

# **CHRISTIANITY AND ANTI-CHRISTIANITY IN THEIR FINAL CONFLICT**

**A Paper Presented At**

**The 21<sup>ST</sup> Meeting of**

**The Dean Burgon Society  
July 14-15, 1999  
Heritage Baptist University  
Greenwood, Indiana**

**By**

**Dr. Gary E. La More, Ph.D., D.D.**

**Pastor of Grace Missionary Baptist Church  
And  
President of Historic Baptist Bible Institute and Seminary**

**1378 Kingston Road  
Scarborough, Ontario, Canada  
M1N 1R2**

**1-416-281-4865**

**www site: [www.gracembc.org](http://www.gracembc.org)**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**INTRODUCTION** ..... 3

**HOW APOSTASY BEGAN** ..... 4

**THE FINAL CONTROVERSY** ..... 4

**SEEN OF ANGELS** ..... 8

**PHILOSOPHIC PREPARATION FOR THE UNIVERSAL CHURCH**  
..... 9

**CONCLUSION** ..... 15

**APPENDIX I**

**THE WORD VIRGIN AND THE REVISED STANDARD VERSION**  
    ..... 17

**APPENDIX II**

**HARRY EMERSON FOSDICK [1878-1969]**  
    ..... 19

**APPENDIX III**

**EXISTENTIALISM**  
    ..... 25

**APPENDIX IV**

**SHAILER MATHEWS [1863-1941]** ..... 29

**APPENDIX V**

**SHOULD CREATIONISTS ABANDON THE KING JAMES VERSION?**  
    ..... 32

**BIBLIOGRAPHY** ..... 37

# CHRISTIANITY AND ANTI-CHRISTIANITY IN THEIR FINAL CONFLICT

## INTRODUCTION

According to Richard V. Clearwaters, D.D.,<sup>1</sup> since the days of the early church fathers, there has continued a somewhat general agreement on the following pattern of prophecy:

1. That before the end of the world, or age of grace, there would be an apostasy, which in its culmination would be not merely a corruption of the Christian faith, but a total denial of it.
2. That the last representative and leader of this apostasy would be a man, a “**man of sin**,” “**the wicked one**,” “**the son of perdition**,” or “**the Antichrist**.”
3. That this man would attain to universal dominion, all nations becoming subject to him.
4. That this dominion would continue but a short time.
5. That he would claim divine honour for himself, and persecute all upholding the faith of Christ, and suppress as far as possible, all Christian witness and worship.
6. That the time immediately preceding and during his reign would be one of great tribulation.
7. That many of God’s chosen people, the Jews, would receive him as their Messiah.
8. And lastly, that this “**man of sin**” would be destroyed together with his adherents, by the Lord at His appearing.

---

<sup>1</sup>Clearwaters, Richard Volley (1900-). Baptist preacher and educator. Born in Wilmot, Kansas, Clearwaters graduated from Moody Bible Institute (1924) and went on to earn degrees from Northern Baptist Theological Seminary (Th.B., 1928; B.D., 1931). He also attended Kalamazoo College (B.A., 1930) and the University of Chicago Divinity School (M.A., 1931). Clearwaters served churches in the Northern Baptist Convention...becoming pastor of Fourth Baptist Church, Minneapolis, Minnesota (1940-1982). He was president of the Iowa Baptist Convention (1937-1939) and served on the board of trustees of Northern Baptist Theological Seminary.

Apart from his pastoral ministry, Clearwaters served as dean and professor of practical theology of Northwestern Theological Seminary and then, in 1956, became founder and president of Central Baptist Seminary in Minneapolis, which was housed in his church. He also founded and served as first president of Pillsbury Baptist Bible College, Owatonna, Minnesota. He received honorary degrees from Northern Baptist Theological Seminary, San Francisco Conservative Baptist Theological Seminary and Bob Jones University (Leonard, Dictionary of Baptists in America, 85-86).

We begin with the **First Epistle of John**. This Apostle is the *only* one using the name “**antichrist**” to define the **man of sin**. We will find in *I John 2:18, 22; 4:3* five distinct statements of fact that applied to his day, closing the first century:

1. That which constitutes the essential characteristic of antichrist, or of the antichristian spirit, is the denial that “**Jesus Christ has come in the flesh,**” or that “**Jesus is the Christ,**”-a denial of the Incarnation.
2. This spirit of the Antichrist was already in the world and had infected many.
3. This antichristian spirit would find its last and highest manifestation in some one man, distinctively, the Antichrist. This is clearly stated in *I John 2:18*, “**As ye have heard that antichrist cometh.**” Upon this, Westcott remarks, “The absence of the article shows that the term has become current as a technical or proper name.”
4. The appearing of the Antichrist marked “**the last hour.**”
5. The many antichrists were apostate Christians. “**They went out from us...**”

#### *HOW APOSTASY BEGAN*

1. People’s first love for Christ seemed to weaken.
2. Following the loss of “**first love**” there was also the loss of “**the faith once for all delivered,**” in some part of its form.
3. The people gradually forgot Christ’s return as a vital hope.
4. The Church subduing the world so vigorously, forgot her own spiritual and faithful life.
5. The Church substituted a human head for Christ the Head of the Church.
6. Satan at this junction of church and state was not greatly feared.
7. From this time on, the earthly political rulers would ask themselves, “What will the earthly head of the Church think of this or that, that I may do?” They never seemed to ask, “*What will Christ the Head of the Church think of this or that, that I may do?*”

#### THE FINAL CONTROVERSY

Bengel has said, “Enter upon no controversy without knowledge, nor without necessity, nor without love.” The subject [of this message] is obviously controversial. If we accept the words of *I Timothy 3:15, 16* [*1 Tim. 3:15-16* - But if I tarry long, that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth. <sup>16</sup>And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the

Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory.] and take them seriously in the Christian ministry today, we will find ourselves in a great controversy.

The *Christian Century*, a self-confessed magazine of *religious liberalism*, made the following plain declaration editorially January 3, 1924:

**Christianity according to Fundamentalism is one religion. Christianity according to Modernism is another religion. Which is the true religion is the question that is to be settled in all probability by our generation for future generations.**

**There is a clash here as profound and as grim as between Christianity and Confucianism. Amiable words cannot hide the differences. “Blest be the Tie” may be sung till doomsday but it cannot bind these worlds together. The God of the fundamentalist is one God; 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 Fundamentalism is one Bible; the Bible of Modernism is another. The church, the kingdom, the salvation, the consummation of all things-these are one thing to fundamentalists and another thing to modernists.**

**Which God is the Christian God, which Christ is the Christian Christ, which Bible is the Christian Bible, which church, which kingdom, which salvation, which consummation are the Christian church, the Christian kingdom, the Christian salvation, the Christian consummation? The future will tell.**

We would point out two things in analyzing this quotation: *first*, that it is a contrast between Fundamentalism and Modernism. During the [seventy-five years] that have passed since this *liberal* magazine said “**the future will tell**,” Fundamentalism has continued under such names as “**evangelical Christianity**” and “**conservatism**.” *Secondly*, Modernism has changed its name-**BUT NOT ITS NATURE**-and has come to be known as “**liberalism**” and “**neo-orthodoxy**.”

In this message [we] propose to show the sharp conflict between these forces, calling attention to those who accept and those who reject the **virgin birth of Christ**, the **Holy Spirit as the third person of the Trinity**, the **existence and ministry of angels**, the **New Testament gospel preached unto the Gentiles by Paul**, and those who reject the **eternal sovereignty of Christ**.

To address ourselves to the first consideration, we deal with those who accept and those who reject **the virgin birth of our Lord**. In 1952 the **National Council of Churches** spent one-half million dollars in launching the new REVISED STANDARD VERSION of the Bible in some three thousand local gatherings across the country. The word used in the Greek for Virgin, “*parthenos*.” appears fourteen times in the New Testament and is

translated uniformly as “**virgin**” in the [KING JAMES BIBLE]<sup>2</sup> ...BUT the REVISED STANDARD VERSION translates it as “**virgin**” only in Matthew 1:23 and Luke 1:27. Elsewhere it appears as “**maiden** (Matt. 25:1,7,11); “**unmarried**” (Acts 21:9; I Cor. 7:25); “**girl**” (I Cor. 7:28, 34); and “**betrothed**” (I Cor. 7:37, 38). Thus as masters, not translators, of the text, they interpret it at will to suit their unbelief. [SEE, Appendix I - The Word **Virgin** and the **Revised Standard Version**]

Dr. [H]arry [E]merson Fosdick<sup>3</sup>, an acknowledged spokesman for liberalism for

---

<sup>2</sup>Parthenός [παρθένος] - **Virgin** - **Matthew 1:23; 25:1,7,11; Luke 1:27 (2); Acts 21:9; 1 Corinthians 7:25,28,34,36,37; 2 Corinthians 11:2; Revelation 14:4.**

<sup>3</sup>FOSDICK, HARRY EMERSON (1878–1979)

*American Baptist preacher, teacher and author; champion of liberal Christianity*

Fosdick was the center of the stormy conflicts in the church over liberalism during the mid-1920s. In college, Fosdick abandoned belief in biblical infallibility and traditional understanding of doctrines of historic Christianity. He emphasized human ability for moral and social progress. Throughout his ministry he encouraged interest in psychology, writing that “the genius of Christianity lies in reverence for personality.” At times Fosdick saw preaching as group-counselling his congregation; at other times, speaking out on an issue.

In 1915 Fosdick moved from a popular Baptist pastorate in Montclair, New Jersey, to Union Theological Seminary in New York City, where he became a professor of practical theology. He had been associated with Union since 1908, part time, as lecturer on Baptist principles and polity. In 1919 Fosdick enlarged his work by becoming guest preacher at the old First Presbyterian Church in New York City. There in 1922, he preached “Shall the Fundamentalists Win?” He argued against doctrinal belief as a requirement for church membership and advocated open admission, so that collectively, through the church, personal and social betterment might be pursued. That sermon and his defense of it brought forth repeated attacks by conservative Presbyterians and Baptists. Finally, in 1925, he resigned his pulpit.

He had won, however, the support of John D. Rockefeller, Jr., who obtained the pastorate of his own Park Avenue Baptist Church for Fosdick and soon built for him the new Riverside Church. The use in the decoration of that building of carvings of such people as Charles Darwin, Albert Einstein, John Wesley, David Livingstone, Moses, Confucius, Buddha, and Mohammed, alongside of Christ, illustrates Fosdick’s broad religious inclusiveness.

At Riverside Church, Fosdick led a vast program of liberal teaching and service, which made him, by the time of his retirement in 1946, a national and even a worldwide figure who inspired others in their ministries. His writings include *The Modern Use of the Bible* (1924), *A Guide to Understanding the Bible* (1938), *The Manhood of the Master* (1913), *The Meaning of Prayer* (1915), and *On Being a Real Person* (1943). His autobiography, *The Living of These Days*, was published in 1956. D.Munson

Douglas, J. D., Comfort, Philip W. & Mitchell, Donald, Editors, Who’s Who in Christian History, (Wheaton, Illinois: Tyndale House Publishers, Inc., 1992) 252-253.

over twenty-five years, wrote to a correspondent the following strong words, “Of course I do not believe in the virgin birth or in that old-fashioned doctrine of the atonement. I do not know any intelligent Christian minister who does.” [SEE, Appendix II - Harry Emerson Fosdick]

The messianic identity of Christ wholly depends upon His virgin birth. If He was a natural son of the first Adam, then He also needed a Saviour, and there is no last Adam to be the federal head of a new race. His messianic identity is the one historic proof of the whole Old Testament; namely, the Jesus of Nazareth pre-existed, was virgin born, was perfect in His life, miraculous in His ministry, atoning in His death; was bodily resurrected and was “**received up into glory**” in His eternal sovereignty.

We pass now to the consideration of the phrase, “**justified in the Spirit.**” Again [we] would like to refer to the new REVISED STANDARD VERSION. Dean Weigle (page 54), in “An Introduction to the Revised Standard Version,” makes the following statement: “The version of 1881 [1891] and 1901 eliminated some of the archaisms of the King James Version. Notably, they substituted the personal relative pronoun ‘who’ for the neuter

---

**Fosdick, Harry Emerson (1878–1969).** American Baptist minister. Born in Buffalo, N.Y., he graduated from Colgate University and Union Theological Seminary, and became minister of the First Baptist Church, Montclair, N.J. (1904–15). During this period he also began a long association as professor of practical theology at Union Theological Seminary, N.Y. (1908–46). In World War I he served with the YMCA in France, and on his return became guest preacher at the First Presbyterian Church, New York City. Attacked by fundamentalists for his liberal theological views, he resigned this position in 1925 to become minister of Park Avenue Baptist Church. Under his leadership this became the interdenominational Riverside Church, where he was minister until his retirement in 1946. For 20 years his radio ministry was carried by the nationwide National Vespers. One of his major interests was the development of personal counseling in the churches in cooperation with psychiatric help. He wrote 30 books, including *The Manhood of the Master* (1913), *The Meaning of Prayer* (1915), *The Modern Use of the Bible* (1924), *On Being A Real Person* (1943), *On Being Fit to Live With: Sermons on Post-War Christianity* (1946), *Rufus Jones Speaks to Our Times: An Anthology* (1951), his autobiography *The Living of These Days* (1956), and *Dear Mr. Brown: Letters to a Person Perplexed* (1961). He also wrote the hymn “God of Grace and God of Glory.”  
J. D. Douglas {J. D. Douglas Editor-at-large, Christianity Today}

Douglas, J.D., *Biographical Entries from 20th Century Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1997, c1991) 336-337.

See also, Dr. Gary E. La More’s **Subjectivism In Religion: Eleven Theological Personalities, 50-57.**

‘which’ where this refers to persons.” Let us turn to Ephesians 1:14<sup>4</sup> and read the R.S.V.: “which is the guarantee of our inheritance until we acquire possession of it, to the praise of His glory.” Why does the R.S.V. use the *neuter* [ὅ] pronoun here instead of the masculine pronoun [ὃς] as does the TR?<sup>5</sup> Why have the revisers insisted on a rendering which denies the personality of the Holy Spirit and ignores completely the honest translation of a plain text? *The answer is simple: The old Modernism failed because it denied plainly revealed truths, but liberalism shifted the strategy and in a very subtle fashion professes to believe the fundamental truths and at the same time interprets them away.*

If we would study the life of our Lord we would find five distinct instances proving that He was justified in the Spirit. *First*, in His baptism the Holy Spirit made a corroboration of His identity; *second*, through His teachings and miracles which He wrought; *third*, in Christ’s offering Himself for sin “**through the eternal Spirit,**” (Heb. 9:14); *fourth*, Romans 1:4 tells us Christ “**was declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead;**” *fifth*, Christ’s coming on the Day of Pentecost to abide with the church in the person of His Alter-Ego, the Holy Spirit, until His second coming. In this conflict between Christ and Antichrist, the division today is the same as ever.

#### SEEN OF ANGELS

We come next to “**seen of angels.**” As we study the earthly life of our Lord we find the announcement of His birth by an angelic chorus. In the next instance, in Matthew 4, after His temptation by the devil, angels came and ministered unto Him. Later, in the garden of Gethsemane, we see Him ministered to by angels. On one occasion the demons said, “**We know thee, who thou art, thou holy one of God.**” He was recognized by the devil, by the evil angels and by the good angels as the Son of God. Later there is an angelic guard posted at His tomb. In answering the critics who frequently declare that angels were merely the “*accepted thinking*” of the day in which Jesus lived and that they were freely interspersed during His earthly life, we would like to ask liberalism, “Why did not angels appear at the crucifixion when our Lord on the cross was so in need of help?” The only answer is in the Word of God; namely, that He was prophesied to tread the winepress alone. For example, Dr. George A. Buttrick,<sup>6</sup> Presbyterian leader, says in his book, *Great*

---

<sup>4</sup>**Ephes. 1:14** - Which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession, unto the praise of his glory.

<sup>5</sup>The Nestle text [25<sup>th</sup> edition]...shows the neuter pronoun in the [footnote].

<sup>6</sup>**Buttrick, George Arthur (1892–1980)**. Presbyterian pastor and professor. Born and educated in England, Buttrick was ordained in the Congregational Church in the United States in 1915 and served pastorates in that denomination before becoming pastor of the First Presbyterian



With Hegel<sup>9</sup> the climax seems to be reached, the last word to be spoken. All dualism

---

<sup>9</sup>HEGEL, GEORGE WILLIAM FRIEDRICH (1770-1831)

*German philosopher*

Perhaps the most influential philosopher of the nineteenth century, Hegel was educated with a view to entering the clergy but reacted against the unimaginative orthodoxy of his professors, and taught philosophy instead at Jena, Heidelberg, and Berlin. He seems to have regarded his philosophy as a defense of Christianity, but his is a Christianity reinterpreted to conform to his philosophy and robbed of its historical and supernatural elements. Hegel thereby contributed to the rise of theological liberalism and the so-called "secular religion."

His early theological writings interpret religion along Kantian lines as a symbolic way of teaching morality. Thus God is pure reason and Jesus is a purely human teacher who acted out of rational duty in opposing the irrational legalism of the Pharisees. His natural religion of reason stands against all the positive religions of any priestly authorities. A little later Hegel changed this to stress not reason but love—the conflict between love and slavery to moral law.

These early ideas, while radically changed later, provide his conception not only of symbol but also of the dialectic: a process in which opposites negate each other yet are united in a synthesis that transcends their conflict. Hegel traced this process through unfolding logical categories into the evolution of nature and of the human spirit and its culture. Unifying this ongoing historical dialectic so that it advances in one direction is the underlying reality of Being, the absolute rational spirit that achieves full self-consciousness and self-expression in the emerging self-consciousness of the human spirit. This underlying absolute is God.

Religion employs imaginative pictorial concepts, sometimes called symbols, in reflecting on man's consciousness of himself as spirit at one with the Absolute. Philosophy dispenses with these symbols by achieving purely rational concepts. Consequently, Hegel took religious beliefs to symbolize his philosophical ideas. This is the case with all religions: primitive nature-religions symbolize the fact that nature is in some way related to Spirit; religions of spiritual individuality, such as Judaism, advance further in recognizing that man is spirit; but the absolute religion is Christianity, whose doctrine of the incarnation means that all finite things embody Absolute Spirit. Hegel, in other words, was an idealist who saw all reality as basically spiritual, and a pantheist who denied that God is numerically or qualitatively distinct from the world.

Other Christian symbols suffer, too. Love means that in the historical dialectic all negation and opposition are finally reconciled by becoming one in the Absolute. Resurrection, the death of death, speaks of Spirit's triumph over negation. Christianity is effectively changed from a religion rooted in historical events into an abstruse metaphysical theory. A.F.Holmes

Douglas, J. D., Comfort, Philip W. & Mitchell, Donald, Editors, Who's Who in Christian History, (Wheaton, Illinois: Tyndale House Publishers, Inc., 1992) 307-308.

**Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich: (1770-1831) Philosopher, absolute idealist, whose influence in Protestant thinking has been enormous. The dialectic of thesis-antithesis-synthesis is not only a description of thought but of the modes of Reality. God is the Absolute Spirit, the Absolute Truth. The real world is rational. Christianity is the**

is resolved, God alone exists. He is the All, both the Infinite and the finite, the Absolute and the relative, the Eternal and the temporal. His life is an Eternal process of self-development. We know the law of His development, and that its ultimate term is man. Humanity is the consummation of Divinity.

Again, the same writer says in the same volume (page 136):

Of the Hegelian philosophy a recent writer says: “In itself it is unmixed anthropotheism, not the exaltation of a creature into the place of God, but the assertion that the creature is the sole and essential God...Alas! Herein lies its bad excellence, that while utterly expunging from creation, as a popular representation, a present Deity; while rejecting an Incarnate Saviour, an indwelling Spirit, an inspired record, a coming day of judgment; its subtlety is such that there is no point of Christian verity, no office of the adorable Trinity, no text of Holy Writ, for which it has not an appropriate niche in its temple of lies. It contradicts nothing, it stultifies everything; it confounds, neutralizes, and eliminates all objects of present faith. It is the first truly philosophical system which, denying the life to come, eternizes the present... The thought of man is the fountain, the judgment of man the judge, of all things...and man, though as an individual born and mortal, is as man the eternal essence.” A German writer says of it that it is “a paganism dressed up anew, and sublimed to a self-adoring worship of mind.”

What is the result of this Hegelian philosophy preparing for the church of prophecy? It blots out the distinction between God and man and between the Church and the world. The Church is not now destined to save Christians out of the world, but rather to save the world. It feeds man’s pride by making him divine in nature by a natural birth. While professing to exalt Christ it denies Christ as a living, ruling Lord of the Church. It is essentially *pantheistic*.<sup>10</sup> According to Dr. Clearwaters, ...Shailer Mat[t]hew[s]<sup>11</sup> in *Our*

---

Absolute Religion confirming the dialectic (even in the Trinity). For reaction against Hegelianism, *see* existentialism. [SEE Appendix III - Existentialism] (Vergilius Ferm’s, A Protestant Dictionary, 117-118.)

<sup>10</sup>**Pantheism** (Greek ‘pan’-all, and ‘theos’-god) The belief that ‘all is god’, that [G]od is so immanent in [H]is creation that [H]e cannot be separated from it. Pantheism and *deism* are opposites. Christian theology teaches the immanence of God, but teaches that God the creator is separate from and sovereign over [H]is creation. He is not identified with it. It is good to have some understanding of pantheism if one is to understand eastern religions, particularly Hinduism. Manton’s A Dictionary of Theological Terms, 89-90. **Deism** (Latin ‘deus’-God) Certain people in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries taught that there is a personal creator God but that this God has not revealed [H]imself to people nor intervened in their history. Having created the world [H]e left it to continue according to fixed natural laws, rather like a clock which continues according to its own workings and finally stops. As a result of this teaching, deists denied the **incarnation** and

***Contemporary God* describes Pantheism so perfectly that when it was published [Dr. Clearwaters] had this experience. [Dr. Clearwaters] was in Chicago University with a**

---

**the possibility of miracles. Ibid., 45.**

**<sup>11</sup>MATHEWS, SHAILER (1863–1941)**

*American educator and advocate of the social gospel*

Born in Portland, Maine, and educated at Colby College (1884) and Newton (Massachusetts) Theological Institute (1887), Mathews served on the Colby faculty from 1887 until 1894. Then he joined the faculty of the University of Chicago Divinity School, teaching New Testament until 1906 and thereafter historical and comparative theology until his retirement in 1933. For twenty-five years (1908–1933) he also served as dean of the faculty. Along with Washington Gladden and Walter Rauschenbusch, Mathews was an early exponent of the social gospel. In this area he published *The Social Teaching of Jesus* (1897)—a pioneer work in stating the biblical basis of the social gospel movement. An active churchman, Mathews was president of the Federal Council of Churches from 1912 to 1916 and of the Northern Baptist Convention in 1915. N.V.Hope

Douglas, J. D., Comfort, Philip W. & Mitchell, Donald, Editors, Who's Who in Christian History, (Wheaton, Illinois: Tyndale House Publishers, Inc., 1992) 462-463.

**Mathews, Shailer (1863–1941).** Baptist theologian. Born in Portland, Maine, he was educated at Colby University, Newton Theological Institution, and the University of Berlin. He was associate professor of rhetoric (1887–89) and professor of history and political economy (1889–94) at Colby University. He was then associate professor (1894–97) and professor of NT history and interpretation (1897–1904) at the divinity school of the University of Chicago. He was professor of systematic theology (1904–6) and of historical and comparative theology (1904–33) in the same institution and dean of the school (1908–33). He wrote many books, among them *Select Mediaeval Documents* (1891), *The Social Teaching of Jesus* (1897), *A History of NT Times in Palestine* (1899), *The French Revolution* (1901), *The Messianic Hope in the NT* (1905), *The Church and the Changing Order* (1907), *The Social Gospel* (1909), *The Making of Tomorrow* (1913), *The Spiritual Interpretation of History* (1916), *Patriotism and Religion* (1918), *The Validity of American Ideals* (1922), *The Faith of Modernism* (1924), *The Atonement and the Social Process* (1930), *Creative Christianity* (1935), *New Faith for Old—An Autobiography* (1936), *The Church and the Christian* (1938), and *Is God Emeritus?* (1940). He coauthored the *Dictionary of Religion and Ethics* (1921) with G. B. Smith. He edited *The World Today* and the *NT Handbooks* series.

Douglas, J.D., Biographical Entries from 20th Century Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1997, c1991) 549.

**See also, Dr. Gary E. La More's Subjectivism In Religion: Eleven Theological Personalities, 42-45.**

native Hindu born in Bombay who read the book with [him]. [The Hindu's] comment was, "This is not anything new-this should not be called Modernism-this is Pantheism which we have had in India for over two thousand years." [SEE, Appendix IV - Shailer Mathews]

This philosophy brings us to the man of sin: II Thessalonians 2:4, "**...Sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God.**"

The question comes to our minds: What can modernism or liberalism do with the Bible after embracing such a philosophy as this? This question is answered again by S. J. Andrews in the same volume (page 169):

Let us ask in what consists the special character of the biblical criticism of today. We find it in the attempt to adjust the statements of the Scriptures, doctrinal and historical, to certain new ruling ideas, pantheistic, agnostic, evolutionary, scientific; and to reject all that cannot be thus adjusted. We may divide the critics of whom we here speak into the two general classes: 1. Those who deny a personal God, or any knowledge of Him if he exists; 2. Those who reject some fundamental facts or principles affirmed in the Bible, thus destroying its unity and undermining the faith of men in it as the revelation of a Divine purpose and will.

What is the church of prophecy now shaping up? It is a church based upon *natural religion*. This contradicts Genesis 1:1, "**In the beginning God.**" As Murphy has said in his commentary pertaining to this opening phrase of the Bible: "**In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth,**" denies *Atheism*, for it assumes the being of God; it denies *Polytheism*, and among its various forms, the doctrine of two eternal principles, the one good and the other evil; for it confesses the one eternal creator. It denies *Materialism* for it asserts the creation of matter. It denies *Pantheism* for it assumes the existence of God before all things and apart from all of them. It denies *Fatalism* for it involves the freedom of the eternal Being.

In addition to Murphy, Dr. Henry M. Morris says that "this one verse refutes all of man's false philosophies concerning the origin and meaning of the world:

- (1) It refutes *atheism*, because the universe was created by God.
- (2) It refutes *pantheism*, for God is *transcendent* to that which He created.
- (3) It refutes *polytheism*, for *one* God created all things.
- (4) It refutes *materialism*, for matter had a *beginning*.
- (5) It refutes *dualism*, because God was *alone* when He created.
- (6) It refutes *humanism*, because God, *not man*, is the ultimate reality.
- (7) It refutes *evolutionism*, because God *created* all things."<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup>Henry M. Morris, The Genesis Record (Grand Rapids, MI.: Baker Book House, 1976) 38.

[See, Appendix V - Should Creationists Abandon The King James Version?]

**It is a church centred in humanity: “Ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth” [II Timothy 3:7]. Irving Babbot, once chairman of Philosophy at Harvard, called the dean of American Humanists, was lecturing in Mandel Hall at the University of Chicago. He was showing the exact parallel between the principles of education obtaining under Rousseau<sup>13</sup> and those obtaining in his day. He parenthetically**

---

<sup>13</sup>**ROUSSEAU, JEAN-JACQUES (1712–1778)**

*French–Swiss philosopher and author*

Rousseau was born into a French refugee family at Geneva. Although brought up as a Calvinist, he became a Catholic through the influence of his benefactress and mistress, Madame de Warens, whose own faith was hardly orthodox. His final position was a unique blend of rationalism and Deism.

Rousseau was a man of many talents. He devised a new system of musical notation, which he presented to the Academy of Sciences in Paris. He composed a ballet and an opera, which was performed before the court of Louis XV. His writings, which touched on education, religion, and political theory, sometimes took the form of novels.

Rousseau’s private life combined pathos with paradox. His theories on education helped to revolutionize modern teaching, yet he deposited his five illegitimate children in an orphanage. He craved for appreciation, yet repeatedly rewarded his friends with gross ingratitude, not least his fellow philosophers and the several women in his life.

Rousseau found fame with his prize–winning *Discourse on the Sciences and Arts* (1750), in which he argued that civilization and progress corrupt morals. It was a theme he developed at length in later works. *Julie, or The New Heloise* (1760) attacked the conventions of society that divorced love from marriage; it also contained a defense of natural religion. *Emile, or On Education* (1762) was a treatise on education in the form of a novel. The young Emile is brought up in a kind of moral quarantine, apart from the corrupting influences of society. He had a private tutor whose role was to direct his pupil’s inquiring mind. This program of learning anticipated modern theories of project studies, unstructured curricula, and the assumption that the child is best helped when he is given freedom to explore and learn. Among the harmful influences to be kept at bay are church bells and toy weapons, lest the child be tempted to think of religion and fighting.

*Emile* contains a lengthy excursus entitled “The Creed of a Savoyard Priest,” in which an aged Catholic priest quietly renounces the teaching of the church in favor of a deistic religion based on feeling. God is the Being of beings. He is to be held in awe, but it is not safe for man with his limited mind to say anything about him.

In the same year that saw the publication of *Emile*, Rousseau set out his political theory in *The Social Contract*. He rejected the idea that government has anything to do with the will of God. States exist for the benefit of the people and may be changed at will. Government presupposes the idea of a social contract by which the citizens of any state voluntarily limit their freedom for the common benefit. Laws exist for promoting this public good. Where they do not, they may be democratically changed.

made this statement:

We have passed from a theological or God-centered world to a sociological or man-centered world, but I feel that we have lost something of great importance; namely, what is called in Christian nomenclature, the grace of God.

It is a church of pure theism: **“Having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away.”** It is a church controlled by the state or under the domination of political rule.

## CONCLUSION

We seem to be coming to the era of the Church prophesied by Professor Huxley:

I can conceive the existence of an established Church, which should be a blessing to the community; a Church in which, week by week, services should be devoted, not to the iteration of abstract propositions in theology, but to the setting before men’s minds an ideal of pure, just and true living; a place in which those who are weary of the burden of daily cares should find a moment’s rest in the contemplation of the higher life which is possible to all, though attained by so few; a place in which the man of strife and business should have time to think how small, after all, are the rewards he covets compared with peace and charity. Depend upon it, if such a Church existed, no one would seek to disestablish it.

Or to the prophecy of Tolstoy in his book, *My Religion*:

To believe in a life to come unfits men to labour in the present, to renounce themselves and to serve humanity. There is no real labour for the race so long as we believe in a future life.

The principles we point out in the Church now being formed is that it is a meditating church which again is well described in the book of Revelation where we see the Church portrayed under the symbol of a woman and this in two conditions, as abiding faithful to her Lord (Rev. 12:1), and as unfaithful, a [Roman Catholic] harlot (Rev. 17:1-10) [ , who has given birth to a number of Protestant illegitimate children.] As a harlot, she is seen as **“a woman [seated] upon a scarlet coloured beast, full of names of blasphemy,**

---

Rousseau’s last main works were his Confessions (1765) and The Reveries of a Solitary Stroller (1778), which combined biography with personal apologia. Despite the religious tinge of much of his writing, Rousseau helped to pioneer the modern secular outlook. His political theories were among the influences that contributed to the American and French revolutions. C.Brown

Douglas, J. D., Comfort, Philip W. & Mitchell, Donald, Editors, Who’s Who in Christian History, (Wheaton, Illinois: Tyndale House Publishers, Inc., 1992) 597-598.

**having seven heads and ten horns. And the woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet colour, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication:” (Revelation 17:3-4) This is the Church now forming, ready to enter into an alliance with the beast (Revelation 13) as soon as he appears.**

**We are living in an era when only MILITANT CHRISTIANITY can survive! The Apostle Paul contributed more than half of the books of the New Testament by inspiration of God. Paul’s conversion was like a call to arms. His movements read like the chronicles of Alexander the Great. He dared difficulties like Hannibal crossing the Alps. His visits were like military invasions. His epistles read like military dispatches. His whole life was a campaign for Christ. Paul was a Napoleon of the cross!**

**“Thou therefore endure hardness, as a good soldier of Jesus Christ.”<sup>14</sup>**

---

<sup>14</sup>Richard V. Clearwaters, “Christianity and Anti-Christianity in their Final Conflict,” in Hastening The Day Of God, comp. and ed. John W. Bradbury (Wheaton, IL.: Van Kampen Press, 1953), 117-124.

## APPENDIX I

### THE WORD **VIRGIN** AND THE REVISED STANDARD VERSION

**THE WORD **VIRGIN** AND THE **REVISED STANDARD VERSION****

<b>King James Bible</b>	<b>Textus Receptus</b>	<b>King James Bible</b>	<b>Revised Standard Version - New Testament - 1946</b>	<b>New Revised Standard Version - 1989</b>
<b>Matt. 1:23</b>	<b>parthen'os</b>	<b>Virgin</b>	<b>Virgin</b>	<b>Virgin</b>
<b>Matt. 25:1</b>	<b>parthénois</b>	<b>Virgins</b>	<b>Maidens</b>	<b>Bridesmaids</b>
<b>Matt. 25:7</b>	<b>parthénoi</b>	<b>Virgins</b>	<b>Maidens</b>	<b>Bridesmaids</b>
<b>Matt. 25:11</b>	<b>parthénoi</b>	<b>Virgins</b>	<b>Maidens</b>	<b>Bridesmaids</b>
<b>Luke 1:27 (2)</b>	<b>parthénon</b>	<b>Virgin</b>	<b>Virgin</b>	<b>Virgin</b>
<b>Acts 21:9</b>	<b>parthénoi</b>	<b>Virgins</b>	<b>Unmarried</b>	<b>Unmarried</b>
<b>I Cor. 7:25</b>	<b>parthénōn</b>	<b>Virgins</b>	<b>Unmarried</b>	<b>Virgins</b>
<b>I Cor. 7:28</b>	<b>parthénos</b>	<b>Virgin</b>	<b>Girl</b>	<b>Virgin</b>
<b>I Cor. 7:34</b>	<b>parthénos</b>	<b>Virgin</b>	<b>Girl</b>	<b>Virgin</b>
<b>I Cor. 7:36</b>	<b>parthénon</b>	<b>Virgin</b>	<b>Betrothed</b>	<b>Fiancée</b>
<b>I Cor. 7:37</b>	<b>parthénon</b>	<b>Virgin</b>	<b>Betrothed</b>	<b>Fiancée</b>
<b>II Cor. 11:2</b>	<b>parthénon</b>	<b>Virgin</b>	<b>Bride</b>	<b>Virgin</b>
<b>Rev. 14:4</b>	<b>parthénoi</b>	<b>Virgins</b>	<b>Chaste</b>	<b>Virgins</b>

**APPENDIX II**

**HARRY EMERSON FOSDICK [1878-1969]**

---

### Harry Emerson Fosdick (1878-1969)

The most popular figure in Liberalism was Harry Emerson Fosdick. He was born near Buffalo, New York, on May 24, 1878, year of the first prophetic conference. His parents were of Baptist connections but they were open-minded to liberal ideas. With his family he attended Prospect Avenue Baptist Church in the city and at the age of seven~joined a nearby church, Westfield Baptist. Early in life he had "religious fears," especially torments over the thought of a Hell. He was rebellious against the "religious taboos" such as cards, the dance, and the theatre. He heard D. L. Moody when young and was impressed by him.

His education set his sail in things religious. From 1896 to 1900 he attended Colgate, where he accepted the theory of evolution, doubted the authenticity of the Bible, and revolted against orthodox views. He began his theological training at the divinity school at Colgate and came under the strong influence of the leading liberal scholar of that period, William Newton Clarke. He accepted the new idea that much of Hebrew history was no more than folklore. His teacher helped him forge a new direction in his thinking, one of open criticism of all dogma, even of the Trinity. His teacher motivated his mind to think independently of theologians and Bible writers. He reacted to some of the conservative teachers at Colgate by transferring to Union Seminary and Columbia University in New York, where he took his B.D. in 1904 and M.A. in 1908. He had been ordained as a Baptist in 1903 with Clarke preaching the ordination sermon and in the next fifty years received some seventeen honorary degrees. At Columbia he took philosophy under Nicholas Murray Butler, and at Union he studied theology under A. C. McGiffert, who had broad modernist sympathies. Union Seminary had earlier separated from the Presbyterian Church when the latter had taken action and unfrocked C. A. Briggs on charges of heresy in 1892. Ever since that episode it has rivaled the University of Chicago Divinity School and Harvard Divinity School for radicalism. One major influence on Fosdick at Union was the stress on the social application of Christian principles. He found the social gospel of Rauschenbusch of Rochester Seminary profound and challenging. While a student at Union, Fosdick worked in the well-known "Hell's Kitchen" in the city and at the mission at Mariners Temple in the Bowery. At Madison Avenue Baptist he assisted George C. Lorimer, who later pastored the famed Tremont Temple in Boston with an effective evangelical and evangelistic ministry and for whom a large hall in the Temple has been named. Others making a mark on his mind were Frame of the New Testament department at Union and Knox in the department of Philosophy of Religion.

From 1904 to 1915 he was pastor of the Baptist church at Montclair, New Jersey, and was an instructor in Practical Theology at Union. He continued to teach at Union until 1946, when he retired. His sermons reflected more and more interest in social issues and in their analysis and solution through religious dedication. In many ways he found the cry of Rauschenbusch to be his own, namely, the establishment of the Kingdom of God as that order of social justice and humanitarian improvement which, he claimed, was the aim of Old Testament prophets and of Jesus Himself. While at Montclair he decided against expository preaching, for he believed congregations were not interested in the meaning of texts; his sermons became more and more

like lectures on problem-solving techniques and attitudes. Their themes were items of personal and current interest, and he drew from the accumulated wisdom of the past, within the Bible and outside, for his answers. In this way he offered solutions to the common problems of disillusionment, defeat, and despair. He used modern psychology as a valued ally, thus antedating Norman Vincent Peale and his success with "Positive Thinking," most of which is non-Biblical. Another influence on Fosdick's thinking was the Quaker, Rufus Jones, whom he greatly admired, a fact he demonstrated by publishing an anthology from his fifty-seven books under the title Rufus Jones Speaks To Our Time - an outline of religious insights based on so-called spiritual inwardness. Fosdick once was reported to have said that had he not stayed at Riverside Church in New York, he would have joined the Quakers.

He left Montclair in 1915 to join the faculty of Union Seminary as Professor of Practical Theology, also assisting in the area of homiletics. Now he gave himself to study modern situations and their meanings in human experience and to clothe them in Biblical language. Another interest was in finding the development or evolution of religious ideas within the Bible itself and their natural development since Bible times. This he put in print in one of the most misleading books circulated among American churches - The Modern Use of the Bible. It might have been more appropriately entitled "The Modern Disuse of the Bible." Few books have led so many thousands of sincere people away from the Bible.

From 1919 to 1925 he supplied the pulpit of First Presbyterian Church in New York, the church which had recently merged with University Place Presbyterian and Madison Square Presbyterian. Congregations increased, for his lectures had great personal appeal and his delivery had an important element which he taught in his classes, namely "drive." His popularity grew rapidly and, although he was not himself a Presbyterian, he brought the crowds to a Presbyterian Church. There seemed no great storm ahead, but one came which shook the church and Baptist and Presbyterian circles to their very foundations. In May, 1922, he preached a sermon entitled "Shall the Fundamentalist Win?" To this question his answer was that the churches should include both those of strict Biblical belief and those of liberal persuasion. It was a plea for toleration and a charge that Fundamentalists were cantankerous and unloving. Fosdick did not intend to publish it, but a layman in his church, Mr. Ivy Lee, did publish it under the title "The New Knowledge and the Christian faith." It was widely distributed and both the Orthodox and the Fundamentalists read it as a call to battle. A grand furor was on. Lee's purpose was to alert churchgoing people to the Fundamentalist threat, and certainly he could not have imagined the national reaction. It was published to label Fundamentalists as opposed to science, to modern culture, and to all who did not interpret the Scriptures exactly as they did. To Fosdick, cantankerousness was worse than heterodoxy. By this time it was evident from his sermons that he rejected the historic doctrines of the virgin birth, the ignorance of the Bible and its literal interpretation, and the second coming of Christ. His lectures at Yale Divinity School in 1923 gave the substance of his The Modern Use of the Bible and exposed his full departure from Biblical faith.

Both the Orthodox and the Fundamentalists rose up in arms. The former were led by

Clarence E. Macartney of Philadelphia, who affirmed that Fosdick denied the very basic foundational truths of Presbyterianism and that he was doing this in a Presbyterian church. Macartney's presbytery in Philadelphia made the proper request (overture) to the New York Presbytery and the General Assembly, which directed the New York Presbytery to correct the situation, but it refused to see anything heretical in Fosdick's actions. Another possibility for resolution of the problem was to get Fosdick to place his ordination within the Presbyterian Church and then to be put on trial on charges of heresy as had C. A. Briggs before him. It would be well to remember at this point that historic Presbyterianism had stressed five main doctrines: the miracles in the Bible, the virgin birth, the ignorance of the Bible, the substitutionary death of Christ, and the bodily resurrection of Christ. Fosdick did not accept a single one of the "Famous Five" while occupying a Presbyterian pulpit, and his congregation and its presbytery were either too weak or too spiritually anemic to do anything about it. In fact, on a vote, the church stood behind Fosdick. Bewilderment followed - how could a Christian church rally around a man who denied everything Christian in doctrine? The General Assembly of 1924 invited Fosdick to join the Presbyterian Church, it being a known fact that Mark Matthews of the First Presbyterian Church in Seattle, Washington, the largest in the denomination, was ready to press charges against him when he joined. But Fosdick did not join, and no trial could be held. He resigned from First Presbyterian Church in October, 1924, effective as of March of 1925. In his letter of resignation he accused the General Assembly of applying the principle of "the closed shop." Macartney questioned his good taste, since he was only a guest in the pulpit each Sunday, but saw as even worse "his frank assault upon creeds, not the Presbyterian Creed in particular, but all creeds...raising in the minds of others as to whether or not he himself receives these great New Testament facts." Professor J. G. Machen of Princeton was bolder and obviously on the attack when he wrote that Fosdick's resignation,

like all his utterance, is the expression of a thorough-going skepticism...he rejects all doctrine...the truth is that two mutually exclusive religions are struggling for the control of the Presbyterian Church...one is Christianity with its appeal to faces.' the other is the naturalistic or agnostic modernism which is represented by Dr. Fosdick and hundreds of ministers in the Presbyterian Church. The separation of the two is demanded not only by the interests of the Christian faith but by simple honesty.

W. L. Pettingill wrote the following in the same issue of Serving and Waiting,

The fight is on and it grows hotter. Let us praise God for that. A fight is much better than a disgraceful surrender and a fight is necessary just now that the truth of the Gospel may continue with us.

From 1925 to 1930 Fosdick served the Park Avenue Baptist, the church of Cornelius Woelfkin - noted Liberal within Northern Baptists - and John D. Rockefeller. The latter showed his

generosity by supporting a call to Fosdick to Park Avenue on the terms that immersion be dropped as a requirement for membership and plans be started for a new church, even though Park Avenue had been built as recently as 1922. This church had known a great evangelical as pastor, Thomas B. Armitage, and later a Liberal, W. H. P. Faunce, who went from this pulpit to the presidency of Brown University.

Rockefeller was willing to give a large sum for the erection of a new edifice, and by 1930 the very beautiful Riverside Church was ready. It was a gem of Gothic beauty overlooking the Hudson River from Morningside Heights in Manhattan. Again the Rockefeller millions were thrown to the side of Liberalism. Riverside was a cathedral of Liberalism, one of non-sectarian inclusive fellowship. But the beauty of the ten-million-dollar structure should not blind us to the facts that it has never had a Bible-preaching pastor in its history and that for such an expensive building its auditorium is on a small scale. Riverside provided a pulpit for Harry Emerson Fosdick to keep on solving personal problems and attacking social ills. The National Broadcasting Company was so impressed by his stature that it gave him free time on Sunday afternoon for "National Vespers." His talks on this program were stimulating to the intellectual and comforting to the religious, always with the assumption of man's brotherhood under the fatherhood of God. He would upbraid Liberals at times for being too optimistic about man's goodness. He saw the rising theology of Neo-Orthodoxy as a thing of disillusionment unless men came to it through Liberalism, as did Reinhold Niebuhr. He believed Karl Barth brought some refinements because he did recognize man as a needy creature.

He felt Barth was right in charging that Liberalism was too blind toward human sin. With the coming of World War II, men needed convictions as well as toleration, and Fosdick saw Barth and Brunner as making significant contributions toward the filling of this vacuum, for very clearly they were dissatisfied with the Liberalism of the early years of this century, with its unhealthy optimism. They went to the extreme of strong pessimism with God as wholly Other, as an alternative to the demoralizing ideas of his immanence within the world process and human story. Now Barth and Brunner turned thousands of intelligent Christians to God's self-revelation. Both reason and faith needed each other. Liberalism had pioneered the inclusive spirit, which tolerated too much and believed too little. Now followed a wholesale confession that Modernism had little in common with Christianity except a few terms. Liberals had preserved a general revelation in everything, but Neo-Orthodoxy turned to the Revelation in Christ, and so was Christocentric, although omitting much of the Bible picture of Christ. Fosdick was within the mainstream of this thinking and suggested a Christian realism because of the disillusionment from two world wars. Because of this disillusionment Fosdick turned more and more to the Quaker position of pacifism and became, as the cliché has it, "wrong-headed in the right direction."

He retired from Union Seminary and Riverside Church in 1946. Until his death a few years ago he continued to maintain his liberal stance, although today one seldom hears his name mentioned or reference made to him in liberal periodicals. Until the end of his life he walked an individualistic road between old-time Liberalism and the more popular Neo-Orthodoxy.<sup>82</sup> (<sup>82</sup>

George W. Dollar, A History of Fundamentalism in America (Greenville, S.C.: BJU Press, 1973), pp. 93-98.)

Fosdick had this to say about the Lord Jesus Christ: "They started with the certainty that Jesus came from the divine realm and then wondered how he could be truly man; we start from the certainty that he was genuinely man and then wonder in what sense he can be God."<sup>83</sup> (83 H. Sheldon Smith, Faith and Nurture (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1941), p. 18.)

**APPENDIX III**  
**EXISTENTIALISM**

## EXISTENTIALISM

[According to Existentialism], real existence is something *more* than our ideas about it. The world antedates man's ideas. **The *essence of anything is what we say it is*.** But *existence* is not this *what* but the *that* which is prior to and beyond the *what*. All definitions are limited to essences. But essences are not existents. Existence itself is unanalyzable; it is a stubborn otherness. This is existentialism.

Contemporary existentialism finds its roots in Pascal<sup>15</sup> and Søren Kierkegaard.<sup>16</sup> Kierkegaard reacted against the philosophy of Hegel (whose philosophy was a system of rational ideas: the real is the rational). He (Kierkegaard) gave emphasis to that which is beyond reason, *i.e.*, existence itself. Existence is transrational. This view has been hailed by many contemporary Christian theologians as confirming the dogma that the Christian revelation itself is something that is above reason and not subject to rational analysis.

Kierkegaard wrote about a *crisis* as the place in which the individual encounters the Christian revelation. A crisis is an extraordinary experience: an awareness of separation from God, accompanied by the feeling of anguish, of utter helplessness (beyond words of description). Despair is thus the gateway to an encounter with that great Existence of God (beyond "natural reason"). Utter misery, sickness unto death, the hopelessness of reason—these are the experiential bases of coming into contact with God who then works peace, assurance and salvation. Thus, in the words of Pascal: the heart has reasons which reason knows not of. The heart of Christianity lies beyond the pale of reason. It is an existential something, a revelation, a supernatural thing to which the pride of intellect remains even a stranger.

---

<sup>15</sup>Pascal, Blaise: (1623-1662) Mathematician and scientist, well known in Protestant literature as representative of the view that in religion the heart has the approach which transcends reason. *See* existentialism. His *Pensées* were published in 1670 (Ferm, 192).

<sup>16</sup>Kierkegaard, Søren: (1813-1855) Danish thinker who has only in this generation come to a place of momentous influence. His physical deformity, his melancholy, his weird love-affair are considerations which play into his theology of despair. His analysis of human nature has been hailed by his admirers as most penetrating. A vast literature has grown up about him. His own works (under pseudonyms of authorship) are many, e.g., *Philosophical Fragments, The Present Age, Fear and Trembling, Stages on Life's Way, The Sickness Unto Death, Concluding Unscientific Postscript*, etc., (now in English translations). *See* existentialism (Ferm, 135)

Karl Barth<sup>17</sup> also emphasized the dogma of the bankruptcy of reason in the encounter with Christianity. Christianity is a religion emphasizing God's descent to man, not man's ascent to God. The "Word of God" must take possession. Man, a sinner, is helpless without this revelation and supernatural salvation. The Bible must supersede all philosophizing and theologizing. Reason is one thing: but faith is another and greater. A Christian builds on faith.

Protestant existentialists thus emphasize: encounter, faith, revelation, uniqueness of the Christian religion, supernaturalism, sinfulness and misery of man by himself, etc.

Existentialism has other forms. In Sartre (*Being and Nothingness*) it runs into atheism. Man is confronted with a Universe beyond his reason. What it is, what God is is only man's thoughts. Thus man's ideas are merely his ideas. **He creates his own world, out of his choices (freedom) in anguish, too, because he must realize that he is alone with his choices.** One can never assert a God except to choose to create one. Nevertheless, even though we shall never know the real (the existential) we can still be heroes in the struggle.

---

<sup>17</sup>Barthianism - A movement of theological thought which is associated with Karl Barth (1886 - born in Basle, Switzerland)-aiming to be a re-birth of historic Protestantism and a reaction from theological liberalism. Associated with this general revival were Friedrich Gogarten, Eduard Thurneysen, Heinrich Barth and H. Emil Brunner. Barth and Brunner belong to the Calvinistic tradition, Gogarten to the Lutheran. Justification by faith, the Scriptures *containing* (emphasis, GEL) the Word of God, the sovereignty of God and original sin are emphasized, avoiding the doctrine of predestination to damnation and disavowing the modern trend of theology which combined with philosophy, comparative religions, the new psychology, etc. Faith is made to rest upon God's Word. Christ is the Divine Logos. Grace is the work of God for salvation, a gift of the Holy Spirit. God's transcendence is stressed: "the finite is not capable of the infinite" (against immanentism); man is separated from God and Christ (man's nature and endeavor[u]r).

"Theology of Crisis" and "Dialectical Theology" are terms characterising the Barthian theology. Crisis means judgment, separation-a crisis coming to man at the hearing of God's Word at which point his existence is at stake. He realizes the gulf between him and God. Man realizes he cannot ascend to God but that God must descend to him. The Dialectic is the method of reasoning by which the doctrine of the crisis is worked out. If God speaks to man it must be through human speech. But how? It is only by means of contradiction between two ideas-the eternal entering time, God vs. man, grace vs. responsibility, etc.-that man can apprehend the contradictory truth that sinful man become just before God. It is a kind of faith-knowledge wherein the transcendent becomes immanent, the spiritual becoming manifest in the material, God overcoming the gulf. Man is at a cross-road between the eternal and the temporal. This theology has had widespread influence in England and the U.S.A. (Ferm, 23-24)

**Roman Catholic thinkers, Etienne Gilson and Jacques Maritain, also uphold existentialism, although of another type. God is a That which becomes a *What* only through revelation. The church (Roman Catholic) can furnish the saving information about the existential *That-What*. Ferm, A Protestant Dictionary, 94-95. [Emphasis, GEL]**

**APPENDIX IV**

**SHAILER MATHEWS [1863-1941]**

---

### Shailer Mathews (1863-1941)

Shailer Mathews was born in Portland, Maine. He studied at Colby College, Newton Theological Institute, and the University of Berlin. He received honorary degrees from several colleges in the United States, France, and Scotland. He was a professor of rhetoric (1887-1889), of history and political economy (1889-1894) at Colby College. In 1894 he went to the University of Chicago to teach N.T. history and interpretation. He later taught systematic theology and comparative theology. He was dean of the divinity school from 1908 to 1933. During his years of teaching, he was also a special lecturer in various colleges and universities, including a Barrows lecturer in India.<sup>64</sup> (<sup>64</sup>Moyer, Who Was Who In Church History (Revised edition. Chicago: Moody Press, 1968), p. 277.)

Mathews was the leading voice of the "Chicago School of Theology." Mathews's own thought was a functionalism of extreme clarity and simplicity, which he used not only in biblical and historical theology, but in the problems of the school and its role as champion of the modernist cause against American fundamentalism. His role in the formation of the Federal Council of Churches and the Northern Baptist Convention reflects his view that the work of the school should be carried into the church.<sup>65</sup> (<sup>65</sup>Clyde Curry Smith, "Shailer Mathews" (in The New International Dictionary of the Christian Church edited by J. D. Douglas. Revised edition. (Grand Rapids, MI.: Zondervan, 1978), p. 642.)

Mathews was President of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America (1912-1916) and as its representative visited Japan in 1915. In 1915 he became president of the Northern Baptist Convention.<sup>66</sup> (<sup>66</sup> Moyer, Who Was Who In Church History, p. 277.)

He was director of the religious department of the Chautauqua Institute from 1912 to 1934. From 1903 to 1911 he was the editor of The World Today, and from 1913 to 1920, of The Biblical World. He was the author of about thirty books.<sup>67</sup> (<sup>67</sup>Ibid.)

Mathews "rejected divine origin of the Bible and divinity and atoning death of Christ, and held that religions, generally speaking, are mere products of the human."<sup>68</sup> (<sup>68</sup>Ibid.)

Dr. Dollar says, "Liberalism produced its most appealing personalities in Fosdick, Mathews, and Rauschenbusch."<sup>69</sup> (<sup>69</sup>George W. Dollar, A History of Fundamentalism in America (Greenville, S.C.: BJU Press, 1973), p. 85.)

Universities and seminaries took the lead in introducing young men and women to Liberalism in all its varied concepts and opinions. Some of these institutions of learning actually became the headquarters of the New Thought and liberal theology. The main ones deserve mention and take the discredit they deserve for the corruption and confusion they produced in the minds of hundreds of students. This criminal activity reached its zenith as prospects for the ministry were brainwashed and misdirected from the truths of the Word of God to the uncertain labyrinth of human speculations, concepts, philosophy, and social-reform programs. Leading the

Liberals in their apostasy from the truth were the theological faculties of the University of Chicago, Union Seminary in New York, Rochester Theological Seminary, Boston University, Duke Divinity School, Harvard Divinity School, Yale Divinity School, Garrett Biblical Institute, Crozer Theological Seminary, Hartford Theological Seminary, Oberlin College, and Western Theological Seminary. Several men were prominent leaders in special positions: among them were Harry Emerson Fosdick of Riverside Church in New York and Professor at Union Seminary; Walter Rauschenbusch, a church history teacher at Rochester and author of major works on the social gospel; and Shailer Mathews of the University of Chicago, to whom Baptists should give the credit of liberalizing the Northern Baptist Convention to the apostate status it now occupies under the name of the American Baptist Convention. Fundamentalists would do well to know Mathews, Fosdick, and Rauschenbusch.<sup>70</sup> (<sup>70</sup>Ibid., p. 93.)

An article in 1926 stated that the supreme issue at the Northern Baptist Convention was the admission of representatives of Park Avenue Baptist in New York City (of which Fosdick was the pastor), which had unimmersed members. The article charged Shailer Mathews with duplicity of belief in claiming that the NBC did not have the right to define a Baptist Church solely as one having immersed members. The University of Chicago was doing everything it could to destroy the independence of a local church. To Shields, Mathews was an example of Modern thinking that "so warps the mind that it becomes impossible for its devotees to either speak or write the truth."<sup>71</sup> (<sup>71</sup>Ibid., p. 110.)

Shailer Mathews was on the first official executive committee of the Northern Baptist Convention. With Mathews on the Committee, the Convention was directing its course toward Liberalism. Mathews was from the notoriously modernistic divinity school of the University of Chicago. He was at this time (1907) advocating "a social religious attitude."<sup>72</sup> (<sup>72</sup>Ibid., p. 145.)

W. B. Riley was to charge that the Northern Baptist Convention was born in the brain of a Chicago theology professor, Shailer Mathews. It was largely framed by him and consequently was planned from the first to turn the denomination into the path of the new theology.<sup>73</sup> (<sup>73</sup>Ibid., p. 146.)

**APPENDIX V**

**SHOULD CREATIONISTS ABANDON THE KING JAMES VERSION?**

# BTG No. 90a

## Should Creationists Abandon The King James Version?

by Henry M. Morris \*

Institute for Creation Research, PO Box 2667, El Cajon, CA 92021

Voice: (619) 448-0900 FAX: (619) 448-3469

"Vital Articles on Science/Creation" June 1996

Copyright © 1996 All Rights Reserved

*"Thy word is true from the beginning: and every one of the righteous judgments endureth for ever" (Psalm 119:160).*

In this day when many Christians have started using one of the modern English translations of the Bible, abandoning the King James Version, it may be well to review a few of the reasons why many creationists still prefer the latter.

### The King James Translators

One reason is that all the fifty or more translators who developed the King James Bible were godly men who believed implicitly in the inerrancy and full authority of Scripture and in the literal historicity of Genesis, with its record of six-day Creation and the worldwide Flood. This has not been true of many who have worked on the modern versions.

Furthermore, the King James translators (54 men altogether) were great scholars, as proficient in the Biblical languages as any who have come after them. They were familiar with the great body of manuscript evidence, as well as all the previous translations. They worked diligently on the project (assigned to them by King James) for over seven years (completed in 1611), with the result that the "Authorized" version eventually displaced all those that had gone before and has withstood the test of wide usage in all English-speaking countries ever since.

## **Which New Translation?**

This is not a new question. There have been over 120 English translations of the complete Bible published *since* the King James, as well as over 200 New Testaments. Even if one really feels that he ought to switch to a modern translation, how can he decide which, if any, is really the inspired word of God? I personally have perused in some depth at least 20 of them.

## **Is God The Author Of Confusion?**

For a long time, the "official" version used in each Bible-believing church was the King James, with the others used occasionally for reference study by teachers and pastors. Now, however, confusion reigns. Congregational reading is no longer possible, and Scripture memorization, which has been an incalculable blessing in my own Christian life, is almost a lost art these days.

And what about our belief in verbal inspiration? If it's only the "thought" that counts, then the words are flexible, and we can adjust them to make them convey any thought we prefer. Exact thoughts require precise words.

## **Which Version Best Renders The Original Manuscripts?**

Even many King James Bibles have footnotes referring to what are said to be "better manuscripts" which indicate that certain changes should be made in the King James text. But what are these manuscripts, and are they really better? It is significant that almost all of the new versions of the New Testament are based on what is known as the Westcott-Hort Greek text, whereas the King James is based largely on what is known as the Textus Receptus. As far as the Hebrew text is concerned, the King James is based on the Masoretic text, while the modern versions rely heavily on Kittel's revised Masoretic text.

The Masoretic text was compiled from the ancient manuscripts of the Old Testament by the Masoretic Hebrew scholars dedicated to guarding and standardizing the traditional Hebrew text as "handed down" (the basic meaning of Masoretic) from the earlier Hebrew scribes, who had in turn meticulously copied the ancient Hebrew manuscripts, scrupulously guarding against error. As far as the Hebrew text developed by Rudolf Kittel is concerned, it is worth noting that Kittel was a German rationalistic higher critic, rejecting Biblical inerrancy and firmly devoted to evolutionism.

The men most responsible for alterations in the New Testament text were B.F. Westcott and F.J.A. Hort, whose Greek New Testament was largely updated by Eberhard Nestle and Kurt Aland. All of these men were evolutionists. Furthermore, Westcott and Hort both denied Biblical inerrancy and promoted spiritism and racism. Nestle and Aland, like Kittel, were German theological skeptics.

Westcott and Hort were also the most influential members of the English revision committee which produced the English Revised Version of the Bible. The corresponding American revision committee which developed the American Standard Version of 1901 was headed by another

liberal evolutionist, Philip Schaff. Most new versions since that time have adopted the same presuppositions as those of the 19th century revisers.

Furthermore, the Westcott-Hort text was mainly based on two early Greek manuscripts, the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus texts, which were rediscovered and rescued from long (and well-deserved) obscurity in the 19th century. Since these are both said to be older than the 5000 manuscripts that support the Textus Receptus, they were called "better." This was in spite of the fact that they frequently disagreed with each other as well as with the Textus Receptus and also contained many obvious and flagrant mistakes.

The fact that these two manuscripts may have been older does not prove they are better. More likely it indicates that they were set aside because of their numerous errors. Thus they would naturally last longer than the good manuscripts which were being used regularly.

So one of the serious problems with most modern English translations is that they rely heavily on Hebrew and Greek manuscripts of the Bible developed by liberals, rationalists, and evolutionists, none of whom believed in the verbal inspiration of the Bible. Is this how God would preserve His word? Would He not more likely have used devout scholars who believed in the absolute inerrancy and authority of the Bible?

### **How About The Archaic Language In The King James?**

The beautiful prose of the King James is a treasure which should not be lost. It has been acclaimed widely as the greatest example of English literature ever written. Apart from a few archaic words which can be easily clarified in footnotes, it is as easy to understand today as it was four hundred years ago. This is why the common people today still use and love it. It is the "intelligentsia" who tend to favor the modern versions. The King James uses mostly one and two-syllable words, and formal studies have always shown its readability index to be 10th grade or lower.

It is also noteworthy that the King James was produced during the period when the English language and literature had reached their zenith of power and expressiveness. This was the age of Shakespeare, for example. Modern English is merely a decadent remnant of its former beauty and clarity. It is no wonder that a Bible translation produced at that special time in history has endured for almost 400 years, meeting the needs and guiding the culture of over ten generations of English speaking peoples.

We have abandoned today many fine points of grammar commonly used in 1600. For example, we forget that "thee," "thou," and "thine" were used to express the second person singular, with "you," "ye," and "yours" reserved for second person plural. Today we use "you" indiscriminately for both singular and plural, thereby missing the precise meaning of many texts of Scripture.

Furthermore, the translators were not only Biblical scholars but accomplished writers, and one of their goals had been to produce a Bible that would "sing" with beauty and power, as well as retaining literal faithfulness to the original texts, which had themselves been written with majestic musical beauty.

With all these factors in mind, do we not most honor the Lord and His revealed word by having it read and used in that form of our language which was in use when the English language was at its best, instead of in our modern jargon? All modern versions are inferior to the King James in this important regard.

## Conclusion

I believe, therefore, after studying, teaching, and loving the Bible for over 55 years, that Christians—especially creationists!—need to hang on to their old King James Bibles as long as they live. God has uniquely blessed its use in the great revivals, in the worldwide missionary movement, and in the personal lives of believers, more so than He has with all the rest of the versions put together, and "by their fruits ye shall know them" (Matthew 7:20).

It is the most beautiful, the most powerful and (I strongly believe) the most reliable of any that we have or ever will have, until Christ returns.

## For Further Study

This brief article is a condensation of a **20-page booklet on the same theme which I have prepared to answer questions by our readers. This booklet is available on request from ICR.**

**All ICR staff members adhere to a Statement of Faith in the form of two documents: "Tenets of Scientific Creationism," and "Tenets of Biblical Creationism." (see Impact No. 85)**

**As a missionary organization, ICR is funded by God's people. The majority of its income is provided by individual donors who desire to proclaim God's truth about origins. Gifts can be designated for research, the graduate school, seminars, or any special part of the ICR ministry. All others will be used where most needed. We pledge to use them wisely and with integrity.**

**If you would like to receive our free monthly newsletter "Acts & Facts," or our free quarterly devotional Bible-study booklet "Days of Praise," just request them by contacting ICR at (619) 448-0900.**

**We believe God has raised up ICR to spearhead Biblical Christianity's defense against the godless dogma of evolutionary humanism. Only by showing the scientific bankruptcy of evolution, while exalting Christ and the Bible, will Christians be successful in "the pulling down of strongholds; casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ" ( II Corinthians 10:4,5).**

**Member, Evangelical Council for Financial Accountability**

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Andrews, Samuel J. Christianity and Anti-Christianity in Their Final Conflict. Greenville, S.C.: Unusual Reprints, 1965.
- Clearwaters, Richard V. "Christianity and Anti-Christianity in their Final Conflict." In Hastening The Day Of God. Comp. and ed. John W. Bradbury. Wheaton, IL.: Van Kampen Press, 1953.
- Dollar, George W. A History of Fundamentalism in America. Greenville, S.C.: BJU Press, 1973.
- Douglas, J.D., ed., et al. Who's Who in Christian History. Wheaton, IL.: Tyndale House Publishers, Inc., 1992.
- \_\_\_\_\_. New 20<sup>th</sup>-Century Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge. Second Edition. Grand Rapids, MI.: Baker Book House, 1991.
- Ferm, Vergilius. A Protestant Dictionary. New York: The Philosophical Library, 1951.
- La More, Gary E. Subjectivism in Religion: Eleven Theological Personalities. Watertown, WI.: Maranatha Baptist Bible College, 1979.
- Leonard, Bill J., ed. Dictionary of Baptists in America. Downers Grove, IL.: InterVarsity Press, 1994.
- Manton, M.E. A Dictionary of Theological Terms. London, England: Grace Publications Trust, 1996.
- Morris, Henry M. The Genesis Record. Grand Rapids, MI.: Baker Book House, 1976.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Should Creationists Abandon The King James Version?" El Cajon, CA.: Institute for Creation Research, 1996.
- Wood, Leon J. Genesis. Grand Rapids, MI.: Zondervan Publishing House, 1975.

