



*"I will stand upon my watch, and set me upon the tower, and will watch to see what he will say unto me, and what I shall answer when I am reproved." Hab. 2:1*

May 27, 2011

Table of Contents –

[Theological Pluralism](#) -  
[Christ In Tuxedo](#) -  
[I Saw Harold Camping](#) -  
[A Good Definition of Faith](#) -  
[Ear Ye! Ear Ye!](#) -  
[The Harvest Is Coming!](#) -  
[Notable Quotes And Quotable Notes](#) -  
[Fundamentalism is ManCentred](#) -  
[What Teachers Make](#) -  
[Cartoons For Wise Men](#) -  
[Dust If You Must](#) -  
[Fundraising Letters and Our Replies To Them](#) -  
[Darwin's Thoughts On Women](#) -  
[Eddy-Torial](#) –

Theological Pluralism –

This is the third article in the series on the “theological downgrade” in evangelicalism and fundamentalism. The responses to the first two articles are adequate evidence that there is a swift move to the left and that many among us refuse to admit the depths and dangers of the drift.

Two facts must be faced in this discussion. First, there is value in having many things in one. The body, for instance, has many parts, but is one unit. My mother used to bake cakes from scratch. With uncanny precision, she could measure a pinch of this and a dash of that to make a perfect dessert, the many parts of which created one delicious product. If, however, she had added arsenic as one of the ingredients, that addition to pluralism would have been deadly. If a human body were to have two heads, that added part would serve to create what would be viewed as a monster.

The second fact is that all change and all pluralism are not equal. An important factor is that the ingredients must be common and compatible. This is why some European countries have found that pluralism is threatening to destroy their society if they don't regulate the things that are being added to it. The best example of this problem can be seen in the addition of Islam to a society. This example is not about religious pluralism; it is about a force that hides military, governmental, and economic power behind religion. This particular addition is exactly what is happening in our own country. This kind of pluralism is destructive, like arsenic would be in a cake.

## Pluralism Applied

Evangelicalism and fundamentalism have added arsenic to their theological cakes as well, and have simply given this deadly part a new name. The point of this series has been to weed out the theological poison that has been added. In some cases, the admixture has included heresy, error, and philosophy, all supported by human reason. The sad thing about these additions is that so many of our own spend so much time defending this sort of error.

It is not wise for us to glibly toss around the word "heresy". Some simply use the word to attack anyone who does not agree with them. Others are fearful to use the word when it is needed, and so spend far too much time protecting those who teach it. I use the word heresy at this point as meaning "an opinion or doctrine contrary to the clear teaching of God's Word in those areas that deal with the central doctrines of Christianity". While it is only for emphasis, I would say that the individual who holds to a heresy cannot be a true believer. For example, you cannot deny the virgin birth, or the deity of Christ, and still be a believer. Such a rejection is a denial of the faith, a belief that is vital to Christianity. Heresy would also include an attack on the existence, character, or attributes of God. To attack the omniscience, omnipresence, or omnipotence of God is heresy. I am not asking for your agreement; this is a statement based on the clear teaching of the Bible.

To add heresy to theological pluralism is eternally disastrous. The second problem in this discussion is theological "error". The problem here is that error is most often mixed with some elements of truth. The wise interpreter will constantly search for the admixture of error in what he reads. There may be truth attached to error; remember that diamonds do come from dirt. Error needs a definition for the purpose of this discourse: it is "any small or large area where teaching is not in full agreement with the scripture that is carefully interpreted with the one biblical hermeneutic".

## The Difficulty With Error

The above definition is based on the fact that there are basically only two hermeneutics. The first is one that rises from scripture; that is, the normal, plain, consistent, and literal system. The other is generated from human reason with an allegorical base. This second system is the same one that is used in liberalism. The use of this human system is often blended with the biblical system, but it is actually the road to liberalism.

How bad is error? While it is true that error may have various levels of seriousness, all error is serious. The Bible doesn't teach several views about the Second Coming; it teaches only one truth. The reason there are a half dozen views about Christ's coming is that all but one of these are derived from an erroneous hermeneutic. The same is true of the doctrine of salvation - there is only one correct view, and it rises from the one biblical hermeneutic.

## The Heart Of The Issue

Why are we asked to accept error even if it is not heresy? The power brokers demand that we give respect to error by the ton. If the biblicist takes a stand, saying there is only one right interpretation of a text, he is held up to ridicule and is called arrogant and intolerant. You recognize, of course, that such arguments are liberal tricks to silence the voices of those whom they see as lesser beings. On the other hand, those who give respectability to error are really supporting it; if you are not opposed to error, then you clearly are supporting it. I remind you that I do not support rudeness and character assignations, but an attack on theological error is not an attack on the character of those who hold error. Great minds talk about ideas; small minds talk about people. This maxim would include those who do not have the ability to separate ideas, doctrine, and error from the personalities of those who hold such errors. In the end, the real issue is about those who practice theological pluralism and are comfortable giving credibility to error by adding it to truth.

By Clay Nuttall

[\(Back to Table of Contents\)](#)

## Christ In Tuxedo –

Dr. Walter Maier told of an event that happened in those early days of the Communist revolution in Russia. The Marxists made a concerted effort to abolish the Christian faith from Russia altogether. As a part of this effort, one of Moscow's leading theaters presented a comedy entitled, "Christ in Tuxedo."

Dr. Maier says, "A packed house saw in the first act a scene featuring a church altar arrayed like a saloon bar with bottles of beer, wine, and vodka. Fat priests sat around the altar raising their arms in drunken toast. Nuns squatted on the sanctuary floor playing cards. It was another of those degrading exhibitions of atheism which repeatedly marked the red rebellion against the Savior."

Dr. Maier reports that the second act featured comrade Alexander Rostovzev. He was a Moscow matinee idol, a disciple of Karl Marx and a sneering enemy of Jesus. You can imagine, then, how the audience roared when the actor walked on the stage impersonating Christ, dressed in a flowing oriental robe and carrying a large New Testament. Soon after his entrance he was to read two verses from the Sermon on the Mount, remove his Palestinian gown, and cry out, "Give me my tuxedo and top hat!"

Dr. Maier reports when the actor began to read from the Sermon on the Mount, something happened. He began to read, "Blessed are the poor in spirit for theirs is the kingdom of God. Blessed are they that mourn, for they shall be comforted."

Instead of making his call for the tuxedo, he stopped as though paralyzed. A silence fell across the crowd as they saw the actor tremble. Then he started to read again, "Blessed are the meek for they shall inherit the earth. Blessed are they who hunger and thirst after righteousness for they shall be filled."

He continued to read the entire fifth chapter of Matthew before the stunned audience without stopping. Those in charge of the drama tried to get his attention and to get him off the stage but he ignored them. Christ's words had done their work in his heart. He had come on the stage to mock and revile Christ but ended up bowing his heart before Him. He made the sign of the cross in the Russian Orthodox tradition and cried out with the prayer of penitent thief, "Lord remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom!"

It was too much for the management of the theater. The curtain came down with a crash, and the show was ended.

The audience was told that the actor had become suddenly ill and would not be able to finish.

We must never forget that the Word of God is a powerful word. It has the power by God's Spirit to provoke men and women to faith. It is able to convert the hardest of human hearts. The Word of God provokes faith.

"Faith cometh by hearing and hearing by the Word of God." Romans 10:17

[\(Back to Table of Contents\)](#)

## I Just Saw Harold Camping –

"I just saw Harold Camping and the poor guy looked so depressed. I told him to cheer up and that it's not the end of the world..."

(received Monday from our son, Jeremy)

(In case you missed it, Harold Camping is the false prophet who predicted that the rapture was to happen last Saturday. - Ed)

[\(Back to Table of Contents\)](#)

## A Good Definition of Faith –

### What is Faith?

Faith is a life that dares  
to commit beyond its means,  
expecting what sense cannot

certify, based on God's promise, dependent on God's supply, motivated for God's glory, and confident in God's integrity.

Dr. Ken Connolly

[\(Back to Table of Contents\)](#)

## "Ear Ye, Ear Ye" –

*As the story goes, a medical doctor asked his child, "Are you registering with comprehension the alternating phases of rarifying and condensing in the atmosphere of the sonic vibrations emanating from my vocal cords and impacting your auditory tympanic membrane?"*

*"Dad," the child sighs, "why don't you just ask me if I heard you?"*

I came across this quote some time ago in a magazine. It reminded me just how important it is to speak simply. It is not only children who need the great truths of Scripture to be told in simple words. Adults need it, too.

There is an increasing tendency for Bible college graduates to use big words and complex phraseology to proclaim the simple facts of salvation.

Pastors who do this have several misguided reasons for doing so.

- \*They think that a large vocabulary shows off their IQ.
- \*They suppose that a high IQ equals wisdom and spirituality.
- \*They crave the prestige of being considered to be an "intellectual."
- \*They hope, if they are intellectual enough, to be allowed into the circle of elite "wise" men.
- \*And this will make it possible for them to overrule any disturbing truths they find in Scripture.

(So they can deceive their hearers into believing the pleasant lies they tell.) Big words are pretty handy if you want to tell lies.

What a contrast there is between Reverend Windbag and our dear Lord Jesus. Have you noticed who were most drawn to Him? "The common people heard Him gladly." When He spoke the Word of God to them He spoke their language. When He preached He used their simple words. He described their daily experiences, and did it in language they understood. And many heard Him clearly and received Him into their hearts. They still do.

Think again of the apostles and their simplicity. Paul reminded the Corinthians that he came to them not with excellency of speech or wisdom of words, declaring unto (them) the testimony of God. He warned them in a later chapter not to be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ. James exhorts us to let our yea be yea and our nay be nay.

Ezra set a good example when he and his fellow scribes "read in the book of the law of God distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading." Neh.8:8

I often scratch my head and wonder if we preachers could cut the length of our sermons by a third if we just used smaller words. By doing so we may find we actually say more, and say it more clearly.

There is a great temptation in this information age for preachers to be erudite and sophisticated, even to be educated beyond our intelligence, but that is not the Saviour's way. He spoke to simple men in simple words. He even sent the Holy Spirit to inspire simple men to use the common man's common Greek to write His words down for simple folks like us to read.

No preacher should ever seek to be a Jumbo pilot. But he should aspire to fold (ever so simply) the Truths of God's Holy Word into little paper airplanes and fly them into the ears and hearts of his hearers.

After all, preaching which contains too many big words is just floccininaucinihilipilification, isn't it?

Bro Buddy

[\(Back to Table of Contents\)](#)

## The Harvest Is Coming! –

There was once a spider who lived in a cornfield. He was a big spider and he had spun a beautiful web between the corn stalks. He got fat eating all the bugs he caught in his web. He liked his home and planned to stay there for the rest of his life. One day the spider caught a little bug in his web, and just as the spider was about to eat him, the bug said, "If you let me go I will tell you something important that will save your life."

The spider paused for a moment and listened because he was amused.

"You better get out of this cornfield," the little bug said, "The harvest is coming!"

The spider smiled and said, "What is this harvest you are talking about? I think you are just telling me a story."

But the little bug said, "Oh no, it is true. The owner of this field is coming to harvest it soon. All the stalks will be knocked down and the corn will be gathered up. You will be killed by the giant machines if you stay here."

The spider said, "I don't believe in harvests and giant machines that knock down corn stalks. How can you prove this?"

The little bug continued, "Just look at the corn. See how it is planted in rows? It proves this field was created by an intelligent designer."

The spider laughed and mockingly said, "This field has evolved and has nothing to do with a creator. Corn always grows that way."

The bug went on to explain, "Oh no. This field belongs to the owner who planted it, and the harvest is coming soon."

The spider grinned and said to the little bug, "I don't believe you," and then the spider ate the little bug for lunch.

A few days later, the spider was laughing about the story the little bug had told him. He thought to himself, "A harvest! What a ridiculous idea. I've lived here all my life and nothing has ever disturbed me. I have been here since these stalks were just a foot off the ground, and I'll be here for the rest of my life, because nothing is ever going to change in this field. Life is good, and I have it made."

The next day was a beautiful sunny day in the cornfield. The sky above was clear and there was no wind at all. That afternoon as the spider was about to take a nap, he noticed some thick dusty clouds moving toward him.

He could hear the roar of a great engine and he said to himself, "I wonder what that could be?"

[\(Back to Table of Contents\)](#)

## Notable Quotes and Quotable Notes –

\* Insanity has been defined as trying the same thing repeatedly and expecting different results. - David Cloud

\* "It was self-serving politicians who convinced recent generations of Americans that we could all stand in a circle with our hands in each other's pockets and somehow get rich." --American radio broadcaster Paul Harvey (1918-2009)

\* "A tyrant must put on the appearance of uncommon devotion to religion. Subjects are less apprehensive of illegal treatment from a ruler whom they consider god-fearing and pious." --Greek philosopher Aristotle (384-322 BC)

\* "Now those who seek absolute power, even though they seek it to do what they regard as good, are simply demanding the right to enforce their own version of heaven on earth, and let me remind

you they are the very ones who always create the most hellish tyranny." --Sen. Barry Goldwater (1909-1998)

\* The branch of the vine does not worry, and toil, and rush here to seek for sunshine, and there to find rain. No; it rests in union and communion with the vine; and at the right time, and in the right way, is the right fruit found on it. Let us so abide in the Lord Jesus. Hudson Taylor.

[\(Back to Table of Contents\)](#)

## Fundamentalism is Man-Centred –

(Pastor Bob Kirkland writes provocative articles on many important subjects. Here are some excerpts from his article on Fundamentalism. To read the entire article, go to the website address at the bottom. - Ed.)

"Our fundamental movement began with a compromising committee of interdenominational leaders who determined what was a fundamental doctrine and what was not. (Something they had no scriptural right to do) The compromise that is prevalent in our movement began over a 100 years ago on day one of our movement."

"I am very strongly saying we need to realize that we are in trouble. Our "*fundamental movement*" was founded on the faulty foundation of human reasoning from day one. Should we not prove what is "Acceptable unto the Lord" (Ephesians 5:10) by checking with the Word of God rather than our favourite successful looking fundamentalists?"

"Fundamentalism started out as a man-centered movement and remains a man-centered movement today."

**"Reasoning Is The Power of The Mind To Think, Understand, And Make Judgments By The Process of Logic.** On several occasions in the Scriptures, we find the disciples "*reasoning among themselves.*" They were trying to understand and make judgments by the process of logic, and their reasoning was always faulty. The only safe way to reason about anything is to follow the example of Paul who "*reasoned*" with his listeners, "*out of the Scriptures.*" (Act 17:2)

In the early 1900s, liberalism and modernism were coming in like a flood. Concerned Christian leaders *reasoned together* concerning how to combat the problem. The outcome of their reasoning was a series of articles known as *The Fundamentals*. The preface to *The Fundamentals*, written by R.A. Torrey reads, "*The oversight of the selection of articles to be included in The Fundamentals was given to a special committee of men who were known to be sound in the faith*" Our "*special committee,*" armed with the logical humanistic reasoning that "*big is better*" decided to bypass God's plan for local churches and formed a "*committee.*" of Anglicans, Presbyterians, Methodists, Congregationalists, Baptists and other denominations. Some sprinkled babies and called it baptism, some did not. Our "*special committee*" included C. I. Scofield, who was divorced in 1883, remarried three months later, and was ordained as pastor in a Congregational church the same year. Our "*special committee*" who according to R.A. Torrey were all "*known to be sound in the faith,*" obviously did not consider the

Scriptures commanding a pastor be “*the husband of one wife*” or baptism as being “*fundamental.*”

## "No Reference To The Local Church

*Nothing is mentioned in their creed about the local church or baptism as these two Bible doctrines could not be a part of their new para-church movement For the first time in two thousand years, God’s pastors and God’s local churches were pushed aside and our new movement became the spearhead of fundamentalism. The fact that the committee was put together with a group of leaders with many different doctrinal beliefs, indicates the reasoning was humanistic rather than Scriptural. Had they reasoned together using the Word of God as their foundation, they never would have formed such a group of men with many different opinions concerning Bible doctrine. The fact is, if they had checked the Scriptures they never would have bypassed God’s pastors and God’s local church in forming a “special committee” in the first place. Nowhere will anyone find a Scripture that would indicate that God wants a “committee” to do His work. First Timothy 3:15 plainly says “...the pillar and ground of the truth” is “...the house of God, which is the church of the living God.” Their faulty reasoning originated in their thinking that big is better. They thought they needed a big organization with some big named people and they set aside Bible truth to accomplish our goal. We determined our doctrinal differences are “preconceived opinions not based on reason” and agreed that “we are responsible to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace, rising above all sectarian prejudices and denominational bigotry.” We had the gall to call it fundamentalism.”*

## "Immersion Is Not A Mode of Baptism - Immersion is Baptism!

In spite of the fact that immersion is not a mode of baptism, immersion is baptism, our new “*special committee*” did not consider it one of the “*weightier matters.*” Ryle went so far as to say we are all taught this wicked compromise of the Scriptures by the “*Spirit.*” Why didn’t *Torrey, Dixon, Riley, Shafer, Scofield* or any other of our “*giants of the faith*” protest? Apparently *unity* in the *movement* was more important than Bible doctrine. Of the sixty-four subjects dealt with in *The Fundamentals*, baptism is not one of them.”

## "Agree To Disagree On Bible Doctrine?

Where do we find a chapter and verse for that nonsense? Our committee should never have “*agreed to disagree*” on Bible doctrines. Our Godgiven mandate is to “*Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine.*” (Second Timothy 4:2) The word “*preach*” in this text means to “*herald.*” A herald would come into town saying, “*Hear Ye! Hear Ye! Thus saith the King.*” If the herald left part of the message out because he thought it might cause disunity, he would have been disloyal to his king. When our founders of fundamentalism left part of the message out, they were compromisers and they were disloyal to the King of Kings. The men who compromised concerning any Bible doctrine should have been treated as Peter was when Paul “*...withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed.*” (Galatians 2:11)”

**"Pastors** are commanded to teach God’s people “*...all things.*” **Pastors** are commanded to teach “*...faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also.*” (Second Timothy 2:2) This responsibility was not given to *editors* or *college professors* it was given to *pastors*. A *college, mission board, newspaper, seminar* or any other ministry **that is organized outside of the local church is not**

**part of a church, it is part of a movement.** (Any and all ministries must be under the authority of the local church if it is going to be in line with the Word of God.)"

## A Malignant Doctrine

**"Para-church movements have made God's local churches less impressive or valuable than colleges, newspapers, magazines, and our movement. The God-given position of the pastor has also been pushed to a roll of less importance with our humanistic titles of presidents, professors, administrators, directors, editors and such like, that lead in our big para-church movements.**

The foundation for all of our para-church organizations is found in Bishop John Charles Ryle's position concerning his so-called "*one true church*," (sometimes referred to as a "universal church"). This malignant doctrine has been the main catalyst for all programs operating outside of the local church. In our fundamental movement *anyone, anywhere*, is now free to start *any ministry* he wants. We are free to *do that which is right in our own eyes*, because we have no local church authority to watch over our new *movements* and no Scripture to dictate the structure of our para-church ministries. Organizations can be built on the false foundation of the so-called *universal church* and methods can be founded on whatever our favourite fundamentalist teaches."

## "Fundamentalism Is Man-Centered

Our new movement started as a man-centered organization. Like Israel of old, who rejected the simple life of Tribes and Judges, crying rather for a king and a kingdom, our founders of fundamentalism rejected God's simple local church plan and God's pastors, and focused on our new kings and our new kingdom. Our movement is plagued with compromise and has been since day one."

We need to get back to **God's Word** and **God's way**. "For *the time is come that judgment must begin at the house of God...*" (First Peter 4:17)

[http://web.mac.com/lcm7/Site/Articles\\_New\\_files/THE%20FUNDAMENTALS%20pdf2.pdf](http://web.mac.com/lcm7/Site/Articles_New_files/THE%20FUNDAMENTALS%20pdf2.pdf)

[\(Back to Table of Contents\)](#)

## What Teachers Make –

(E)very once in a while I ask students at school who their favourite teachers are. Surprisingly, they say they don't have any. I sure did when I was in school. Mr. Van Orden made algebra and geometry interesting, Mr. Tharp taught all of us high school hot rodders how to formulate racing fuels for our V-8's, Mr. Wooley provoked us to think in Physics, and Mrs. Roach made Texans want to learn to speak and write English (!) So when I came across the following article I wished I could pass it on to the teachers who were some of my heroes, but I can't. They are all gone.

Maybe the best thing to do, in their absence, is to pass it on to you, just in case you are a teacher, or still have one you can thank by sending them this. - Ed.)

## What Teachers Make

The dinner guests were sitting around the table discussing life. One man, a CEO, decided to explain the problem with education.

He argued, "What's a kid going to learn from someone who decided his best option in life was to become a teacher?" He reminded the other dinner guests what they say about teachers: "Those who can, do. Those who can't, teach." To stress his point he said to another guest; "You're a teacher, Susan. Be honest. What do you make?"

Susan, who had a reputation for honesty and frankness replied, "You want to know what I make? I make kids work harder than they ever thought they could. I make a C+ feel like the Congressional Medal of Honor. I make kids sit through 40 minutes of study hall in absolute silence. You want to know what I make?"

I make kids wonder.

I make them question.

I make them criticize.

I make them apologize and mean it.

I make them write.

I make them read, and read, and read.

I make them show all their work in math and perfect their final drafts in English.

I make them understand that if you have the brains, and follow your heart, and if someone ever tries to judge you by what you make, you must pay no attention because they just didn't learn."

Susan paused and then continued.

"You want to know what I make? I MAKE A DIFFERENCE,"

And then she finished off by asking him, "So, what do you make?"

(I find, after searching for the author's name, that this is one of many modified versions of the original "poem" (by Taylor Mali). I know, I know, my English teacher would have my head for using anything else than the original version . My apologies, Mrs. Roach. You are the one who demanded that I write. So I do it my way. -Ed.)

[\(Back to Table of Contents\)](#)

## Cartoons For Wise Men –

[\(Back to Table of Contents\)](#)

## A Poem For Overworked Homemakers –

### Dust If You Must

Dust if you must but wouldn't it be better,  
To paint a picture or write a letter,  
Bake a cake or plant a seed,  
Ponder the difference between want and need?

Dust if you must but there's not much time,  
With rivers to swim and mountains to climb,  
Music to hear and books to read,  
Friends to cherish and life to lead.

Dust if you must but the world's out there  
With the sun in your eyes, the wind in your hair,  
A flutter of snow, a shower of rain.  
This day will not come around again.

Dust if you must but bear in mind,  
Old age will come and it's not kind.  
And when you go and go you must,  
You, yourself, will make more dust.

### Rose Milligan

(Remember, a house becomes a home when you can write "I love you" on the furniture...  
Ed.)

[\(Back to Table of Contents\)](#)

## Fundraising Letters and Replies to Them –

### Dear Pa\$tor Flintheart,

I am \$eeking fund rai\$ing engagements\$ for our mi\$\$ion\$ team in \$eptember. It i\$ our de\$ire to lead our group of mi\$\$iology \$peciali\$t\$ to the de\$perately needy field of the Gold Coa\$t in Queen\$land. We are \$tirring the \$aints to \$upplicate, \$trive, and \$upport thi\$ worthy project \$o that

we can storm the gates, and save souls in one of Satan's strongholds. In order for us to be successful we are asking pastors and churches to support us and stand with us in this worthy soul saving project. If you can fit us into your schedule, please give me a call on \_\_\_\_\_.

Rev. Grabbuck  
Missionary to the up and out sucker of the Gold Coast

Dear Missionary Grabbucks,

I appreciate the noble project your knowledgeable team is undertaking. I have heard that the overheated economy of that part of the state is a large part of their ignorance and ignoble behaviour. The casinos have put an astronomical financial burden on the poor downtrdden working class people living there. Unfortunately, we have no dates available in September. In fact, the earliest available date is in November, 2015.

We thank you for notifying us. If you are in our area, be sure to phone our unlisted church phone number.

Like I always say,

Be ye warmed and filled,

Pastor Flintheart  
No Way Baptist Church

[\(Back to Table of Contents\)](#)

## Darwin's Thoughts On Women –

According to Charles Darwin, the central mechanism of evolution is survival of the fittest. In this concept, inferior animals are more likely to become extinct while the superior ones are more likely to thrive.<sup>1</sup> The racism that this idea has produced has now been both well-documented and widely publicized.<sup>2</sup> Less widely known is the fact that many evolutionists, including Darwin, taught that women were both biologically and intellectually inferior to men.

### Reasons for Inferiority

According to Darwinian theory, women were less evolved than men, and because of their smaller brains, they were "eternally primitive," childlike, less spiritual, more materialistic, and "a real danger to contemporary civilization."<sup>3</sup> The supposed intelligence gap that many leading Darwinists believed existed between human males and females was so large that some leading Darwinists classified them as two distinct species-males as *Homo frontalis* and females as *Homo parietalis*.<sup>4</sup> The differences were so great that Darwin was amazed "such different beings belong to the same species."<sup>5</sup>

Reasons for male superiority included the conclusion that war and hunting pruned the weaker men, allowing only the most fit to return home and reproduce. Women, in contrast, were not subject to these selection pressures but were protected by men, allowing the weak to survive.<sup>6</sup>

1 Darwin, C., *The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection*, London: John Murry, 1859.

2 Bergman, J., "The History of the Human Female Inferiority Ideas in Evolutionary Biology," *Rivista di Biologia/Biology Forum* 95(2):379-412, 2002.

3 Gilmore, D., *Misogyny: The Male Malady*, University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, p. 125, 2001.

4 Love, R., *Darwinism and feminism: "The 'women question' in The Life and Work of Olive Schreiner and Charlotte Perkins Gilman,"* in Oldroyd and Langham, Eds., *The Wider Domain of Evolutionary Thought*, D:Reidel, Holland, pp. 113-131, 1983.

5 Rosser, S., *Biology and Feminism*, Twayne, New York, p. 59, 1992.

6 Dyer, G., *War*, Crown Publishers, New York, p. 122, 1985.

<http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/am/v2/n1/darwin-taught-male-superiority>

[\(Back to Table of Contents\)](#)

## Eddy-Torial –

### Whatever Happened to Church Discipline?

A recent letter from a dear pastor friend raised the question of church discipline. Why is the biblical practice of dealing with sin in the churches so seldom seen? It is almost extinct, you know. If we were in a time of revival in our churches, maybe, just maybe, we would not need to practice church discipline. But we are not experiencing a 21st century revival. At best, we are seeing the incremental surrender of all we believe.

I am compiling a list of conclusions regarding the absence of church discipline. The list is growing. I welcome any valid contributions.

1) The Scriptures are clear regarding the purging of sin out of the local church:

**Matthew 18:15 - 20** - The Lord Jesus Christ told His disciples how He wanted them to deal with sin in the church.

**I Corinthians 5:1 - 13** - The Holy Spirit inspired the apostle Paul to command the church at Corinth to exclude those whose testimonies leavened the church with the sins of Greek culture.

**II Corinthians 2:1 - 11** - The Spirit further instructed the church to receive back the repentant sinner into fellowship, once it was clear that he had forsaken his sin.

**Galatians 6:1** - Again, the end objective of church discipline is revealed, in that we are commanded to restore the errant brother. His restoration depends on him forsaking his sin.

2) The new evangelical method of interpreting Scripture exalts reason above revelation. We do not hear IB pastors using the term, "culturally relevant", but they have attended enough New Evangelical conferences to learn their ways. And now we see this "relevance" being practiced in our churches. Pastors reason out the position that church discipline is not compatible with the "big is good" and "soft is better" philosophies of soft evangelicals.

3) Western culture does not recognize the authority of Scripture at present, and so our churches meekly concede the point. Yes, we know the Scriptures command the purging of leaven out of the churches, but it just isn't done any more, so we wink at sin and hope God Himself will drop a grand piano on it. Just so He doesn't expect my church to do anything about it.

4) The **BiggestIsGoodest Fellowship** frowns upon any action that excludes a sinner from the church. Oh, she may be a Typhoid Mary, and he may be Simon Magos, but we wouldn't want to make waves, lest we disturb the sleeping saints.

Bro. Buddy Smith.

[\(Back to Table of Contents\)](#)