and the cultural topics of a people, including art, music, architecture, advertising, photography, and cinematography, to name a few.

While the modernists assailed the validity and surety of science and the scientific method as objective and unbiased, the postmodernists argue that their truth is true only to those who share a dedication to use that particular version of scientific expression and terminology. In this context the postmodernists are strong in the concept of “constructivism.”

Constructivism is a main underlying learning theory for postmodern education. It is the belief that knowledge is invented or constructed in the mind. In a simpler word, the ideas and concepts that teachers teach and students learn are not “reality” but merely human constructions. Postmodernists do not believe that knowledge is discovered; knowledge simply arises from the mind of an individual. Therefore, all reality does not exist objectively outside the mind; reality is merely in the mind of those who perceive it. The postmodernist concludes that no one’s version of reality can therefore lay claim to having more objectivity and authority than another’s.

This view of knowledge has serious implications. It means that all knowledge is based on relativism and is somewhat pragmatic. To the postmodernist, knowledge can never be objective; no one person’s knowledge is necessarily true, for everything is changing. Thus, whatever is taught in school can never be viewed as “classic” education; even math is always changing *or* is simply deduced from the perspective of the individual performing the math problem. There is no absolute answer; it is a matter of the individual mind and how it perceives the problem. This postmodern concept is behind the Common Core curriculum of our federal government; there is a shift away from a teacher-centered classroom to a more student-centered environment. Certainly this is related philosophically to the progressivism of John Dewey. Much of postmodern education is based on Dewey’s perspective.

How does all of this fall into the present distress in which we find ourselves? How does this control the present United States of America or even the present distress of religion and that of Fundamentalism?

Post-America: Present America

One of the original presidential promises given by the present administration was that a radical change would come during its administration. Though other

candidates had made similar promises, little did we know the “radical” meaning behind this promise in 2008. Obama declared that he was to bring about a “Post-America” that would literally bring to naught the former America, destroying and denouncing its birth and greatness. He believed that all of the concepts of the Constitution were founded in the minds of those who colonized America; therefore, although the ideas of certain men molded this country, now others had to influence today’s America. This belief in the “colonization of minds” is a characteristic of American education; and according to postmodernism this concept must be abolished, for there can be no colonization of the mind for everyone. Whenever the dominant culture asks other minorities to do what they do, to speak using classroom English, to solve math problems, or to view history and science the dominant culture’s way, or to have the same concepts of morality, music, religion, etc., they have acted in the old colonial ways. Therefore, this “colonization” must end and “radical” (root) changes must come to America.

What does this mean in a postmodern America? This would demand that the country now pursue great diversity of values, tastes, morals, etc. The suppressed and oppressed subcultures in our society must now be given the right

to express themselves unhindered by law and discrimination. There must come an equality through postmodern ideology, an equality which means equal in terms of power relationships within the government and the right of expressive voice. A tolerance and freedom must also come to such downtrodden people.

This term *tolerance* has been changed to mean that such people are never to be denounced, criticized, or oppressed. There must now be the freedom for cultures, lifestyles, and heretofore suppressed underground communities to be free to live, do, and say what they want, with no negative words declared against them. Such people must be given the opportunity for creativity in constructing knowledge concerning themselves and defending their values; their diverse viewpoints are to be encouraged. There is also the importance of the affirming of emotions of such individuals, so this will promote the need of self-esteem. Such emotions are never to be challenged, including their hatred or selfish jealousy; this is true both in the classroom and in the adult world of those who loot and destroy property because of their anger. Such individuals would be “disabled” if a teacher’s or a policeman’s mind reality was imposed upon them.

From this perspective the child or the adult creates his own knowledge, and thus there is no objective knowledge to learn. Any concept

of a “classic” education must be destroyed, and the student himself is to create knowledge and truth for himself. Thus the student must create his own solution, whether or not it is right (from the “colonization” perspective) or whether or not it makes any sense. A student or an adult must never be told that he is wrong, for this would not be helpful to the individual; it would produce inhibitions and warp his personality. This concept is even to be taken into the areas of science and social studies, for all the knowledge that has been taught in Western civilization has been taught from a colonization perspective, and thus the present teachers have no right to declare that this is the only knowledge or right way. The postmodernists imply that the past claims to knowledge are never neutral but are representative of some institute of a power relationship between ones who say they know the truth and the ones whom they impose the truth upon.

Curriculum, according to the postmodernists, should not be organized into definite subject matter or disciplines that are separated by boundaries of what others say is right or wrong. It should be made fluid and flexible to provide for all personal and group identities, for all lifestyles, social, political, and economic ideologies. Therefore, other civilizations and cultures must be equally taught in the schools of America, including Islam. Old

thinking (such as “colonial” Christian principles) must now be thrown out to welcome other contemporary diversities. This is what the present government seeks to bring all of society to—there is no right or wrong, there is no truth or error, there is no terminology of law. This is why political men can break the law, defy the established law, set their own laws contrary to the very Constitution of a country; for in their thinking this is not wrong. The concept of law only exists in what they believe to be so in their mind.

Postmodernists attempt to *undefine* and *unidentify* all previous knowledge which they believe was given by subjective minds to control a minority of people. Ironically, the ideologies and “knowledge” coming from the minds of the contemporary are likewise to control a society and bring dissidents under the political correctness of the present rulers. Thus, the concept has not changed but simply comes from other men: to overthrow the control of one political group in order to be controlled by another political group.

Post-America: The Present Distress

We may wonder where the leadership of “statesmen” of former days can be found in America—men and women of absolute principles, men of integrity and righteous character? Where are the men who once stood for America’s

Constitution, its founding principles, and the preservation of its integrity and legacy? Where are those who were given to truth, to justice, and to the American way? Such men are not only few and far between but also hated, maligned, beaten down, and intimidated with the rhetoric of postmodernism—homophobic, Islamophobic, racist, Christian, narrow-minded, anti-feminist, etc. It is evident the world is not looking for men and women of character to rule; they seek those who are deeply immoral, anti-God in their words and perspectives, given to lying and deception, and capable of manipulating the truth to make evil look good. These are the men and women who lead the nation today; they are postmodernist in their belief, and to them *truth* is only a relative term for the whim of the moment.

God has given our country over to such leaders for its destruction. There is no country in the world now that has plunged into the depth of debauchery of sin and immorality as is so flagrantly promoted here in America. Even the Devil knows how immorality will destroy a nation, for he influenced Israel through the Midianites to be taken by the way of Balaam. The Devil knows that God Himself will judge the nation that was once given to righteousness. The Devil knows God will withdraw His presence of security away from even this nation if it turns to iniquity. We have come to such an hour, for God

has given us over to a “reprobate mind,” where insanity has become sane.

The language of absolutes no longer exists in these United States. The biblical language of what a Christian is has been expanded by the postmodern Christianity to include sodomites, Mormons, and even Muslims. There is no line of demarcation drawn. The language of marriage, gender, morals, abortion, family, father, mother, “one flesh,” etc. have been forced into concepts of contradiction to their historical view. Marxism, socialism, communism, fascism, nihilism, etc. have all become terms so nebulous and without negative meaning in postmodern conversation that it is fruitless to even use the terms in warning of the decisions being made politically. Similarly, the postmodernist’s destruction of an absolute definition for words such as *national deficit*, *bankruptcy*, or *takeovers* has made these terms meaningless in the public political discussions of our day.

Yes, everything of the past mindset must go; we are being forced to believe that the illogical, the immoral, the absurd, the irrational, the insane, the abnormal must now be given a chance to work, believing it may work. Postmodern experimentalists do not care about the results, the product, and the destruction (to say nothing of the judgment of God) that history has proved time and time

again will come upon such a nation. The postmodernists believe we can beat the odds; we can gamble away the lives of men and women, boys and girls, and come out differently than what the past has established.

Conclusion

Our days are truly numbered as a nation; perhaps we only have some twelve months before everything changes to the new order for America. Our country, which at one time was the greatest militarily, has been unilaterally depleted of its military power by executive order. Our debt is the greatest of any nation in human history by executive order. Our land has become prime real estate for the economic purchasing by other countries through executive order. Our leaders have bowed to the powers of Islam by executive order. Our national autonomy has been given over to the United Nations by executive order. A country designated as a “Christian” nation of the past has now been denounced by executive order. The fastest growing language in America is now Arabic by executive order; the Islamic religion is the fastest growing religion in America by executive order; eighty percent of all the tens of thousands of mosques in America have come into existence since 9/11 by executive order. The Islamic population of America is being imported from the Islamic countries by executive order; the Islamic demographics will reach over forty percent in

our nation by 2025, and perhaps even sooner by executive order. Potentially, electromagnetic-pulse weapons (EMPs) being prepared by Russia, Iran, and North Korea could disrupt and destroy all forms of a country’s electrical infrastructure; such an attack would plunge the USA into chaos as food, water, and basic services grind to a screeching halt for at least two years. For these concerns the passivity of our current administration declares executive permission and assistance. The massive flood of immigrants in the past twelve months and the hundreds of thousands to come in the next few months from Islamic nations are being strategically placed around the country to resolve the electoral votes which will make null and void any populous vote by executive order. This next election year may do away with the Constitution and perhaps bring a subtly declared dictator to America by executive order. The courts of the land have lost their ability to rule righteously by executive order. The Christian concept of belief has become an enemy to the state and the term *Christian* connoted with terrorist according to executive order.

Nevertheless, to the true End-time Christian, rising higher than all of the words of “executive orders” or present earthly powers, there still stands *The Word of God*, which will only permit the “powers that be” to do what is part of God’s plan.

Second Timothy 3:9 clearly declares that “they shall proceed no further.” We must remember that Antichrist is still yet to come:

It was given unto him to make war with the saints, and to overcome them: and power was given him over all kindreds, and tongues, and nations. And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. If any man have an ear, let him hear (Rev. 13:7–9).

Dear Reader, we are in the prelude generation that is to lead to the coming of Antichrist, a generation that is preparing the earth for His coming. Postmodernism is the absurd mindset that is now bringing

utter chaos and insanity to the very forefront of global humanity. To such forerunners of the Man of Sin, the concreteness of history will have to be destroyed, both its memory and its influence, in order to bring about the acceptance of the chaos of iniquity in its full power. To such men’s thinking, out of the chaos will come their *kosmos*, their world “order.”

May God help us in these perilous and troublous times. As world leaders prepare and eagerly wait for the Man of Sin to make his unveiling, may we as God’s people anticipate the unveiling of the “Son of Man,” yea, the “Son of God,” at His Second Coming. S

Featured Sermon Set

SERMONS FROM THE FOUNDATIONS PULPIT
FOUNDATIONS BIBLE COLLEGIATE CHURCH
DR. H. T. SPENCE, PASTOR
Opening of Fall Semester 2015

My Book of Acts

My Pentecost

My Receiving of the Word (Dr. Dennis Lowry)

My Believing and Healing

4-Sermon Set (Audio CD): \$12.50 + \$5.00 s&h* (MP3 - \$8.00 + \$4.00 s&h)

Foundations Ministries • P. O. Box 1166 • Dunn, NC 28335

800-849-8761 • wwwFOUNDATIONS.edu

*NC residents, please add sales tax to your order total.

Postmodernism and Post-Religion

Dr. H. T. Spence

Postmodernism is the term that has come to describe the pervasive way of thinking in the Western world, particularly in the last twenty years. While the earliest seeds of postmodernism can be traced back to the writings of men such as Nietzsche, Heidegger, Marx, and Freud, key men who solidified its place in contemporary philosophy include Geoffrey Hartman, Jean-François Lyotard, Michel Foucault, Jacques Derrida, and Richard Rorty. The New Age movement has helped to distribute this philosophy into the general culture of societal thinking today.

In the rational thought of previous generations, men believed in a “worldview” or what some have called the “presupposition” of their life’s philosophy. This worldview meant that everything they believed came under a universal-principle view. Even the Christian believed his worldview came under the canopy of the Scriptures, and thus everything must be subservient to its governing perspective. Such reasoning played a dominant role in understanding and interpreting an individual’s purpose for existence.

In contrast, today life is viewed as fragmented and void of any universal principle organizing the particular incidents and experiences of life. In fact, the concept of a worldview is dead and meaningless

to the postmodernists. Even the perspective of “reality” has no objective meaning; reality has been reduced to merely that which exists within an individual.

The Reality of Man

Postmodernism believes that the only reality that does exist for a man is that which he creates. Since there is no God to affect the view of reality and how we should behave in life, and since there is no absolute truth, then reality is only what we make it to be. This brings to mind the writing of Hollywood’s New Age guru Shirley MacLaine. In her book *Out on a Limb* (1983), she asked the question of her “spiritual guide” David if he believed in reincarnation. His response was, “It’s true if you believe it and that goes for anything.” This reveals even from years ago that postmodernism has never viewed reality from principles but from preferences, for this present-day philosophy denounces all “principles” or anything that is in the context of “authority” and dogmatism. Even Enlightenment’s sacredness of reason and science has become viewed as tools of oppression against man. Many of the postmodernist writers, especially the feminists, believe that science is built upon a “male-centered view” and thus becomes culturally coercive upon a generation.

If reason and science are denounced, then what is to take their place for man? When man is convinced to abandon reason and objective knowledge, the resulting vacuum is filled with experiencing life through only the avenue of subjective feeling. Emotions, feelings, inward reflections, subjective experiences, and even self-created myths, all become contemporary man's new reality.

In the latter part of the 1700s, there were men who questioned the ability of man to truly "know" anything. David Hume and Immanuel Kant questioned the concept of epistemology, believing that perhaps all knowledge needed to be placed into two categories, that of the phenomenal (the reality world) and the *noumenal* (a world that could not be known). Philosophers then took those two divisional worlds of knowledge and declared there to be an "upper story" and a "lower story" world of knowledge reality: the lower story being the "real" world in which we live day by day, based on reason and factual perspective; and the upper story being an escape world where reason does not exist but is simply a world where we make life to be what we desire for ourselves. In those early years when such a concept of epistemology was presented, philosophers knew there was an impregnable gulf between those two stories. And the only way to leave the lower story

and reach the upper story was for reason to be destroyed or rendered inoperative for a season of time. This could only take place through hallucinogenic drugs or alcohol, or by convincing the mind to believe the unreal to be real. By doing so, a man could catapult himself from the real to an unreal world; but it would have to be an "escape from reason." Nonetheless there was always that gulf that divided the real world from the non-real world. An Anne of Green Gables could adopt a window friend and pretend with a vivid imagination that this friend existed in order to escape from the real world of hardship and being an orphan. There was also the looking glass of Alice in her Wonderland where animals talked and the non-real became real. There is also the world of imagination of children playing with dolls and toy soldiers. But there must always be that clear line of demarcation drawn between the real and the non-real. Today, the postmodernists have blurred the line of difference and distinction between those two stories, between the real world in which we live and the "reality" world we create and make our own.

This concept of reality will be seen by the postmodernist denouncement of truth, of absolutes, and of the real to be found outside of ourselves. When this denouncement is made, then man creates his own reality without having to prove it by reason

or trial. Allan Bloom alludes to this in his book *The Closing of the American Mind* (1987):

The danger they have been taught to fear from absolutism is not error but intolerance. Relativism is necessary to openness; and this is the virtue, the only virtue, which all primary education for more than fifty years has dedicated itself to inculcating. Openness—and the relativism that makes it the only plausible stance in the face of various claims to truth and the various ways of life and kinds of human beings—is the great insight of our times. The true believer is the real danger. The study of history and of culture teaches that all the world was mad in the past; men always thought they were right, and that led to wars, persecutions, slavery, xenophobia, racism, and chauvinism. The point is not to correct the mistakes and really be right; rather it is not to think that you are right at all.

In his work *New Introductory Lectures on Psycho-analysis* (1933), Freud had already addressed a relativism that sought to abolish any objective absolutes for directing human behavior:

Fundamentally, we only find what we need and only see what we want to see. We have no other possibility. Since the criterion for truth, correspondence with the external world, is absent, it is entirely a matter of indifference what opinions we adopt. All of them are equally true and equally

false. *And no one has the right to accuse anyone else of error* [emphasis added].

This thinking pronounces candidly the days of the Judges, when everyone does that which is right in his own eyes and creates whatever world he wants for himself without accountability to anything or anyone. Convictions are no longer part of man's conscience or thinking; everyone has his personal opinions, and no one is to view his opinions higher than anyone else's opinions. There is no truth; all opinions are relative. This is how radio "talk shows" survive: everyone calls in and gives their opinion, but by the end of the show there is no establishment of truth. Perhaps the talk show "host" will be able to make everyone's contribution of benefit and "he has a point." For every opinion is equally right.

Postmodernism's Concept of Religion

Perhaps the acceptance of religion by postmodernism creates the greatest surprise. It must be remembered that "modernism," based purely upon reason, denounced religion, believing that it should not exist. With this belief the early atheists consistently attacked religion's purpose of existence. But postmodernism permits an individual's religion, as long as it is kept within the confinement of one's self. It is adamantly opposed to the propagation of religion to others or

the concept of “evangelizing” the world. One may believe what he wants to about God (or gods), but religion must be purely individualistic and never collective. There should be no churches, assemblies, classes, etc. But let everybody believe what they want; whatever makes them “feel good,” that should be their belief. Personal religion must never be based upon doctrine, any concept of absolutes, or a consistent belief.

Postmodernism strongly denies creeds, articles of faith, and any form of dogmatism that is demanded of others. In fact, religion should be whatever an individual makes it to be, like an elixir of instant, feel-good, subjective syncretism. Even Christianity should permit individuals to take a number of beliefs and collectively bring them together to make a buffet of subjective beliefs; whatever suits your taste at any given moment would be most proper. Such beliefs may change from week to week, for another aspect may be found of greater pleasure for the life and added to the pot; this all can be freely mixed to make one’s own “reality” of religion.

How would this concept define morality? Postmodernism declares that all moral values are relative. This necessitates that each person develop his own moral values without a concept of God or an objective revelation, such as the Bible influencing his subjective religion. Man is not to be looking

for what is right or wrong, but what will please him or what he will gain from it. Even the cultures of various countries and races should be permitted with all of their views of right and wrong. Thus, evangelizing them would be a detriment, and to condemn them for what they do would be absurd in manner and respect for their subjective ways and beliefs. The “natives” do what they do because they were shaped by their culture, and who are we to tell them it is wrong? They have no responsibility or accountability to its being right or wrong. Because this is to be the view of postmodernism, tolerance becomes one of the pillars of this mindset. Yes, according to postmodernism we must tolerate all manner of living, of belief, and of lifestyle. Nothing is to be said in opposition; they are to be accepted, commended, and encouraged. Of course, this tolerance is *not* to be given to those who believe in absolutes and are dogmatic in their beliefs of right and wrong, and of what is to be the only road that leads to God, that is, the way of Jesus Christ found in the Scriptures. And if one dare think that another individual is wrong, or that there is some form of punishment such as hell awaiting those who reject the Gospel, then woe be to that person! Yes, such individuals will not be tolerated in a postmodern society!

It will be observed as we inquire deeper into this dark chasm of

postmodernism that it is exclusively based upon individualism. It is one thing to live in a pluralistic society, but now we are being demanded to accept all religions as equally true and to believe that there is no right or wrong religion and no one road leading to "God." Even the courts are now declaring that it is up to each individual to determine the concept of "meaning," of existence, of the universe, and of the mystery of human life. No one religion has a right to declare the exactness of these concepts of God. Any negative statement given against another religion will be viewed as hate speech.

As for the Bible, it is not accepted as absolute but simply viewed as the subjectivism expressed by its authors. For what really happened is unknowable, and if it *is* knowable, it is unimportant. The Liberals, going back to the mid-1800s, denied the historicity of the Bible, and all of these years since have tried to prove the unreliability of its professing historical aspects. But now the postmodernists tell us that the history does not matter; it is simply what the Bible writings do for you in a moment of time; they are neither to be taken literally nor dogmatically but are simply to be an avenue or a tool whereby we come to our own subjective "experience" in religion. One has the right to draw from the Upanishads, the writings of the Hindus; the Sutra, the writings of

the Buddhists; the writings of the Koran; or any other religion: all are permissible in order to gain one's own "inner" perspective of reality. It could even be through an assortment of all of these writings that thus reality for one's self is found. There is no "truth"; there are only truths, and those truths may be for "the moment" and only for that individual at that time.

It must be acknowledged that Europe is moving quickly to the abandonment of Christianity while America, through the postmodernism of the mega-churches, is moving to adopt a more comfortable form of Christianity. America has adopted a more palatable Christianity with that of the world and its postmodern thinking. In the end, the product will be the same; both become an effect of the modernity upon the Church and the mutual destruction of public, Biblical Christianity. But more words will be given on this subject in our last article of this issue of *Straightway*.

Postmodernism and History

The historicity of Christianity is being denied today, not only by the world but also by the public institutional church. Mel Gibson's *The Passion* gave us a hodgepodge of myth, legend, and some history thrown into the movie to more pronouncedly bring us into an existential experience of the "feelings" of Mary, of Jesus, of

women, of soldiers, and many others. All was mixed together and permissibly accepted in the light of what it did existentially for the audience. Both the Liberals and the Modernists reject the resurrection of Jesus, other than for existential influence for the individual's subjective religion. Again, in a post-modernist context, Christian history is irrelevant, it is immaterial, and the Church should spend no time discussing this issue since it is not important.

But this mindset influences all perceptions of history. A simple example of this is found in the newer history books written on the Civil War, or even by visiting the few museums dedicated to its history. The honest heart would be amazed at how the history is being written and certain aspects of its existence even denied. History either commends or condemns; therefore, the present generation must do something with it or deny its existence. A recent poll indicates a growing number (at this time 33 percent) of those in America do not believe that the Holocaust took place, that the killing of some six million Jews by the Nazis during World War II ever happened. Such individuals believe that it has been a Jewish mythological propagation to produce global sympathy, and that the various holocaust museums in Israel, in America, and in Europe are only in existence to maintain the myth. This will be true of all the histories of

evil men: the present ruling powers of modern history will redefine and reinterpret. What was viewed as barbaric and an atrocity at the time it happened will be rewritten to laud the incident. By what we see today of our present administration and the evil and deception intricately woven in his doings, present historians will declare him as the best man for our country and the world. Amidst the quagmire of our postmodern times, we must remember there are no principles, only preferences; there will be no simple reality of right or wrong, but a grand objective universalism. Truly, postmodernism is the extreme form of relativism.

Postmodernism and Culture

One of the powerful viewpoints of postmodernism that has become a crucial weapon of destruction to truth in our contemporary may be found in the "culture" of a people. Culture, from a secular perspective, can be the fineness of feelings, thoughts, tastes, manners, etc. of an individual, of a civilization, of a given race or nation at a given time or over all time. This will include customs, arts, conveniences, etc. But the word also includes the development of the mind or body by education or training. Postmodernism believes that whatever a people's culture may be, it must be accepted by others. Heretofore, when certain ethnic groups entered a country, they either complied with the culture and language of that country, or they

isolated themselves into a geography within the country where they could continue their “culture.” We have observed this in large cosmopolitan cities where there is a “China Town” or as in the city of Jerusalem where there is a distinct Arabic section of the city in contrast to the Jewish section. Postmodernism forces a society to integrate and accept these cultures. All must blend into one, with the acceptance of their music, their language, their living, and their sins without any negative response. This would be true in a community; even churches would be forced to accept whatever cultural lifestyle that comes. It is one thing to accept the cultural foods, clothing designs or colors, manner or protocol, music, architecture, and even certain living persuasions of a people. But it will be quite another to accept their views of God (or gods) and of Jesus Christ. It will be quite another to accept their lifestyles that promote iniquity and bold anti-God events and programs attacking Jesus Christ. It will be quite another to accept their specific views of law and of what is right and wrong to govern that community or nation. Such is the case of the “culture” of Islam. The very foundational belief of Islam is against everything that historic America is founded upon. Such an individual could not become an American, unless America can be changed to assimilate the anti-Americanism within the country.

are told that we must accept the culture of these myriads of people who are presently being brought into our country. It is not that they must change, but, to the contrary, we must accept their ways, their religions, their languages, their customs, their sins, their “laws,” even if these laws are against the laws of our country. Postmodernism strongly believes that America was based upon a colonialism of the past, which was based upon certain men’s “reality” being forced upon the rest of society. And now, we have come to a generation that must do away with all previous laws of America—its “colonial” Constitution, its morality—and even become a nation of diversification of law. How ironic that we now have another “colonialism” being forced upon us with the aggressiveness of a communist regime. Our Supreme Court, as set up in earlier history, was for a unified country of principles established to interpret a unified view of right and wrong. Though the country “permitted” the presence of differences of opinions and beliefs of religion, there was still a unifying principle of right and wrong that ruled the nation; it had a concept belief of “righteousness.” Now the leadership declares that this is unacceptable. The country’s colonialism must be destroyed, and all cultures within this country must be permitted to live with their laws and lifestyles. Yes, it may be debated that Islam is a religion, but it is definitely a

This is where we are today. We

way of life in a culture that controls its people with absolutes. Its control is far more intensified than what is found in today's mongrelized Christianity which gives no public evidence of intensity of lifestyle. Postmodernism declares that such people must be permitted to live according to their 24-hour-a-day regulations of laws, foods, holy days, prayers, governments, courts, clothing, and family polygamous marriages. Who is to say that the killing of a child is not permitted? Who is to say that the oppression of women is wrong? Who is to declare that if one leaves the "life" of Islam he cannot be put to death? Who is to say that Jihad is wrong? Who can define what a "terrorist" is? All of this is part of the world culture of a people, and post-America, based on postmodernism, must accept them with open arms and without one word of condemnation or any law of restriction. Thus the cities must get in harmony; the prisons must do away with the serving of pork; the public schools must accommodate the teaching of the "culture" of Islam.

Such "intolerant" forcing of "tolerance" also dominates the culture of sodomy, pedophilia, rape, polygamy, pornography, rock music, occultism, etc. These cultures are demanding non-discrimination in every aspect of public living, including the denouncing of distinction of public rest rooms, of human genders, of family concepts and their

existence. We are not only to permit them to live their culture publicly but also to provide for them and submit to assist them in a way that indicates no contrary "feeling" or "mindset" about their culture.

God truly made the races, and people have their manner and way of living in the light of their geographies and their nativity. But sin can pervade any culture no matter who the people are. The Gospel condemns sin within any culture, and the Christian is called upon to separate from it. The Christian must not only preach the Gospel to "all" men and call them to Christ the singular Saviour, but also to preach the life-changing power of that Gospel, conforming the believer to the message of that Gospel proclaimed, no matter who the people are and where they live. Ethnic or national cultures may continue with those redeemed people, but the sin found within that culture must cease. There *is* a biblical culture that all Christians must live, and it rises to a greater authority than their own culture.

Conclusion

Truly our present society is moving with great acceleration into the literal redefining of humanity and its concept of reality and existence. The former language of humanity has become an enemy to postmodernism; its terminology is antiquated and must be discarded; and all of the old forms of human existence will be

abandoned. This is not only seen as true for the secular world but also for Christianity. We thus are now witnessing the abandonment of historic Christianity and the mutation of a new Christianity that will accommodate the postmodern mind. Fundamentalism may try to maintain the doctrine of Christianity but will use the wrapping of the contemporary, believing that the end will justify the means and that even the world's methods do not affect the message.

What new religious shape will Fundamentalism now take in this postmodern world? How will the

present trends of Fundamentalism conceptualize Jesus and the biblical principles? More and more, present-day Fundamentalism is becoming the product of postmodernism. Its leaders, musicians, church programs, Christian schools, colleges, and universities are all coming together to make this paradigm shift of what is a "Fundamentalist." It is evident we will never return to the former biblical days. Fundamentalism has intentionally left the path of truth and is now blazing a new road in a new direction. Our next article will carefully unfold the present dilemma of fallen Fundamentalism. S

Postmodernism and Post-Fundamentalism

Dr. H. T. Spence

In 2004 Paul Feyerabend, a former philosophy professor at the University of California (Berkeley) boldly declared the following:

To those who look at the rich material provided by history, and who are not intent on impoverishing it in order to please their lower instincts—their craving for intellectual security in the form of clarity, precision, 'objectivity,' [or 'truth']—it will become clear that there is only one principle that can be defended under all circumstances and in all stages of human development. It is the principle: anything goes. [*Science Rules: A Historical Introduction to Scientific Methods*, p. 376.]

Here, Feyerabend presents the basic concept of the postmodernist

when it comes to the unfolding history of all epistemology. According to the postmodernist, there have been many theories promoted as "truth" in the realm of science that were later discarded. Postmodernism believes that no scientific theory is ever neutral, that scientists will always have an agenda, especially a political agenda. They believe that old theories tend to die along with their proponents, while the new theories attract the attention of younger scientists who in turn promote their theories over the older ones. Therefore, they conclude that all scientific theories should be only considered a current theory until replaced by a new current theory.

With this subjective presupposition

the postmodernists do not believe that anything, including so-called science, can tell us what is real; what is real is only what scientists believe to be real at that particular time in history. Because even scientific concepts are not immune to subjective currents in language and culture, no one can claim any scientific objectivity about the world. Reality remains only what is real to the subjective perspective of each individual—as a result, Feyerabend declares, “anything goes.”

The belief that “anything goes” has become not only the philosophy of contemporary secularism but also of contemporary Christianity, yea, even within the remains of Fundamentalism. This article seeks to give an overall view of Postmodernism and its pervasiveness in Christianity and in Fundamentalism.

The Postmodern Pope

As the largest identification in Christianity, the Roman Catholic Church has well entered into postmodernism. The *Malachy* prophecies refer to the current pope as the last pope, the one who will bring destruction to the Roman Church, the Antichrist pope. Many believed when this present pope took office this prophecy did not apply to him. Nevertheless, the unfolding of the papal rule of Francis has revealed the surprise and wonder of a postmodern Rome.

For many years the priestly order known as the Society of Jesus or

the Jesuits has acted as the subtle power behind the papacy; they are sometimes called “the Black Pope,” the authoritative one standing in the shadows of the papacy. In a previous *Straightway* article (March-April 2015, “The Changing Face of Roman Catholicism,” Part 2), we presented the growing tension between the previous two popes and the Jesuits, the latter becoming Marxist in philosophy. This growing controversy boldly brought to the forefront one of the Jesuit’s own to openly rule from Peter’s throne. The papal throne has received a man who is the first of the Jesuits to rule. Almost from the outset of his administration, Pope Francis has been breaking down the “absolute” traditions of Romanism. He truly has become the postmodern pope for this present generation.

In 2013 Pope Francis had two interviews: (1) with the Jesuit Antonio Spadaro, director of the journal *La Civiltà Cattolica* (Catholic Civilization), and (2) with the atheist professor Eugenio Scalfari, founder of the leading Italian secular newspaper *la Repubblica*. In both these interviews Jorge Mario Bergoglio (Pope Francis I) declared his principles of belief and expressed how he sees the current state of the Roman Church. It is interesting to note that there are conservative men in the Vatican who try to “handle” this pope and his bold statements by coming behind him and interpreting what he “really meant” when he gives his various

speeches that seem to be contrary to the Roman Catholic tradition.

In his interview with Scalfari, Pope Francis stated, “Each of us has a vision of good and evil. We have to encourage people to move towards what they think is good.” This is a classic postmodern statement that has become viewed by many as the *mantra* (a Hindu prayer or invocation) for the postmodern age. The pope declared in this statement that each person must choose to follow the good and fight the evil as he conceives them. He also went on to state that everyone follows their own conscience, and it is “enough to make the world a better place.” One of the statements of the pope that caused repercussions around the world was, “If a person is gay and seeks the Lord and has good will, who am I to judge him?” Some of his men declared that it was a remark that “slipped out on the spur of the moment.” But this was not the case. In the subsequent interviews with *La Civiltà Cattolica*, the pope not only repeated but amplified it by saying, “Spiritual interference in personal life is not possible.” This interview was published simultaneously on September 19, 2013, in sixteen magazines of the Society of Jesus, in eleven languages. Some considered it the first true “encyclical” of Pope Francis.

From his recent trip to America and the appointed places of his visit, words poured forth revealing

that he truly is an eclectic pope who has the capability of blending the contemporary philosophies, religions, and worldviews into the subjectivism and progressivism to promote his postmodernism. His “pious” sympathy for all the religions of the world, his permissibility of sodomy (“Who am I to judge”), and the systematic, behind-the-scenes methodical dismantling of many of the traditions of Romanism have all given indication that he knows that to survive in the future Rome must change! The world will be seeing and hearing more surprising, shocking actions and declarations from this pope as his papal reign continues to unfold. He may be the one to dismantle the old and bring forth a new Romanism that will help assimilate the world religions in the future.

Postmodernism in Christianity

As has been already observed, postmodernism is without structure, without definitions, without language, and without established roots of history. It is very clear that postmodernism was born from the seed of existentialism, which does not believe in past or future, but simply lives for the moment, the present, and what is to be gained for the present.

The pervading influence of postmodernism into the institutional church became initially evident in the mid-part of the twentieth century; it came to a prominence in the 1990s, amidst a growing intense hatred for doctrine or anything that was

established and grounded in absolutes and standards of living. When these changes took place, there was a strong movement for the churches to enter the “warm,” the “casual,” the “feel-good” services with less emphasis on the distinctive lines of life and living. More and more, the belief was in a “subjective” Jesus and what He was to the individual. It was all about “experience” and less of doctrine, subjectivity over objectivity—a religion not with words but subjective images.

The language used to describe this new Christianity seemed to give glory to God. Dan Kimball in *The Emerging Church* (2003) boldly states the following:

We should be returning to a no-holds-barred approach to worship and teaching so that when we gather, there is no doubt we are in the presence of a Holy God. I believe that both believers and unbelievers in this emerging culture are hungry for this. It isn't about clever apologetics or careful exegetical and expository preaching or great worship bands . . . emerging generations are hungering to experience God in worship (p. 116).

Robb Redman, author of *The Great Worship Awakening* (2002), has made the observation that there is now a move to eclectically bring the liturgical vintage form of worship with the postmodern generation, using words, somewhat doctrinal, in the wrapping of contemporary music. Redman states, “A common approach

to the worship awakening among Protestant churches is to create a blended service combining older and newer liturgical elements and musical styles” (p. 197).

Julie B. Sevig, managing editor of *The Lutheran* magazine, wrote an article entitled “Ancient New” (September, 2001); she made it clear that the postmodernists look for a sensual, experiential worship:

Post-moderns prefer to encounter Christ by using all their senses. That's part of the appeal of classical liturgical or contemplative worship: the incense and candles, making the sign of the cross, the taste and smell of the bread and wine, touching icons and being anointed with oil.

Sevig, citing Leonard Sweet in his book *Soul Tsunami*, states the following: “Post-moderns want a God they can feel, taste, touch, hear and smell—a full sensory immersion in the divine.” Sevig also quotes from Karen Ward, an Emerging Church leader, observing the following:

Evangelicals are using traditions from all liturgical churches from Orthodox to Lutheran to Catholic . . . Though they have limited experience using their new-found symbols, rituals and traditions, they're infusing them with vitality and spirit and life, which is reaching people.

An article written by *Worship Leader* magazine editor Chuck Fromm states:

We are now living in a post

Passion of the Christ world. The extraordinary success of Mel Gibson's landmark film, and the controversy that surrounded it, underscores in no uncertain terms how imagery shapes our cultural consciousness. The implications for the church and its service of worship, have been both profound and ambiguous.

Youth today are being brought up in a diversified age where everyone is accepted and all kinds of lifestyles are becoming the norm of living. More and more, the Church is accepting a variety of religious paths and permitting more and more of the lifestyles to be part of the "Christian" faith. With pastors like Joel Osteen and many others, postmodern Christianity typically views spirituality as a journey intimately linked with the pursuit of personal growth or development. A bettering of self becomes the definition of spirituality, not a relationship with God. Some have gone so far as to include a dash of Zen Buddhism and a dash of Native American religion to one's nominal Christian beliefs. The postmodernist's view of subjective religion encourages the blending of many lifestyles of religions, and we are witnessing Christianity becoming a part of this noted subjective change. All of the liberal denominations have for years drawn from other religions for their expansive introductions for their parishioners to explore.

Present-day Fundamentalism

A few years ago a son-in-law of a Fundamentalist leader wrote

me believing that I had been too strong in an attack against a present distress in Fundamentalism. When I brought up historic Fundamentalism, he smugly and curtly replied that he knew nothing about historic Fundamentalism. When I responded that I would be glad for the opportunity to present its historical legacy, both in biblical doctrine and biblical separation, he sent back another e-mail and boldly declared that it did not matter what the beliefs were in earlier days; the important need of Fundamentalism was to become acclimated to the changes of the present need in Christianity. This was the response of a rising self-professing minister some forty years younger than I. It was clearly evident that though he resided in the buckle of the so-called Bible Belt, the circle of influence of this young man was that of Neo-Evangelicalism, yet with a new view of Fundamentalism, namely of a postmodernist persuasion.

It will be very difficult to find the "language" of historic Fundamentalism within the present-day concept of Fundamentalism. As we observed in the days of the birth of Neo-Evangelicalism, certain terminology may be used within present-day Fundamentalism, but the outworking of the practical methodology and standards are quite different and more identifiable with Neo-Evangelicalism.

The line of demarcation between Fundamentalist music and the sounds

of contemporary music has now become blurred. The world's sound is clearly present in Fundamentalism's music, while the work of the cross in crucifying the flesh is not part of their evangelical message. The casual look has been part of the Fundamentalist "look" for several years now. The "crossover" is becoming the trend in every area of public display.

In fact, Fundamentalism no longer has a clear definition of the "world"; therefore, how is a Christian to be delivered "from this present evil world" (Gal. 1:4)? The world knows its own sound, even when it is in the context of professing Christianity, and the world will be naturally drawn to its own sound. The present musicians of Fundamentalism know this and hope that these will be the sounds that will make Fundamentalism in a new wrapping more attractive. It is still the old adage of using the Philistine ox cart to transport the ark of God.

Throughout history the world's religions have all had their unique distinctives. Postmodernism believes these distinctives must be dismantled, all of the divisions of religion must be discarded, and all religions must become one in the promotion of humanity. Religion, in their mindset, must simply be a persuasion subjectively and not to be promoted outside the individual's own mind. We are now at a time in history when such pressing demands have come to the Fundamentalist's door.

And only those who submit to this global demand of dismantling the distinctives, and even the approach to the Fundamentals, will survive the public arena of imminent religious martyrdom.

In the light of this global acclimatization of religion, one may ask the question: Is the Christian Faith in America growing or is it dying? Have we become like the Europeans who are moving toward the full abandonment of Christianity, or are we in America submitting to the adoption of a convenient and more comfortable form of Christianity? Perhaps, ultimately, we will come to be a nation of the abandonment of historic Christianity; however, it is evident at this time in our history that Christianity in America (including Fundamentalism) has adopted a more comfortable form and concept of its present interpretation of Christianity. Yet, in the end, both the abandonment of Christianity and the changing of it will simply prove the powerful impact of modernity on the Church worldwide, and then postmodernism will enter into the heart of the institutional church.

We must acknowledge that we have already moved into a redefining of Christianity and of Fundamentalism, and both are breeding a new form of Christianity which is not that of Scripture. The public Christianity has abandoned biblical truths and is in the transition of experimenting with other forms, including a variety

of secularist perspectives, with the hope that a “neo” reformation (one accepted by all) will spring forth. We have yet to see the final new shapes that Christianity will take in the postmodern world to come. It must also be said that all of the religions of the world (including Islam) are in the throes of a postmodernist rebirth. Because of the fluid, elastic powers of postmodernism one cannot predict its final product. Not even the leaders of such a movement can predict where this contemporary ship is headed or what sandbars it will hit; but the thrill and excitement of this new venture are simply to be known in the uncharted, non-absolute waters into which the Church is headed.

Fundamentalism is now openly making friends with Neo-Evangelicalism, as we have witnessed in the recent visit of the president of Bob Jones University to Wheaton College, the old bastion of Neo-Evangelicalism.

And recently, Liberty University announced several revisions to its student handbook. This university was founded by Jerry Falwell, a Neo-Fundamentalist/Neo-Evangelicalist. Since his death, his sons have come to the forefront taking the ministry well into an open Neo-Evangelical context. The University continues to cast aside whatever standards there have been as it enters into the pressures of the postmodern times. Alexandra Markovich recently noted for the *Washington Post* that Liberty’s

student handbook “The Liberty Way” is in continued revision:

Change is in the air at Liberty University: couples can now do more than hold hands in public without fear of fine, men can wear ponytails, and students can watch R-rated movies (with ‘caution’). . . . Liberty, the largest Christian university in the world, has relaxed its rules this semester to give its students more freedom.

She went on to also note that even the fine of \$500 for practicing witchcraft has been removed from the handbook. These changes at Liberty are only a few examples of the many so-called “faith-based” colleges and universities that are radically changing and leaving their conservative roots. Kevin Roose, the news director for the Fusion Network, recently observed, “Liberty, like many other evangelical colleges and universities, is (very) gradually starting to resemble its secular counterparts.” While a number of professing Fundamentalist schools have closed down in the past two years due to finances, others continue. Will the pressure to acclimate to the contemporary bring greater changes to their already-growing secular appearance and manner? Will this be true of Bob Jones University in the next three years?

Postmodern Symptoms in Fundamentalism’s Music

The breakdown of music in Fundamentalism began with men like

Frank Garlock and Ron Hamilton. Although lectures were being given against the world's music by these men, the sympathetic spirit and sound of the contemporary were subtly creeping into their music. Tim Fisher, another Fundamentalist teacher and singer, in his book *Battle for Christian Music*, failed to strongly stand against contemporary music (as noted in a number of observations made in his chapter "Guilty by Association"). We alluded to this fact in our book *Confronting Contemporary Christian Music*. He drew from Romans 14 to declare that we must not be too hard on musicians using contemporary music. Romans 14 has nothing to do with music; music is not a "doubtful disputation" nor in the same category as food. Certain styles of music have a clear identification in our generation with the contemporary, "the world's sound." Fisher presented his Christian logic in a neutral position that added to the confusion which came into Fundamentalism.

Frank Garlock heralded the principle of how the church follows the world in its journey in "worldly music," taking the place where the world was before it entered into a deepening of the worldliness. But my dear earthly father often observed that Mr. Garlock was helping to bring this about. Many of the eclectic styles of the world's music were introduced to the Fundamentalist children through Ron Hamilton's *Patch the Pirate* music. From this grey area entered years ago, Fundamentalism has now shifted

further into the world.

In *The Rise and Fall of Historic Fundamentalism*, we made the following statement:

This grey area consists of a weakened message, a contemporary-shaped melody, a constant usage of suave dissonances, men singing pretty like women, women singing soft and sensual, dreamy surrealistic orchestrations, and the adopting of syncopated accompaniments.

This can never happen in Christian music unless the world has become a part "in heart" of the musician's perspective of Christianity.

The list of influences on Fundamentalism's music continues. Cary Schmidt, the Associate Pastor at Lancaster Baptist Church, the home church of West Coast Bible College, clearly identifies the crossroads that Fundamentalism has come to and the need of not looking back to the historical perspective of Fundamentalism but to the new perspectives that must be seen for this generation. In his book *Music Matters*, Schmidt implies that the Bible is not up-to-date for the contemporary since Paul was not preaching to kids with iPods. Like Victoria Osteen's calling for the music in their service to bring God down among the people, Schmidt believes that the music will bring the transformation to the human being and even conform us to Christ's image. He is a man that has led both the church and school into the CCM acceptance, even to the point of

taking the hard, upbeat songs of the postmodernist, charismatic church of Australia, "Hillsong," and introducing them to the present waiting (with anticipation) Fundamentalist movement, but mellowing the "hard, upbeat" to a more subtle acceptance for Fundamentalism. It is interesting to note that more and more, the world's "look" in dress, hair, and thinking are all an integral part of the music being promoted today. More and more, "anything goes" is becoming a novelty to the young Fundamentalist crowd.

When I was growing up in the Pentecostal churches, musicians like Ralph Carmichael, Bill Gaither, Dottie Rambo (Jesus Only), and the quartets of Southern Gospel music were the norm. My dear father was in a constant battle against such music that eventually helped birth the Charismatic movement. But now the redirected Fundamentalist movement draws from not only these individuals (voices of the contemporary Christian music of the past) but also a new breed of contemporary composers such as Keith and Kristyn Getty, Stuart Townend, Bob Kauflin, Steve and Vikki Cook, and even Melody Green (wife of the late contemporary singer Keith Green). We must remember that these individuals are ecumenists, non-separatists from the world.

For several years now Fundamentalism has been enamored by the Celtic and Irish New Age

sound. Even the newly-appointed president of Bob Jones University and his former evangelistic team strongly promoted Celtic and Irish music which is now brought into the broadening base of BJU music. The contemporary song of the Gettys and Stuart Townend, entitled "In Christ I Stand," has now become accepted by all of the Fundamentalist schools and many churches. The Gettys' website gives sad reality of the eclecticism of doctrine and the contemporary, both in their music and attire. They are viewed even by Amazon.com as being "at the forefront of the modern hymn movement over the past decade demonstrating the ability to successfully bridge the gap between the traditional and contemporary." Bob Jones University is now using these contemporary composers, becoming the motivator and innovator for rapid changes in neo-Fundamentalism.

As the leadership in America has led us into postmodernism, so this school that once stood in the forefront of the battle against all this chaos of New-Evangelicalism has led Fundamentalism into a postmodern persuasion. Perhaps the leadership believes that this is their only way of survival in this new era of change. The rising young leaders in Fundamentalism speak of Christianity as being a "prism" with the many facets of color that must be accepted as the Gospel comes from different perspectives. Yet this analogy becomes a key to

open the door of acceptability of contemporary Christianity.

Conclusion

Postmodernist thinking is rapidly making inroads into Fundamentalism. Such thinking for “anything goes” is also found in the casual dress that aggressively dominates the churches. American missionaries are introducing the “dress-down” look around the world in the native churches as they “dumb down” the souls of the people with shallow preaching, limiting accountability to God. Fundamentalism is more and more blending itself in with the world; they want to have no difference in their appearance. The formal attire of respect for God and His house has now become a thing of the past in Fundamentalism. How sad to see pastors in the pulpit with their “jeans” and polo shirt attire endeavoring to make worship more compatible with the world’s philosophy of the casual. The “casual” that entered Western civilization by the influence of John Lennon and the Beatles has now witnessed Christianity following suit. And now Fundamentalism is following in the footsteps of such thinking.

Another sad commentary of postmodernism in Fundamentalism is the seminaries presenting a variety of interpretations of Scripture, which has opened the door for the acceptance of many “subjective interpretations” of Bible passages. “Thus saith the Lord” of past Fundamentalism has

now been given over to simply let the student decide which subjective interpretation he wants for his life. One interpretation is as good as another. This has been the normal approach of Sunday school teaching for many years as the teacher opens up the class for everyone to give their “opinion” and interpretation, with no resolve of absoluteness by the end of the class. *This is raw postmodernism on the laity level of teaching.*

Owning, reading, and carrying a Bible are biblical concepts being denied existence while today the Bible has lost its identity as “the Book” and is placed alongside of the many “apps” on laptops and iPads. Sad to witness even pastors use laptops and iPads as the pulpit Bible. The personal Bible held in the hand as a “book” is now viewed as antiquated and is mocked as being not up with the times. The Bible has become one of the many eBooks that is scrolled down for worship or identified with the teleprompters at the front of the church. Yes, the Bible has become nothing more than another part of the electronic age.

We blend Christianity in with our living, rather than change our living to be conformed to the Christian Faith. Is this “American” Christianity? Is this becoming the trendy Western religion around the world? Postmodern Christianity cares not to ask if Jesus rose from the dead, or if He is the everlasting Son of God. The questions that

seem to matter to the churches today include (1) why does not the Christian tolerate all lifestyles of living? (2) why do Christians support warfare? (3) why is Christianity against sodomy? or, (4) why is Christianity against pro-choice or abortion? More and more, the Christianity of today is about questions of the contemporary rather than declarations of truth. The suits are gone, the ties are gone, the jeans and polo shirts are in for the preaching to the Sunday crowd along with the pulpits of wood exchanged for the acrylic, see-through lecterns. Yes, this is the “new” look of Christianity, the “new” Church, the postmodern church that is compatible with the innovative postmodernism of the times.

Even drinking wine and attending movie theaters have become accepted in many of the Fundamental circles. We have subjectively permitted all of these changes to be a part of Christian acceptance. At one time the intercollegiate sports were not allowed, but recent years have declared such intermixing with the world as “trendy” for the Christian colleges. It makes us more acceptable by the world. Such professing Christian schools cry aloud on the court and field, “We are witnessing for Jesus,” and the crowd goes wild with enthusiasm.

The Fundamentalist conferences of former days took their stand against the apostasy and warned the people of the apostate trends knocking on the door of Fundamentalism.

Some may have viewed them as too militant years ago. But it must be acknowledged that there is no militancy in Fundamentalism today; such a stand is conspicuously absent in the meetings. Whatever distinction of life and message that may have existed in Fundamentalism’s past, today that distinction is gone. It has no distinction; it has syncretically blended with Neo-Evangelicalism, and has taken delight in doing so.

We are at the worst hour in human history for the sight of a true biblical Christianity. The Lord gave the question in Luke 18:8, “Nevertheless when the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?” Here, He was referring to true Biblical Faith. Christianity today has come truly to the time of the Judges, when there is no king and every man does that which is right in his own eyes. The Lord Jesus has been cast out of the End-time Church, and only the individual that loves the absoluteness of His Word “will hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches.”

May there be such a remnant to come out from among this apostate Church Age, and be separate, touching not the unclean thing. To this group the Lord declares, “I will receive you, and will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters.” “Having therefore these promises, dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God” (2 Cor. 6:17–18; 7:1). [S]