

Dangers Of The Last Days

By Pastor Emeritus Kent Kelly

sermonaudio.com

Preached on: Wednesday, August 10, 1988

Calvary Memorial Church

400 S Bennett St
Southern Pines, NC 28387

Website: www.calvarymemorials.com

Online Sermons: www.sermonaudio.com/calvarymemorial

Returning tonight, if you have your Bibles, to 1 Timothy chapter four reading in verse one.

Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils; Speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron.¹

Let's bow together as we ask the Lord's blessing on his Word.

Our Father, we recognize again tonight the desperate need that we have of the help that can only come from thee if we are to understand thy Word and to understand the world around us in the light of that Word. We pray that you will help us to come to you with the faith of little children recognizing the utter simplicity that is required if we are to walk in the light. We pray that you will help us to be sensitive to the convicting power of thy Spirit, to help us understand the things that are true.

We pray now that you will move in power, that the Word of God might speak to each of our hearts, that we might gain understanding because we have come into this place to study thy Word this evening. And we pray these things in the precious name of the of the Lord Jesus Christ and for his sake, Amen.

I am bringing you a series of messages entitled, "Dangers of the Last Days." And tonight I want to speak to you on the historical record. I want to give you a history lesson that is really basic to understanding everything else in this series of messages.

Most Bible believing Christians know virtually nothing about the historical development of modern Christianity. That's because we have lived through some of the most momentous changes in the history of the Church. Things were in a state of upheaval in the times that are recorded in the book of Acts. Things were in an upheaval at the time of the Protestant Reformation. But there were no spiritual upheavals of great consequence in between those periods of time. There was simply a steady decline away from the truth until it was necessary for the Reformation to shake people out of their apathy. But we have seen in this nation some very radical developments just within the last 100 years.

¹ 1 Timothy 4:1-2

It is impossible to discern the trend in the Church today without knowing something about the past. I am a Fundamentalist. I say that without reservation and without apology. I say it in spite of what you hear from the media. Anyone who doesn't know the difference between a Muslim Fundamentalist and a Bible believing American Fundamentalist is too ignorant to be discussing the matter in the first place. So don't be intimidated by the humanists, by the pseudo intellectuals who make those kinds of comparisons.

The Bible says, "Answer not a fool according to his folly."² You know the difference between an Arab terrorist and a Bible believing Christian so I won't waste your time talking about any of those comparisons.

But I think it is important to understand that even informed humanists know the difference. A Bible denying, Christ rejecting, liberal theologian can read. And if he reads, if he is willing to do nothing more than consult history, if he learns the historical facts...

I am going to read you a statement written by an apostate devil. His name is Professor Kirsopp Lake. He was a well known professor at the University of Chicago, the University of Chicago's theological division being famous for unbelief since the very beginning.

The lesson here is this. You will be an apostate devil who denies the Bible, someone who denies the deity of Christ and the gospel of salvation, but you can still be an informed apostate devil. And that is what this man is. It is possible to be lost and still get your facts straight when it comes to matters of history and that is what this man has done.

Let me read you a statement by professor Lake. He says:

It is a mistake, often made by educated persons who happen to have but little knowledge of historical theology, to suppose that Fundamentalism is a new and strange form of thought. It is nothing of the kind: it is the partial and uneducated survival of a theology which was once universally held by all Christians. How many were there, for instance, in Christian churches in the eighteenth century who doubted the infallible inspiration of all Scripture? A few, perhaps, but very few. No, the Fundamentalist may be wrong. I think that he is. But it is we who have departed from the tradition, not he, and I am sorry for the fate of anyone who tries to argue with a Fundamentalist on the basis of authority. The Bible and the corpus theologicum of the church are on the Fundamentalist's side.

And here is a man who is willing to face the facts even to admit the truth. He is willing to recognize that which can be understood by anyone who is willing to read what the record of history has to say. He says, "Fundamentalism is not some new strange form of

² Proverbs 26:4

thought.” He says, “Any educated person who thinks that shows their lack of knowledge of historical theology.” Professor Lake says, “Fundamentalism is the theology once held universally by all Christians.” He says, “Even though I think Fundamentalists are wrong, it is not the Fundamentalist, it is we, the modern churchman, it is we the liberal theologians who have departed from the tradition.” He further says, “The Bible and the corpus theologicum, the Bible as the body of theology of the Church is on the Fundamentalist’s side.”

So by the common use of the Word, the apostle Paul is a Fundamentalist. The apostle John was a Fundamentalist. The Lord Jesus Christ was a Fundamentalist. And through the better part of the 18th and 19th centuries, Bible believing Christians universally were Fundamentalists.

It was not until the early part of this century that there had begun to develop in this nation something known as the Fundamentalist-Modernist controversy. Now you need to remember that. The Fundamentalist-Modernist controversy. The Fundamentalists believed what the Church has always believed. The Modernists were men within the major denominations who had become enamored with foreign theology. I don’t necessarily mean from another nation, although that is what it was, primarily, primarily German theology by men such as Karl Barth, Emil Brunner. And this theology challenged the authority of the Bible. The Modernism came by way of the colleges and universities.

It was like that because in those days they were primarily preacher training institutions, places like Harvard and Yale and Princeton and others were established to train preachers of the gospel. That was stated in the founding documents of those educational institutions.

In the 1920s and 30s the conflict between Fundamentalism and Modernism became very intense. Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists, Lutherans, everybody was involved in the conflict. And in this course of time there were some great men of God who stood for the Faith.

I talked to you recently about Dr. Robert Dick Wilson, probably the single greatest Bible scholar that ever lived, old men like J. Gresham Machen, R.A. Torrey, Bob Jones, Sr., B.B. Warfield, C.I. Scofield, W.B. Reilly, T.T. Shields in Canada, men who were very vociferously opposed to the Modernism, the apostasy and with the denominational churches of this nation.

Listen to the words of an editorial written in the liberal *Christian Century Magazine*, January the third, 1924. Now these are the Modernists assessing the Modernist-Fundamentalist controversy.

Christianity, according to Fundamentalism, is one religion. Christianity according to Modernism is another religion. There is a clash here as profound and as grim as between Christianity and Confucianism. Amiable

words cannot hide these differences. “Blessed be the tie that binds” may be sung until doomsday, but it cannot bind these worlds together. The God of the Fundamentalist is one God and the God of the modernist is another. The Christ of the Fundamentalist is one Christ; the Christ of the Modernist is another. The Bible of the Fundamentalist is one Bible; the Bible of Modernism is another.

Now, as I say, these are the words of a Modernist defining the irreconcilable difference, differences, plural, that they perceive to exist between Fundamentalism and Modernism, totally opposed points of view, totally different religions, an entirely different god, an entirely different christ, an entirely different bible, no similarities perceived by either side in the final analysis.

So as a result of these conflicts there was massive division. There were a great many men—some of the men that I mentioned to you a moment ago—who resigned from these universities, Bible believing Christians left their denominations. They came to the point that they felt that they could no longer support the apostasy in these denominations and in obedience to the Word of God they separated themselves.

Out of this Fundamentalist-Modernist controversy were formed groups such as the Independent Fundamental Churches of America, the General Association of Regular Baptist Churches, the Orthodox Presbyterians, the Bible Presbyterians and a great many more. The foundation of Bob Jones University was an outgrowth of this controversy as Dr. Bob Jones, Sr. left the Methodist Church.

Throughout the late 1930s and the 1940s the gap widened between Fundamentalism and the major denominations. There were some people who chose to stay with the denominations and because they chose to stay and they were Bible believing Christians they had to try to justify their position. A good example of this was Dr. Donald Grey Barnhouse. Barnhouse was a Presbyterian preacher. He was considered by many to be one of the best Bible teachers to live in this century and he had a great deal more influence than most people because he had a radio broadcast and he had a very large following.

In the 1930s and 40s Barnhouse was crystal clear in his attacks on the apostasy in this own Presbyterian Church. He refused to take communion with the men that he believed to be Bible deniers and Christ rejecters. He once told a young man who was being ordained by some of his fellow ministers in the Presbyterian Church that if they laid hands on his head he ought to shave off the hair because it would have touched the unclean thing. He was very outspoken in his opposition to the apostasy and the Modernism in the Presbyterian Church.

But he didn't come out. And because he didn't obey the Word of God and come out he had to justify his position. And in 1954 he had reversed his former criticism of the Presbyterian Church. He had appeared before the Presbytery and apologized for saying

bad things about them. And he decided that he was going to try to encourage people to stay in the denomination and support the movement.

Dr. Francis Schaeffer was just the opposite. In his early writings he was very hostile, very critical of those who preached separation from apostasy. When he was writing just before he died he admitted that this path of compromise with unbelief had been the wrong path. In fact, he gave the accommodation of liberal theology as one of the reasons why he believed there had been such a tremendous decline in the institutionalized church in America, such a decline in the propagation of truth.

By the late 1940s and the 1950s there was a new trend that began to develop. Many of the old warriors of fundamentalism had died. The liberalization of the preacher training institutions had continued. The denominations had grown stronger economically, stronger numerically. And it was during this period of time that the spiritual life of the nation took a back seat to the fighting of World War II. The one thing that was in the minds of people superseding everything else was the war effort, the way society needed to work together to fight the Second World War.

But I think it is an interesting side light to consider that the electronic church was in its infancy during this period of time. Not only was the electronic church at work affecting the religious views of the people, it was really far more influential back then than it is even today. Today there is a great deal of cynicism about religion in the media. Today there is a wide selection available to people: television, cable, radio. But back in those days nobody had a television set. There wasn't anybody watching TV to occupy their attention. Just about everybody had a radio because they wanted to keep up with what was going on with regard to the war and so forth. There were very few radio stations and there were very few programs on those radio stations.

So you were very limited if you were going to do anything besides sit around the house and look at one another, you were going to listen to the radio and you were going to listen to what was there because there weren't many choices.

And there was Donald Grey Barnhouse, who by that point at time had changed his views. He was now praising the apostates he had once exposed.

Another man was on radio. He became one of the most influential programs in America. His name was Dr. Charles E. Fuller and the program was called *The Old Fashioned Revival Hour*. Dr. Charles E. Fuller was a fundamentalist. He was a Bible believing Christian who was very concerned about trying to get people saved and a great many people were saved through his ministry.

If you have ever heard Jerry Falwell speak more than twice you have no doubt heard him say that he got saved by listening to *The Old Fashioned Revival Hour* on the radio, listening to the preaching of Dr. Charles E. Fuller. In fact, Jerry Falwell has followed the pattern of Dr. Charles E. Fuller and expanded on it in the way that he has conducted his ministry since that time.

Fuller was one of the first to have what you might call a nationwide ministry established through the media because he was on the radio and he was one of the few people on the radio. He raised massive amounts of money. He raised incredible amounts of money and he used the money to build a school, Fuller Theological Seminary.

Dr. Fuller, like most of the old time preachers was not an educator, so he brought in an intellectual to head up his school, Dr. Harold John Okenga, a man with several degrees, one that he felt would be qualified to head up Fuller Theological Seminary.

Dr. Okenga was the first president of Fuller Seminary. Now, as I say, Dr. Fuller was a Fundamentalist. He was a great preacher. He was a man greatly used of God. But he made some of the very same mistakes made by the electronic church today. Much of his support came from the major denominations. If he was outspoken against their apostasy pretty soon they wouldn't send him any money. He wouldn't have a nationwide ministry anymore. He wouldn't have a school to which people came from all over America.

Fuller could not preach separation from apostasy and keep his nationwide ministries, so he compromised. It is too bad he didn't live to see the result.

I am sure that the Lord is not allowing Dr. Charles E. Fuller to look down from heaven and see his school, because you are supposed to be happy in heaven and if he could see his school right now he wouldn't be very happy.

I am quoting from an article written by a Fundamentalist. His name is Dr. John C. Whitcomb, Jr. He is a professor of Theology and Old Testament at Grace Theological Seminary. Many of you know him from the books that he has written with regard to the conflict between creation and evolution.

Dr. Whitcomb says this:

By the middle of the 1960s Fuller Theological Seminary in Pasadena, California was firmly in the hands of scholars who were clearly and openly opposed to the doctrine of biblical inerrancy. In 1967 in Toronto Daniel Fuller, now the dean of Fuller Theological Seminary, was invited to give a paper before the Evangelical Theological Society.

Now this is Dr. Charles E. Fuller's son, by the way.

He told his astonished theologians that God had deliberately accommodated error in the text of the Bible. I quote, "God deliberately accommodated errors in the non theological and non moral facets of biblical teaching in order to enhance the communication of revelational truth."

Now this is Dan Fuller, the dean of Faith Theological Seminary. Dr. Whitcomb says this—I am editing here for brevity.

What has happened to Fuller Seminary in recent years? The situation without exaggeration is practically demonic in the sense that anything is demonic which contradicts God's written Word, divides believers and destroys their understanding of God's Word. In my view in the 1980s Fuller Seminary has sunk doctrinally to this level.

The reason is this: The third disastrous trend to have enveloped Fuller Seminary is a rampant ecumenism of the most extreme form, lubricated by the charismatic mentality and particularly promoted by one of the professors of the Fuller Seminary School of World Missions Arthur Graesser.

At the World Council of Churches Congress in Vancouver four years ago Dr. Graesser issued an official appeal to all evangelicals to join or rejoin the World Council of Churches. The gist of it was this. "Possessed as we are with moot charismatic understanding about God and each other, let us join the World Council of Churches and share our experiences."

Dr. Graesser who was once a missionary of the gospel in China with the China Inland Mission has fallen under the spell of the Fuller Seminary process of apostasy and is now leading the way toward identity with liberals, Roman Catholics, indeed, everyone who is ready to say something nice about Jesus. God's inerrant Word is apparently no longer the authoritative measuring stick or guideline for professors at Fuller Theological Seminary who share the ecumenical dream.

who was once a missionary of the gospel in China with the China Inland Mission has fallen under the spell of the Fuller Seminary process of apostasy and is now leading the way toward identity with liberals, Roman Catholics, indeed, everyone who is ready to say something nice about Jesus. God's inerrant Word is apparently no longer the authoritative measuring stick or guideline for professors at Fuller Theological Seminary who share the ecumenical dream.

And that is the assessment of Fuller Seminary by Dr. John C. Whitcomb, Jr. But I am really ahead of the story here in terms of our history.

Fuller Theological Seminary brought in Dr. Harold John Okenga. He was the intellectual. He was there to be the first president of the school. And in an address to the student body in 1947 Harold John Okenga coined an original phrase, "The New Evangelicalism."

Seven years later he left Fuller Seminary. He went on to pastor Park Street Church in Boston. Through these years with the national exposure that he had at Fuller, the prominence he gained from that, he continued to call for the development of this New Evangelicalism.

Now let me explain what that means. Remember the Fundamentalist-Modernist controversy, those were the terms commonly in use in that time, Fundamentalist meaning people who believed the Bible. Very simply that is what it means. Modernist meaning people who don't believe the Bible or who believe it according to their own definition rather than the way it is written.

But another name for a Fundamentalist in those days was the name Evangelical. Someone who was a Fundamentalist was also an Evangelical. The word "evangelical" comes from the Bible concept of the evangelist or someone who is evangelistic. The evangel is another term for the gospel. So an evangelist is someone who preaches the gospel, someone who preaches the evangel, the good news concerning the Lord Jesus Christ.

Someone who is evangelistic is someone who wants to reach others with the gospel of Jesus Christ. So it was a rather common appellation back in those days to refer to Fundamentalists as Evangelicals, meaning people who want to reach others for the Lord.

But Okenga didn't like the old Evangelicals who were the Fundamentalists. He said that the old Evangelicalism, Fundamentalism was a failure. He said that the old Evangelicalism of the Fundamentalists was outdated, it was anti intellectual. It was Pharisaical. So he said, "What we need is a New Evangelicalism." In his opinion Fundamentalism had a bad public image. That's exactly what the modern media are saying today.

So when you hear J. Vernon McGee attacking fundamentalists on the radio don't think that he is concerned about that name being associated with Muslim terrorists. That has absolutely nothing to do with it. J. Vernon McGee renounced the name Fundamentalist and the Fundamentalist movement 30 years ago. He did that when he aligned himself with Harold John Okenga and the New Evangelicals.

By 1957 the New Evangelical movement was in full swing. That was 10 years after Okenga originally introduced that term when he first became president of Fuller Seminary. Since Dr. Okenga is the father of New Evangelicalism, I will let him explain it to you in his own words.

Now this is a news release that he put out December 8, 1957. He says:

The New Evangelicalism has changed its strategy from one of separation to one of infiltration. Instead of static front battles the new theological war is one of movement. Instead of attack upon error, the New Evangelicals proclaim the great historic doctrines of Christianity. The New Evangelical is willing to face the intellectual problems and meet them in the framework of modern learning. The strategy of the New Evangelicalism is the positive proclamation of truth in distinction from all errors. The evangelical believes that Christianity is intellectually defensible, but the Christian cannot be obscurantist in scientific questions pertaining to the

creation, the age of man, the universality of the flood and other moot Biblical questions. The evangelical attempts to apply Christian truth to every phase of life.

Since I first coined the phrase "The New Evangelicalism" at a convocation address at Fuller Theological Seminary ten years ago, the evangelical forces have been welded into an organizational front. First, there is the National Association of Evangelicals which provides articulation for the movement on the denominational level; second, there is the World Evangelical Fellowship which binds together these individual national associations of some twenty - six countries into a world organization; third, there is the new apologetic literature stating this point of view which is now flowing from the presses of the great publishers; fourth, there is the existence of Fuller Theological Seminary and other evangelical seminaries which are fully committed to orthodox Christianity and a resultant social philosophy; fifth, there is the establishment of *Christianity Today*, a bi - weekly publication, to articulate the convictions of this movement; sixth, there is the appearance of an evangelist, Billy Graham, who on the mass level is the spokesman of the convictions and ideals of the New Evangelicalism.

And Okenga also says this:

Fundamentalism too often has been identified with peripheral emphases on doctrine and method, thus forfeiting the right to being a synonym with evangelical. For decades fundamentalism has proved itself impotent to change the theological and ecclesiastical scene. Its lack of influence has relegated it to the peripheral and subsidiary movements of Protestantism. Wherever fundamentalism and modernism came into test in a theological struggle, fundamentalism lost every major battle in the historical field. It has demonstrated little power to crack the social situation challenging the church today. The motivating loyalty to fundamentalism on the part of many Christians lies in its orthodoxy, its faithfulness to the Word of God. However, the judgment of history of fundamentalism is that it has failed.

Now keep in mind the salient points made by Dr. Okenga representing New Evangelicalism. Number one, the National Association of Evangelicals; number two, the Evangelical World Fellowship; number three, New Evangelical publishing houses and literature; number four; New Evangelical seminaries; number five, *Christianity Today* magazine; and number six, Billy Graham, who, and I quote, "On the mass level is the spokesman of the convictions and ideals of the New Evangelicalism."

And what are their convictions and ideals?

Number one, that Fundamentalism is a failure because it has failed to change the apostate denominations and cure the social problems of society. Number two, that the—quote—

strategy should be changed from separation from apostasy to infiltration into apostasy; number three, to give a positive message that does not expose error; and number four, to join the framework of modern education while avoiding—quote—“obsucritanist issues” such as the creation, the age of man, universal flood in the days of Noah.”

Now those are the convictions and the ideals of New Evangelicalism by the man who coined the term. You shouldn't be able to find a better authority on the subject than the man who invented the whole operation.

Do I need to tell you that all four of those convictions and ideals are contrary to the Bible, every single one of them. Number one is post millennial hogwash. Fundamentalism is not a failure because it has been unable to change the apostate denominations and cure the social ills of the society. If we were able to do those things before the Lord Jesus came back the Bible would not be true.

In the first place the Lord Jesus says, “Strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it.”³

In every generation there are few... He didn't say a minority, he wasn't talking about 47½%. He said, “Few there be that find it.”⁴ There are very few true believers in any generation, certainly not enough to change institutionalized religion, to turn it from its apostasy or to cure the social ills of society.

The Word of God says, “But evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving, and being deceived.”⁵

The second thing that the—quote—strategy should be changed from separation from apostasy to infiltration into apostasy. What is this changing strategy foolishness? Since when is it our business to set strategy? We don't give the orders. If we are those who believe the Bible we take the orders. The strategy has already been set. It is called the Word of God. And you don't change the strategy because you don't like it or because you think it would be nicer to do it some other way. To change the strategy from separation into infiltration is to change from obedience to the Bible to disobedience to the Bible. That is what you do when you change the strategy. The only strategy that God advocates is separation from apostasy.

In Ephesians chapter five and verse 11 he said, “And have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them.”⁶

In Romans 16:17 God says, “Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them.”⁷

³ Matthew 7:14

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ 2 Timothy 3:13

⁶ Ephesians 5:11

⁷ Romans 16:17

In 2 John verses 10 and 11 he said, “If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine,”⁸ that is sound doctrine, “receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed: For he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds.”⁹

Titus 3:10 says, “A man that is an heretick after the first and second admonition reject.”¹⁰

2 Corinthians 6:17: “Wherefore come out from among them...”¹¹ You did read that, didn’t you? “Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you.”¹²

That’s God’s strategy, separation from apostasy. And, by the way, if any man would change the strategy, anybody comes along telling you to change the strategy, the Bible tells you how to deal with that.

2 Thessalonians 3:6. “Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the tradition which he received of us.”¹³

God not only commands you to separate from apostasy, he commands you to withdraw yourself from every brother, every fellow believer who advocates changing the strategy.

The third conviction and idea of the New Evangelicals is to give a positive message rather than expose error. God says that is not right. He says it right here in this book. Though the Lord Jesus Christ and John the Baptist publicly denounced the apostate preachers of their day as a generation of vipers... that wasn’t a very positive thing to say, was it? Didn’t win them many friends or influence many people into talking about how loving they were because they said it.

He said, “O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come?”¹⁴

You won’t ever hear a New Evangelical talk like that. The Lord Jesus called them hypocrites, blind guides, children of their father the devil.

Of those who depart from truth Titus 1:13 says, “Wherefore rebuke them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith.”¹⁵

⁸ 2 John 10

⁹ 2 John 10-11

¹⁰ Titus 3:10

¹¹ 2 Corinthians 6:17

¹² Ibid.

¹³ 2 Thessalonians 3:6

¹⁴ Luke 3:7

¹⁵ Titus 1:13

The apostle Paul gave written instructions to the Church by inspiration of the Holy Spirit. He said in Galatians chapter one, “If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed.”¹⁶ Let him be condemned to hell. That is what the apostle Paul said about apostate preachers.

And in case someone missed the point he repeated it right there in the same passage. He said, “As we said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed.”¹⁷ Don’t fellowship with him. Don’t dialog with him. Don’t commend him to your evangelistic crusades. Let him be accursed.

If you read the Bible you will know that it is absolutely unscriptural to preach a positive message rather than exposing error. There is only one directly instructional passage in the entire Bible having to do with preaching. It says:

Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine. For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine.¹⁸

Reproving is not positive. Rebuking is not positive. Exhortation is the positive application of truth after error has been reproved and rebuked.

It is interesting to note that preachers in the Bible not only exposed error as a primary part of their ministry they named by name the groups and the individuals involved. That is how you know about the scribes and the Pharisees and the lawyers and the Sadducees because the Lord and his disciples identified those people by name. Those were distinct religious groups that had departed from the truth, groups not unlike the modern denominations of this world in which we find ourselves.

The apostle Paul has said, “Demas hath forsaken me, having loved this present world.”¹⁹

He said, “Alexander the coppersmith did me much evil.”²⁰ He went out and named the people by name.

He said, “Hymenaeus and Alexander have made shipwreck concerning the faith and I have delivered them to Satan, that they may learn not to blaspheme.”²¹

He said, “Hymenaeus and Philetus’ words eat like a cancer, a canker. They have erred concerning the truth and have overthrown the faith of some.”²²

¹⁶ See Galatians 1:8

¹⁷ Galatians 1:9

¹⁸ 2 Timothy 4:2-3

¹⁹ 2 Timothy 4:10

²⁰ 2 Timothy 4:14

²¹ See 1 Timothy 1:19-20

²² See 2 Timothy 2:17-18

And those are just a few of many passages that are my authority for preaching this series of messages. And I will say to you, again, it is not a matter of who is right. That has absolutely nothing to do with it. The question is what is right. And the commandment of the Lord Jesus to me is, "As you would that men should do unto you, do you even so to them."²³

And I say to you that if I help the ungodly and love them that hate the Lord, I hope somebody will say that I am wrong for doing it. If I support the apostate denominations, the preachers running institutions of this nation that train men in unbelief so that they can go out and preach a false gospel, I hope somebody will say that I am wrong because now matter how I try to justify it, if I end up some day doing that I will be wrong.

Dr. Charles E. Fuller was a great man of God. But what has that got to do with anything?

There were many Christians in those days, I'm sure, who would have said, "How could you possibly say anything against good old Dr. Fuller? All the years that he has been preaching the gospel, as many people as have been won to the Lord through his ministry, as sincere a man as he is, how could you say such a thing?"

And yet somebody should have said something. Somebody should have said, "This is wrong. Dr. Okenga is bad news. The things this man is saying are unscriptural. And if we don't watch out down the road somewhere we are going to have a major seminary in this country with the dean of the place, the son of Charles A. Fuller, denying the inerrancy of the Word of God, denying the existence of hell, bringing in a union of the charismatic movement and the Roman Catholic Church and the National and World Council of Churches right on the campus of Fuller Theological Seminary."

If you said that back in the days when Charles E. Fuller was around everybody would have said, "No, sir. It will never happen. You are just being negative. You are being unkind to poor old Dr. Fuller who has worked so long and so hard for the cause of Christ."

The New Evangelicals say, "Don't be negative. Don't obey the Bible and follow its pattern. We feel much better with a positive message that doesn't expose error."

As a result there are millions of Americans who have no idea of the inroads of apostasy and unbelief that have been made into their denominations and the churches that they attend and the people that they support.

Finally, Okenga said, "We are going to join the framework of modern education by avoiding such osbscuritanist issues is the creation, universal flood in the days of Noah."

As for the framework of modern education, God says, "Cease, my son, to hear the instruction that causeth to err from the words of knowledge."²⁴

²³ See Matthew 7:12

²⁴ Proverbs 19:27

On the mind of anybody who has got a grain of common sense a little experience, that is the death blow to the framework of modern education.

“Cease, my son, to hear the instruction that causeth to err from the words of knowledge.”²⁵

The Lord Jesus Christ said that any man who is slow of heart to believe the stories of the creation and the flood, is a fool.²⁶ How is that for negative preaching? He said that in Luke 24:25. He said, “The mind of the fool would be even slow of heart to believe all that the fathers have spoken.”²⁷

The Lord Jesus Christ cited and believed the Genesis account of creation. He cited and believed the Genesis account of the flood in the days of Noah just the way it is written there in the Bible, even the part about the water being above the tops of the highest mountains. He put his stamp of approval upon the account, not upon each particular. He just endorsed the whole thing. And he found nothing obscure about either one of them, apparently.

New Evangelicals, with the emphasis on the jelly, only a man with jelly for a backbone would be intimidated by the opposition of science falsely so called.²⁸

We are talking about people who spend a great deal of time and money getting their masters, their Ph.Ds and they are not willing to be the off scouring of the earth, the scum of the earth in the mind and assessment of the modern intellectual community.

They have got too much invested emotionally, financially in trying to be somebody in the world of scholarship.

Then, when you get into the framework of modern education to be recognized, to be appreciated as someone who has a meaningful opinion. They don't want to be some low life, ignorant, fundamentalist who believes the Word of God just the way it was written. It would be too great a bow to their ego.

I say to you, the goals and the convictions of New Evangelicalism as expounded by their founder in the historical record are not only unscriptural, they are anti scripture. And when you talk about the National Association of Evangelicals, the World Association, *Christianity Today* magazine, the publishing houses, Billy Graham, you are talking about people who are pushing this anti scriptural philosophy.

I will say to you again, I am not saying these people are lost. I am saying they are disobedient to the plain teaching of the Bible. I am saying it doesn't matter who they are

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ See Luke 24:25

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ See 1 Timothy 6:20

and it doesn't matter if next week I change my mind and join them, you better believe that we will be wrong, all of us, because we have taken a position that is contrary to what is right.

We live in a world that needs the gospel very desperately. But I will tell you the real story behind all of this. This was an attack on the sovereignty of God by the powers of darkness. Is the devil putting into the mind of people like Billy Graham, Charles E. Fuller, Okenga, that if I don't go to a certain place, if this certain group of people doesn't have the opportunity to be exposed to me and my preaching they may go to hell forever. These people need me. And I can't let little things like what the Bible says stand in the way. I have to be certain that these people have their opportunity to hear me preach so that they won't go to hell forever because I didn't get to preach to them.

Now we are talking here about some very subtle and sophisticated pride in the hearts of men as a motivating factor. It is a hyper Arminian view that if we can't get to people, if we can't step over all the barriers, including ones that are set by the Word of God to get out the gospel, then there will be all these people that end up dying and going to hell.

And I suggest to you that God never called us to save a single soul, not even one. He called us to preach his Word faithfully. And he said, "If you do that, my Word will not return unto me void, but will accomplish that which I please and prosper in the thing whereto I sent it."²⁹

Now see that you [?] not. And if it is true we don't have to change the strategy. We just have to be very careful that we stand in the evil day and having done all to stand.³⁰

Let's bow together as we close in prayer.

Our Father, we do rejoice tonight in the privilege of gathering together. We pray that you will help each one who has come into this place to understand the reality of thy Word. We thank you that the precious blood of Christ is still powerful, that the gospel is still the power of God unto salvation, that any who will trust the Lord Jesus, receive from him the gift of eternal life. We pray that you will help us that we might have the wisdom that we need to understand the issues that face us in this hour. And we pray these things in the precious name of the Lord Jesus and for his sake. Amen.

²⁹ See Isaiah 55:11

³⁰ See Ephesians 6:13