

# The Continuing Battle for the Bible

copyright 2008  
revised © 2018  
Mr. Gary S. Dykes

[Mr. Dykes is solely responsible for all of the content of this essay,  
except for the indicated quotes]

## BATTLE Nº 1 - BULTMANNISM

One of the influences corrupting theologians on both sides of the Atlantic stems from a radical liberal named, Rudolf Bultmann (1884 - 1976). He used numerous sophistic techniques to popularize the blasphemous notion that the Gospels represented the beliefs (or, theology) of the earliest Christian (even pagan) churches, rather than the genuine facts about the Lord Jesus Christ!

In other words, Bultmann convinced numerous scholars that the early beliefs and culture of the first century Christians generated the four Gospel accounts. Their value lies in their exposures of the belief systems of the earliest Christians. He uplifts their cultural aspects, and corrupts the concept of Divine Inspiration.

For Bultmann, the gospels must first be "demythologized" in order to reveal what the true Christian faith is. Bultmann believed that the actual historicity of the Gospels to be inaccurate, and that they were manipulated by the early Christians to reflect their personal biases or beliefs germane to their arguments or preaching aspects. We might present one quote (from hundreds which can support the above evaluations):

*Certainly there is no guarantee that all the sayings in the gospels in which Jesus cites words of Scripture were really spoken by him; many were surely put into his mouth by the church, in order to justify its own position.*

An English translation of Bultmann's text from: *Jesus and the Word*, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958. Page 62.

Accordingly, to Bultmann, the original (or the very earliest) MSS of the NT were constructed in a milieu composed of gnosticism, Jewish apocalyptic literatures, and Hellenistic pneumatology; each "religion" altering in various ways the words of the NT manuscripts. (s.v. in *Primitive Christianity*, 1956, Meridian, beginning on page 175, the section named "Primitive Christianity", by Rudolph Bultmann). He leaves no room for Divine Inspiration. I call this classical "Bultmannism". I also include the popular notion that some of the gospel writers relied upon historical writings, or some former written accounts in order to create their own version (or gospel). Thus my definition of Bultmannism. It has infected many Biblical scholars of our day as well! Bultmannism is similar to the views which Old Testament scholars impose upon some of the Old Testament writings, I include these folks as well -- who see the OT as fabricated writings or myths. Here is a short list of scholars who knowingly or naïvely accept Bultmann's theory, **and** who deny an inerrant, God-breathed text; some from the early twentieth century and some current:

H. M. Kuitert	Ernst Käsemann
Otto Piper	Charles Scalise
Dr. David Parker	Günther Bornkamm
Douglas A. Campbell	E. Fuchs
Dr. Reuben Swanson	James H. Charlesworth
Carl Clifton Black II	Gerhard Ebeling
Dr. Daniel Wallace - (see below)	Mary McClintock Fulkerson
Professor S. G. F. Brandon	Brevard Childs
Professor G. C. Berkouwer	Dr. Bart Ehrman
J. A. T. Robinson	L. Harold DeWolf
Alfred Loisy	Paul K. Jewett
Colin Brown	W. G. Kümmel
Mark Goodacre	Robert Funk
Hermann Gunkel	Marcus Borg
Dr. Lewis B. Smedes	Reginald H. Fuller

Karl Barth  
Norman Perrin  
Brian Keith Blount  
James M. Robinson  
U. Luck  
Professor James A. Sanders  
C. Kavin Rowe  
Richard Mouw  
Emanuel Tov  
Dr. Bruce M. Metzger - (see below)  
Helmut Koester  
Donald Hanger  
Jeffrey Stackert  
Oscar Cullmann  
Stephen B. Chapman  
Kevin Hector  
Frederick William Dobbs-Allsopp  
Trutz Rendtorff  
Stevan Davies  
David Martinez  
Edgar V. McKnight  
Hans Conzelmann  
Katharine Doob Sakenfeld  
Charles E. Carlston  
John Goldingay  
Joel Marcus  
B. H. Streeter  
Beverly Roberts Gaventa  
Joseph Klausner  
Gary Glassman  
Walter Bauer

Morton Smith  
Burton Mack  
Darrell J. Doughty  
Alvar Ellegård  
Gregory Riley  
Robert Eisenman  
Richard Horsley  
Paula Fredriksen  
John Dominic Crossan  
Carol Meyers  
Earl Doherty  
Timothy Freke  
Peter Gandy  
John P. Meier  
Stephen Patterson  
G. A. Wells  
George F. Somsel (added via his request!)  
William Dever  
*et al.*

For particulars and references for each of the above, contact me. [garyandgale2000ATatt.net - change the "AT" to the @ symbol]. Similar to Bultmann, some ascribe origins of Biblical texts to sources other than Divine Inspiration.

In Biblical times, in Israel, some educated religious folks who formed groups were commonly known as the Pharisees or Sadducees, and also as scribes and minor priests. It is fair to refer to the same types of modern counterparts as modern day Pharisees! For they often use their knowledge of Scripture to attack Jesus and Paul and the Apostles. These "Pharisees" thrive within the Christian community as tares amongst wheat. Many modern associations are of a mixed nature, having within the memberships both genuine Christians and overt pagans. Thus a mixture which is not proper for genuine saints to be a part of, we believers are not to fellowship with or within such organizations, regardless of their religious appearances or pseudo-orthodoxy.

The above list of men and women contains scholars who are members of various religious societies, secret societies (Freemasonry), members of the faculties of various institutions, members of various religious denominations and members of popular "clubs" such as the SBL (Society of Biblical Literature). Many have multiple degrees. Thus, we have a group of peoples who can and do influence the translation of Bibles, the interpretation of Biblical texts, the teaching of Biblical materials. They influence their comrades in the media as well, as seen in the many television productions in which some card-bearing scholar portrays the Qumran communities as proto-Christians, or some other such wild theories. The American public is under attack from these modern Pharisees!

S.I. Hayakawa, once wrote (in: *Language in Thought and Action*, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.. 1978, pages 289f.):

*...as members of institutions we incorporate into ourselves certain institutionally demanded attitudes.*

*Many persons are, through emotional insecurity as well as through lack of extensional orientation, unable to depart from institutionally expected attitudes.*

*The term often used to describe this process is "internalization". It refers to the process in which people take ideas [like from their instructors, or mentors!] ideologies, beliefs, commands, and attitudes from the society in which they live and make them part of themselves, so that the ideas, ideologies, and so forth seem to come from within themselves and seem to be their own ideas and ideologies.*

*...to have nothing but institutionalized attitudes is eventually to have no personality of one's own, and therefore to have nothing original or creative to contribute to the institutions of which one is a member.*

Now, I put forth that some or many of the above scholars are elitists, card-carrying, tenured Pharisees who parrot liberal agendas and perversions; knowingly or unknowingly twisting the truth of the Scriptures.

Typically, some of the above will whine and claim that they are being attacked. Most do not like to be out-front, clearly naked. They prefer to slither behind ingeniously designed dense coverings. They accept the distortion of truth (under a variety of euphemisms) but cannot endure criticism, or descriptions of their writings or behaviors. I am not blindly attacking, I am exposing. These criticisms are against their teachings, writings and beliefs, not their beings!!

I intentionally use strong language, I intend to emphasize reality and the real dangers which some of these Pharisees present. The dark prefer the darkness. I will gladly debate any of the above, if they should want a public clarification! If I have wrongly placed a name in the above list, inform me,

and teach me why such and such should be removed from the list. Recall I am evaluating their works, not the person(s)!

Below is a relevant quote from C. van Till:

*If I have offended you it has been because I dare not, even in the interest of winning you, offend my God. And if I have not offended you I have not spoken of my God. For what you have really done in your handling of the evidence for belief in God, is to set yourself up as God. You have made the reach of your intellect, the standard of what is possible or not possible. You have thereby virtually determined that you intend never to meet a fact that points to God. Facts, to be facts at all -- facts, that is, with decent scientific and philosophic standing -- must have your stamp instead of that of God upon them as their virtual creator.*

*I shall not convert you at the end of my argument. I think the argument is sound. I hold that belief in God is not merely as reasonable as other belief, or even a little or infinitely more probably true than other belief; I hold rather that unless you believe in God you can logically believe in nothing else. But since I believe in such a God, a God who has conditioned you as well as me, I know that you can to your own satisfaction, by the help of the biologists, the psychologists, the logicians, and the Bible critics reduce everything I have said this afternoon and evening to the circular meanderings of a hopeless authoritarian. Well, my meanderings have, to be sure, been circular; they have made everything turn on God. So now I shall leave you with Him, and with His mercy.*

extracted from Cornelius van Till's, *Why I Believe in God*. Philadelphia: Committee on Christian Education, Orthodox Presbyterian Church, n.d.

## BULTMANNISM, THE REAL PROBLEM

By supposing that the early writers of the gospels wrote in such a way that their writing reflected their own religious biases or the views of their particular religion, the very teaching of the Inspiration of the Scriptures is contradicted. Inerrancy becomes irrelevant. The very integrity of the Scriptures is compromised. Not to mention the assertions that the Scriptures are God-breathed and sound ( I Peter 1:10-12, Hebrews 4:12, II Timothy 3:15-17, Matthew 15:4-9, Proverbs 30:5, II Samuel 22:31, most of Psalms 119, John 8:47, all of II Corinthians 4, II Thessalonians 2:13, Jeremiah 23:30 *et al*); are false, and that therefore the texts are unreliable. (And, as an old-fashioned exercise, look up each reference and ponder its meaning.)

Luke did not need or use Mark's gospel or Matthew's in order for him to write Luke or Acts. Luke needed the Holy Spirit, and the Holy Spirit guided Luke's writings as well as John's and the rest of the human scribes and dictators of the original Biblical manuscripts. Luke surely heard oral teachings about Jesus, however we are wrong to suggest that he based his gospel upon prior written sources (as does Wallace, below). [Certainly Eta Linnemann's words are relevant here—note her argument on page 190 of *Is There a Synoptic Problem*, 1992, Baker Book House—as concerns Luke's sources].

Though some cultural differences exist when styles and habits from Biblical times are contrasted with our times, many ethics and admonitions remain unchanged: homosexuality is still condemned, women need long hair when worshiping, folks should dress modestly, live separate and God-honoring lives, *et cetera et cetera* - - - are all still or should be, enforced.

Do I Hear An Objection?

It is often said that since we no longer possess the original autographs, how do we know that the original evangelists (or, as per Bult-



mann, the early church) did not write them so as to include their own personal changes or alterations or religious agenda(s)? Prove it.....Well, first lets reverse the question: How do you know that they changed any of the words? Prove it.....

Let me reply.

(1) The Bible itself declares it is Inspired. Men were moved by the Holy Ghost to pen what they did. (And yes writers are similarly spoken of as well.)

*19 We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day star arise in your hearts:*

*20 Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation.*

*21 For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.*

*1 But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction.*

*2 And many shall follow their pernicious ways; by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of.*

*3 And through covetousness shall they with feigned words make merchandise of you: whose judgment now of a long time lingereth not, and their damnation slumbereth not.*

*4 For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment;*

*5 And spared not the old world, but saved Noah the eighth person, a preacher of righteousness, bringing in the flood upon the world of the ungodly;*

*6 And turning the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah into ashes condemned them with an overthrow, making them an ensample unto those that after should live ungodly;*

II Peter 1:19 - 2:6 KJV (and you think my language is strong!)

Other passages also bear upon this issue. If Bultmannism be accepted, or if the original written accounts of the gospels are not true, then you are declaring the Bible, or parts thereof, to be false. How profound a human gesture you make, how tall you appear standing up against God! Yet man is not actually so...though man's nature is full of pride, envy, jealousy and the desire to humiliate the Good Lord. What did Jesus mean in John 10:35 - *"...the Scripture cannot be broken"*? Or what of Luke 16:17? Jesus had explicit trust in the OT texts, just as the NT writers had trust in the NT texts (II Peter 3:15, 16, Revelation 22:18-20).

(2) The internal witness agrees with the fact that Matthew, Mark, Luke and John all wrote their texts, all moved by the Holy Spirit to do so. The indwelling Holy Spirit within me and the bosoms of countless Christians in bygone eras agree that the 27 books of the NT are accurate. Just because a few manuscripts differ, is no cause for crying out that the sky is falling! Healthy manuscript comparisons (amongst the thousands of copies) remove and reveal the small amount of reproduction errors and intentional changes.

(3) The earliest canons of the NT contain our four gospels. The earliest known writings of the "church fathers" do not reject any of the gospels. In the earliest portions of Christianity (pre A.D. 95) men and women had the gift or special ability to recognize evil spirits and the Holy Spirit, [I Corinthians 12:10] none of them apparently rejected any of the four gospels, none left any warnings to us that any portions of the four gospels are in

error. It is true that some groups did not accept some of our NT texts, such as sects of the Syrian churches, but these stand out as quite sectarian, not the norm.

So, in review, the three reasons—why I am convinced that the original texts of the NT manuscripts are not altered nor emended by the original writers—are:

(1) The Bible itself declares itself to be valid and true. Jesus often states that "*It is written...*" in each case He quotes Scripture, clearly indicating that He saw it as authoritative. (Only infidels would see a negative circular reasoning here).

(2) The Holy Spirit witnesses to the integrity of its text.

(3) Church tradition supports its integrity.

It is true that some intentional alterations were introduced in some of the ancient Biblical manuscripts, these are usually detectable, often quite easily as Ehrman proves. However, these few manuscripts are not our sole guides to the text. Intentional changes stand out when several hundred manuscripts are collated [i.e. compared word-for-word]. But these errors do not mean that ALL of our Bibles/documents are contaminated. Nor, that any of the gospel accounts are fabrications!

Amongst the above mentioned names are some who really love the Lord and His word, but have obviously been led astray! Their statements in their published works promote the dissolution of the integrity of the Scriptures, it is hoped that they will come to their senses, and quit declaring that:

(A) the original texts or gospels are not the products of Divine Inspiration, that God has not preserved His Word perfect and intact

and,

(B) critics cannot reconstruct the original MSS, thus we are plagued with unresolvable errors.

Hence, these liberal critics seem disheartened, their rational humanistic methods cannot rescue them, they cannot find God's Word! They are products of a form of "institutionalism" they have been programmed, often with Bultmannian codes.

For example, we might single out Professor Daniel Baird Wallace, a man, I in many ways greatly admire; we might illustrate a quote from one of his many essays published on the Internet. In an essay titled, "*The Synoptic Problem*" he states: (as concerns the relationships betwixt the synoptic gospels)

*"...if identical verbiage is to be attributed to Spirit-inspiration, to what should verbal dissonance be attributed?"*

His essay leaves one persuaded that: Wallace promotes the idea that instead of reliance upon the Holy Spirit, that some of the gospel writers relied upon prior written works. Wallace seems to support the "Q" source theory, at least in part, and may become a centerpiece for the Jesus Seminar. If indeed, Mark was written first, what source did Mark use? Mark was not an eyewitness, it is clear that he was divinely Inspired to write what he wrote, even though he worked with Paul and Peter. Each of the other gospel writers were also miraculously inspired. There is/was no need to rely upon any other sources, the Holy Spirit gave each writer all the information they needed, as well as the sequence in which the gospel accounts unfold, which was also prior determined after God's will. Note who John's source was when he described the city coming down from heaven - Revelation 21.

Wallace, seems to have a very disturbed view of inspiration! He accepts a mechanistic process **or** a process which is human/source related; thus he limits himself and misses the wonder and reality of genuine Divine Inspiration. He claims that his studies make him orthodox, yet such claim is valueless as some of his studies are completely wrong-headed. Perhaps his parroting of Stein's work is part of his problem? In reality there is no "Synoptic Problem".

As concerns the late Bruce Manning Metzger, he writes in *The New Testament Its Background, Growth and Content*, (1965, page 86):

*There is no reason to doubt that a significant proportion of the words and events included in the Gospels are there not only because they figured in the life of Jesus, but also because they served some vital need in the life of the early church. Since, moreover, many of the sayings of Jesus were preserved mainly by being preached, they were liable in this way to a certain, or rather uncertain, amount of modification with a view to bringing out the point of them in one or another set of circumstances in the primitive church. What each evangelist has preserved, therefore, is not a photographic reproduction of the words and deeds of Jesus, but an interpretative portrait delineated in accord with the special needs of the early church.*

Metzger too, drank deep from the polluted well of Bultmannism. In the next section, below, we will look closer at the institutions (seminaries) which produced such thinking and men as Metzger (Metzger is an exponent of Princeton), *et al.*

Examine two leaves; one may have fine hairs on its upper side, the other leaf may have hairs on its bottom side. Is God inconsistent? Why did He so design these leaves? Should they not meet OUR idea of conformity? Indeed! God designed each gospel account to meet His specifications, their sequence of events and their language use is no accident, though we readers

may not perceive why one may differ from another, there is a valid reason, just as there are reasons why hairs may appear on one or another side of various leaves, or indeed be entirely hirsute.

It is hoped that they (Wallace and those still living) will recognize that the majority of MSS promote accurate truth, truth not manipulated by the earliest writers or copyists or their religious biases. This is what needs emphasis, not the few intentional alterations. Why not promote truth? Why not promote that agreement which exists amongst thousands and thousands of Greek, Latin, Old Church Slavonic, Ethiopic, and Coptic manuscripts? It is amazing that Moses could write of his death, and it is amazing that Moses could quote words spoken between God and Adam, yet he did so, perfectly via the Inspiration of the Holy Spirit. Amazing, yes, but true and authoritative. [despite claims that Joshua wrote these postscripts, *et al* ] A man, like Professor Wallace, is seemingly at a loss here to describe Moses' source for these texts. Wallace himself may never know.

Perhaps, you may suspect that there exists no danger from the above named individuals; below is a sampling of the results of their collective teachings, a money making venture, money to support their distorted views of the Bible. The naive and gullible are at risk. (period.). One final example of the danger and corruption which is spreading like cancer worldwide is the *COMMON ENGLISH BIBLE* production, which has—as many of its editors—scholars who were programed at Princeton and Fuller Seminaries. It is a fine example of a lack of respect for the original Holy Writ. A lack which these men and women have been trained to accept. Note this sample quote from I Corinthians 3:1-4.

*Brothers and sisters, I couldn't talk to you like spiritual people but like unspiritual people, like babies in Christ. 2 I gave you milk to drink instead of solid food, because you weren't up to it yet. 3 Now you are still not up to it because you are still unspiritual. When jealousy and fighting exist between you, aren't you unspiritual and living by human standards?*

4 When someone says, "I belong to Paul," and someone else says, "I belong to Apollos", aren't you acting like people without the Spirit? -

quote from: *THE COMMON ENGLISH BIBLE* (CEB, 2011)

Besides added words (such as adding supposed agents to various sentences) and concepts, note the use of contractions. The English can be rather poor, "*jealousy and fighting exist between you*". Being fleshly-minded is quite different than being "*like people without the Spirit*". The saints in Corinth are babes, yes, yet they ARE spiritual, even if their behaviour is as babes, they are still spiritual. The problem of allowing the flesh (humanism, emotions, human rationale *et al*) to be their guides, is omitted in the above passage instead of "fleshly" the CEB prints "*unspiritual*"!

I Corinthians 4:15 states:

*I gave birth to you in Christ Jesus through the gospel...* (In 4:15 Paul did not dictate this, rather, *he became their father through the gospel!*)

I Corinthians, we note, 6:14,

*14 God has raised the Lord and will raise us through his power. (6:14 omits the comparative/conjunctions "not only has God raised the Lord....")*

note I Corinthians 7:28

*28 But if you do marry, you haven't sinned; and if someone who hasn't been married gets married, they haven't sinned. (the alteration of "virgin" [KJV, NASB] to "someone who hasn't been married" really distorts Paul's teaching here.)*

note Genesis 1:1

*When God began to create....* (A footnote here has an improvement. The Hebrew actually reads...*In (the) beginning God created... Created* is a Qal perfect, a verb, it denotes a finished or complete action; *beginning* is a neuter, feminine, singular noun, in the construct state (perhaps absolute). The CEB changes this noun into a verb. The CEB really misconstrues this verse. This created heavens and earth, is not the first day, no process, no *began*. Note verse 5).

and I Corinthians 10:18,

*18 Look at the people of Israel.* (Really! It actually should read: *Behold, Israel after the flesh,* (KJV) earthly Israelites, which maintains the distinction between earthly/fleshly and heavenly/spiritual. Again reference to the flesh is omitted.)

finally, I Corinthians 12:27

*27 You are the body of Christ and parts of each other.* (actually it is, "*you are of body of Christ*" NOT you are the body of Christ. If those in Corinth were the body, who or what were the saints in Ephesus or Galatia?)

Jesus Christ is no longer the "Son of Man" but rather the *Human-One*. [s.v. Matthew 8:20 etc. CEB]. We could go on and on, as it is, I hope folks do not depend on such a highly promoted production (CEB), by doing so they supporting certain publishing concerns as well as Dr. Joel Green, one of the editors, who by the way convinced his own seminary to give priority to the CEB, as in I work for you, you promote me, pat my back and I pat yours.

The translation was produced by five denominational publishing houses and cost about \$3.5 million and it took four years to complete. The *Common English Bible* was released in digital format in 2009 or 2010, and



made available on religious websites. The first time the *Common English Bible* was available in print was in 2011. In November 2011, all sorts of editions were for sale in the CBD sales catalog, only \$30.00 for a copy in imitation leather, as well as about 9 other editions and styles; and not only that but special CEB Bible dictionaries, and CEB maps were for sale as well. They desperately needed to add a special CEB dictionary as many of its non-standard English words are not in normal dictionaries! In May (2010 as I recall), Fuller Theological Seminary voted to add the *Common English Bible* to the NRSV and the TNIV as translations that could be required for students doing biblical studies.

*We wanted something that was an academically excellent translation from Greek and Hebrew, and one that reflected our strong position regarding women in leadership,*

Dr. Joel B. Green, professor of New Testament Interpretation, (Fuller Theological Seminary) as told to *The Christian Post*.

By placing the supposed historical contexts (or, scenarios) via historical criticism on such a high plane of authority, as opposed to the very words of the Biblical texts; modern scholars are keen to note or suggest that, the word should also exist or be known in its MODERN context as well. Consequently, they feel justified to *alter* the cultural landscapes of the NT texts so as to agree with modern environments. In doing so, they often think that they are assisting the readers' comprehension. Consequently gender issues arise, sexual behaviours become issues, women in ministerial roles becomes an issue, excess diversity becomes an issue, mythological relationships become issues, gender perversions become issues, psychological evaluations of the NT authors/writers become issues. Many of these "side-effects" stem from an adoption of the theology of Rudolph Bultmann. Bultmann's existentialist views denied the actual resurrection of Jesus, and denied the miracles of the NT as actual facts. These "side-effects" are included in my designation of "BULTMANNISM".

BATTLE № 2 - THE UNIVERSITIES and SEMINARIES

Before observing various institutions of "higher" learning, we might first discuss the the title "Doctor" as expressed with the abbreviations of: PhD, D.D., Litt.D, D.Min., D.Phil., LL.D, Th.D., and the like, but especially the PhDs and the D.Ds "Doctors of Divinity". I am certain that the degree system in America's system of higher education is detrimental to the advancement of knowledge and to the free exchange of multiple ideas and views. Some might state that the higher degree's verify the fact that one is certified or has proven to be qualified via attainment of the PhD. Rubbish. In theology, winning a PhD often means one has been able to please his/her mentors and the political or religious biases of the particular institution. They have earned the right to become an insider, a member of the good-ol-boys club. The free exchange of religious viewpoints is all but eliminated in most religious institutions. It is the Bible in handcuffs.

For example: if a student, should praise President Trump for his stance on abortion at Harvard Divinity School, they would find him/herself at odds with the administration, and at odds with those who finance the institution. One must suppress their thoughts in such environments. Try mentioning the Biblical views on homosexual behavior at Yale or Michigan and numerous liberal seminaries and see the administrative anger burst upon your "narrow-minded bigotry". This is hardly a situation in which a young mind can grow and learn and experience new realities, while forming good concrete ethics and values! At Dallas Theological Seminary, it is best not to promote the idea that water baptism is not for the church today, you may stay in the program, but your professional ministerial career is hamstrung.

Many of the above mentioned names in the prior section, did and do teach. Consequently their disease is dangerous as it often infects young, naïve and impressionable students. That is why I mention them by name to expose them. One such as I, am not much of a threat to them, I have not stood before very many students and coerced their minds, restricting their

freedom of thought and making them feel as if they are on an accepted path. May this essay itself not be so categorized!

*Good* teachers present options and opportunities, relying on good thinking processes amongst their students to advance their thinking and to evaluate options critically. Restricting the students' growth and knowledge stems from the instructor's own fears or inability.

Being tenured is not all bad. It is like insurance for the journalist or for the restaurant chef. However, it has gotten out of control. Poor professors live in fear, their assistants live in desperate hope, all seeking the security of being tenured. This basic need has been exploited to the extreme in many seminaries and institutions. Even after achieving tenure, one lives in fear that he/she may lose it via a real or truthful opposition to the powers that be. [*à la* Harry Bultema!]. As a result we have many seminaries full of like-minded clones, afraid of individualism, afraid to wrestle with new ideas and concepts, and afraid to let the Bible speak plainly and literally to their hearts and minds. Some have let the institution's biases and narrow tunnel-vision views (also known as a doctrinal statement, or statement of faith or purpose) become their own shtick, some have completely sold-out to their handlers. The instructor's fears, and or greed or vanities have severely handicapped many aspiring students. This is a crime.

Page Smith reminds us:

*There seems little doubt from the perspective of the present day that the introduction of the Ph.D. as the so-called union card of the profession was, if not a disaster, an unfortunate and retrograde step.*

Page Smith, *Killing the Spirit: Higher Education In America*. 1990. page 108.

Perhaps we should begin with Princeton University, rather the seminary located upon the campus of Princeton. For indeed it has been poison-

ing the minds of many scholars/students in the field of theology for over 75 years now. Its venom is rather insidious.

#### PRINCETON. SEMINARY

Since 1950, about 7,000 peoples have graduated from Princeton with a M.Div or equivalent. More than 1,090 Princeton Seminary alumnae serve "the church" in 88 foreign countries. Princeton [i.e. "seminary"] welcomes students from other Protestant denominations, as well as from the Eastern Orthodox and Roman Catholic churches.

Shortly before 1929 the Seminary went through some disastrous changes! For a brief review of those events I recommend the following file: which file is found at: [www.americanpresbyterianchurch.org](http://www.americanpresbyterianchurch.org) (a very informative site) The file's title is: *The Reorganization of Princeton Theological Seminary*.

The above link provides adequate data on Princeton, thus I am spared from trying to add more information.

One of the "things" I admire about Princeton Seminary, is that they are somewhat "out-front" with their views. That is, their views are not hidden in confusing language, or couched in elusive terms. Their view of Biblical inerrancy is well known. They openly reject an inerrant Bible.

In one of their campus publications, *INSPIRE*, Summer/Fall 2000, Volume 5, Number 2: they print the following admission/confession from a former student:

*"For John [Turpin], seminary was a pivotal time that affected the direction of his whole life. "I had a strong agnostic period in college," he remembered, as though it were only a few, not fifty, years ago, "and I arrived at Princeton still very much in doubt about a lot of things, partic-*

*ularly because I had been exposed to some people who taught the inerrancy of the Bible. I asked Dr. Piper, bless his heart, if he would give me a special reading course on the authority of the Bible. He didn't have anything else to do...well, of course, he did. But he agreed to do the course with me. He told me what to read and met with me two or three times. It made it possible for me to continue, because I began to understand that the authority of the Bible came from Jesus Christ and not from the text. Everything changed."*

So the poor fellow was "straightened-out". It is hard to imagine that any entering students at Princeton, today, are ignorant of its destructive criticisms of the Bible. Do not be fooled the Princeton of Charles Hodge's and B. B. Warfield's day, is DEAD.

Today Princeton continues to promote many liberal agendas, designed to discredit the very integrity of the Holy Writ. In my personal opinion - they are a willing tool in the hands of Satan. The only advantage they may present when compared to other universities, is the fact that they have a fairly nice library.

#### FULLER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Lots of ink has been spilled upon this institution located in/near Pasadena, California; it seems to have been a "poster-boy" for theological degradations. However, in my mind, it is not as dangerous today as is Princeton (above). Nevertheless Fuller is more deceptive, it plays word games, and gives the impression that they are a genuine conservative corporation/institution.

Fuller Seminary forms a complete chapter in Harold Lindsell's book, *The Battle for the Bible*. The chapter is quite informative and because someone scanned and posted the chapter to the internet, I shall simply link you to it for references.

Lindsell on Fuller (A PDF file, located on the site: [www.Biblical-data.org](http://www.Biblical-data.org))

From their current statement it seems that they believe portions of the Bible to be inerrant:

*Where inerrancy refers to what the Holy Spirit is saying to the churches through the biblical writers, we support its use. Where the focus switches to an undue emphasis on matters like chronological details, precise sequence of events, and numerical allusions, we would consider the term misleading and inappropriate. From [www.Fuller.edu](http://www.Fuller.edu)*

They believe other portions of the Bible, those dealing with chronologies, geography *et cetera*, to not be trustworthy! They thus add some Bultmannism into their system of belief in that Bultmann would agree that only some small portions are fully accurate and not loaded with errors, conjectures, biases or myths.

In 1949 their statement read in part:

*The books which form the canon of the Old and New Testaments as originally given are plenary inspired and free from all error in the whole and in the part.*

The "free from all error in whole or part" has been removed. Lindsell also notes that in their current statement they state:

*Scripture is an essential part and trustworthy record of this divine disclosure. All the books of the Old and New Testaments, given by divine inspiration, are the written Word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice.*

Lindsell notes that:

*It is where the word infallible is placed that makes the difference. Had the statement said that the Books of the Old and New Testaments "are the infallible Word of God, the only rule of faith and practice," it would have repeated in different words what the first statement of faith had said. But what the new statement does is this: it limits infallibility to matters of faith and practice. And this is the view espoused by Daniel Fuller in his address on Warfield. Scripture that does not involve matters of faith and practice is not infallible.*

Thus, one needs to read Fuller's statements of faith very carefully! But the quote from [www.americanpresbyterianchurch.org](http://www.americanpresbyterianchurch.org), below is clear:

*We have already seen that new evangelicalism was to have a concern for social involvement which fundamentalism supposedly lacked. Many pages could be written about the seminary's [i.e. Fuller] efforts in this direction. It has decried racism on its campus, sent a representative to march at Selma, crusaded for women's rights, opened all of its degrees to women and spoken sympathetically about homosexuals. In 1975 Professor Paul K. Jewett published a book, *Man as Male and Female*. The purpose of the book was to establish the equality of men and women. Some of his statements were in conflict with the Scriptural statements of the Apostle Paul. Jewett argued that Paul was simply mistaken. On the one hand, his conclusion shows the extremity of his position on equality; on the other, it shows the bankruptcy of his position on inspiration.*

Dr. Lewis B. Smedes, Professor of Ethics at Fuller Seminary, wrote an article in the August, 1978, *Reformed Journal*, on the subject of ordaining homosexuals. He wrote the following:

*The data coming from psychology may tell us more about what homosexuality is than the Bible tells us. Any sophomore today is likely to know more about homosexuality than Paul [the Apostle] knew.*



*What did Paul know about homosexuality without the benefit of Freud or Kinsey? Romans 1 shows that, by the inspiration of God, he knew that homosexuality was the ultimate sin of a sin-sick society, that it was "uncleanness" in God's eyes, that it was a "vile affection," and that it would receive the judgment of God. Paul may not have understood it psychologically, but he knew the will of God on the matter, and that is what we need to know to have a right attitude toward the sin. - end quote.*

Clearly at Fuller, we note that the liberal agendas are alive and strong. The attack upon God's Word grows stronger there day-by-day. I have visited Fuller several times (they have a nice library), but their understanding of the Bible and hence their evangelical stances are built upon foundations created by men who used too much sand in the cement. When Fuller Seminary began its capitulation downward, it was coming under the sway of several professors who had just recently been programmed at Princeton! Scholars like young Dr. Fuller. Currently Fuller is staffed by numerous offsprings of Princeton: James T. Butler, Richard J. Erickson, Douglas H. Nason, Arthur G. Patzia, and others. Fuller is another tragic example of what liberal agendas can do to a once fine, and I mean FINE institution.

#### SEWANEE: UNIVERSITY OF THE SOUTH

Different from the above two seminaries/institutions is Sewanee. This institution has lost all touch with reality. What was good is now bad, what was once bad is now good. Liberalism, free speech, diversity prevail except when truth is spoken; white males are inferior, heterosexuals are perverts and bigots. God is a woman, or whatever you want him/her/it to be. Thus laden are the educational motiffs at Sewanee, a once prestigious institution of the Episcopalian church in southern Tennessee.

Sewanee sits upon some hills spanning 10,000 acres, a campus with beautiful buildings of stone and luscious landscaping. It had its beginning just before the Civil War. It has a somewhat small but very fine library. That's all of the good I can muster when I think of this beautiful campus. (I have also met some very nice folks on campus)

Sewanee is owned by the 28 southern dioceses of the Episcopal church, their only "seminary". It was the institution which offered the notorious Bishop Pike an honorary degree! Pike refused it because Sewanee did not then allow black students to enroll! Even Pike appears decent when compared to this now very troubled institution.

According to information at [www.virtueonline.org](http://www.virtueonline.org), gifts and endowments to this school are shrinking as former alumni are shocked when they learn of the very liberal stances this "seminary" has taken. I visit the campus often and trust me I know when a lady is dressed provocatively. On this so-called Christian oriented campus, many females are making a statement with their style of dress. It is lewd when seen in its supposed context of a stately Christ centered campus. I have been on many "Christian" campuses, even a monastery, and the dress code at Sewanee is definitely inappropriate for an institution funded by numerous churches which make some claim to knowledge of God and His Will.

[www.virtueonline.org](http://www.virtueonline.org) reports: [about an on-campus organization]

*GSA (Gay Straight Alliance) founded in 1988 to provide a setting for confidential and frank discussion concerning human sexuality. Its goal is to dispel stereotypes about sexual orientation by building community and providing education.*

There are several gay "clubs" on the campus at Sewanee. One should carry a spray bottle of bleach should you have to use their restrooms!

Finally, another of my personal observations: in 2006 in the main floor of the library were prominently displayed large photos of completely nude women, photographed displaying their bushy genitals to all library users (even children who may perchance enter the building). Now I realize that some may have referred to this as "art", but its flagrant display and where it was displayed shows a total insensitivity to other humans. Is it "free speech" or "free expression" to genuinely offend others? How rude! Again a statement folks at Sewanee intentionally and willfully made. Thus I leave Sewanee, an institution which bashes Biblical truths and the dignity of men and women.

The above three samples of corrupted (in my opinion) Universities/Seminaries, present somewhat radical examples. Yet not far behind them lie Harvard Divinity School, the Divinity Schools at Vanderbilt, Duke and Yale.

Note the following from the student's guide book at Duke University; paranoia concerning student language use. Duke recommends the following language use for all its students:

bulletin of  
Duke University  
2008-2009  
**Divinity School**

from page 189

*LANGUAGE ABOUT GOD*

*Although these guidelines are designed mainly for use in terms of language about people, care and attention should be given also to language about God in writing, speaking, and worship. Language about God should articulate the variety and richness of God's manifestations to humankind. It should also respect the deeply personal nature of God as expressed through the Trinity. These suggestions are offered as a beginning point from which one can develop androgynous language about God.*

*1. The exclusive use of either masculine or feminine pronouns for God should be avoided.*

*2. Metaphors showing God's personal relationship with humans should be used, but need not be personalized with "he" or "she."*

*3. A variety of sex-specific metaphors can be used: "God is the father who welcomes his son home, but she is also the woman who searches for the lost coin.*

What an insult, an outrageous declaration! What is one to do when Greek and Hebrew grammar prescribe a masculine gender to God? (*s.v.* Deuteronomy 29:13, Romans 1:21 *et cetera*). It seems that Duke Divinity students, or their superiors, cannot correctly read Greek or Hebrew. What is more important, respecting a liberal pagan culture, or Biblical truth? Duke is one of the most politically correct universities in the world. It is to be avoided, except for its fine library!

Dirt can be found in many supposedly "stately institutions", and presenting them all would require a very large volume. Those which present clear doctrinal positions which seem conservative are perhaps safer institutions at which one may send their children. Those which are ONLY theological in nature, seem at least to present fewer hidden agendas—that is, if they are charismatic they will tell you so, if they are amillennial or whatever, they will let you know. Typically the first year students sign

statements which state the institution's position on numerous matters, and the students indicate whether they agree or not. [Such as at Multnomah School of the Bible]. These agreement or disagreement declarations can affect the student's subsequent placement. Whereas at many liberal Divinity schools, most students are attracted by some Professor or an instructor's reputation, or some sort of status. Within these tombs of fantasies, new students are quickly indoctrinated into a total rejection of pristine Biblical truths. The name of Jesus may be used, and the Bible may be studied, but the very Spirit of the book is ignored.

Thousands of American students are thus programmed to not understand or trust the Bible, and this attack upon the Scriptures is often government financed through loans and GI assistance. No wonder Biblical truth in America is rapidly diminishing, as our college graduates and new pastors have no real faith in the written Word, no trust, and such poison is taught to their congregations and Sunday schools. Thus it spreads. Its all relative to them.

BATTLE Nº 3 - THE ORGANIZED INTERNATIONAL ATTACK  
UPON THE BIBLE

I begin this final section with a quote from a work by Philip J. Lee, titled *Against the Protestant Gnostics*, Oxford, 1987. Page 3:

*For the gnostic Christian, ancient or modern, the simple faith (pistis) of the believer is not sufficient. Instead, there must be knowledge (gnosis). Using this Greek verbal noun, the Church Fathers tagged the ancient heresiarchs with the derogatory name gnostics (gnostikoi), "those who know". Often there was the ironic implication, "those who think they know something the rest of us do not know.*

The genuine elected saints KNOW, yet this is not via the advancement of a secret or mysterious knowledge, rather it is simply by trusting God, and by relying upon the indwelling Holy Spirit. What we know is what God has said, the text of His word, the 66 books of the Bible. We do not fully understand all of its contents, but we know His truth when we read it. We are not elitists, we do not consider ourselves "better" than the poor or wealthy pagans. Yet there are amongst our ranks those who do claim to be elitists.

Certain folks who call themselves "Christians" claim to have supernatural abilities above and beyond the normal Christian of this day and age. Some claim to hear words from God, to be able to speak NEW words from God! Some claim to be able to remove a person's sins, or claim to be able to pray to some female deity who will then grant them access to God Himself! Others form secret societies, believing that by good works, monetary donations and secret wisdom, they will enter the Celestial Lodge. Others believe that they themselves (by being united as "Christians") are transforming this corrupt world into an eventual kingdom, prepared for the return to earth of the King Jesus Christ. They believe that the "church" of this age will triumph over evil, contrary to what the Bible literally teaches. These same folks create many social endeavors, striving to improve this corrupted earth and its sick cultures. Like the Indians of North America they (often unknowingly) see the earth as our Mother, and thus will sacrifice all

to save a nearly extinct snail, or to create more ice or ice cubes to ship to the north pole for the poor polar bears, or they hawk a confused form of salvation in the name of Jesus Christ. .

Genuine Christianity and its Bible has always been attacked on a world-wide basis. In China and in many of the Arab nations and Burma, the Bible is all but outlawed. Nothing new here, this has been and is a reality which Christianity has faced for millennia, with success. Even on the international plane, it is the educational institutions, the media [note especially the televised programs from *National Geographics* and those of PBS], and the foreign governments which pose the greatest threats to the promotion of Biblical truths and the very Bible itself. Behind these threats, nationally and internationally, lies the will of that one is who eternally opposed to God.

Programs to feed the hungry, or hawking Christ to a God-hating world, selling the gospel in exchange for so-called conversions. Claiming that all humans are God's children! The social gospel ignores the realities of God's written Word, the social gospeliers pick from out of the Bible that which fits their view [and ignoring thje contexts] of the future. When the book of Revelation or Daniel exposes their error, they claim that the texts must be understood in another (often an excessive spiritualism) way. Ecu- menicalism embraces all, even the haters of God. Light and dark are joined, good and evil become one, and a new age is thus created. Acting like dogs in heat, lust is called love.

Nowhere in the Scriptures are we told to love [agape] pagans! As concerns the "*love thy neighbor*" command [Matthew 5:43], per the context of the Matthew passage being a quote of Leviticus 19:18, the neighbor is a Jew! not some foreigner whom the Jews were to stay separate from. Love your genuine brothers and sisters. Who is the "*one another*" of John 15:12? Focus your talents and energies upon the elect, edify your brothers and sisters in the Lord. It is Satan who wants you to waste your AGAPE love: water the living plants, not the dead stalks or the deceiving tares!

Those who believe the predictions of Claire Clivaz (of the University of Lausanne in Switzerland) that the printed Bible is going to disappear,



can only agree if they too live in an isolated paradigm, separate from the rest of the world. Note her words in this quote:

*...Christians can live without Christ's body, so they can live without a closed, printed version of the New Testament; even the sharing of the bread is each time the reminder of a disappearance, or the sign "of an immense Absence" accompanied by nostalgia, as Rubem Alves put it. Consequently, I believe that the digital revolution will be an opportunity to confirm that Christianity is not a "religion of the book", but of the Spirit and of communities.*

*The New Testament at the Time of the Egyptian Papyri. Reflections Based on P<sup>12</sup>, P<sup>75</sup> and P<sup>126</sup>. (P.Amh. 3b, P.Bod. XIV-XV and PSI 1497). Claire Clivaz, 2010.*

She (Dr. Clivaz) believes that the world will simply read digital editions of the Bible, editions which fluctuate as various scholars and readers add or subtract various manuscript readings on-line and done in a haphazard manner. Hence no stability. She lives in a fantasy world, completely out-of-touch with believing Christianity. But, sadly, her fantasy world is quickly becoming a reality, here and now on this doomed planet. 50 years ago I would have thought this impossible!

Christ-hating governments have and will rise up against God. Nazism, Islam, and in fact any government which today has not the Bible as their guide, wishes to remove or corrupt God's written Word. At present, the United States is in great danger of losing its blessings which God has graciously poured out upon us. In our quest to separate church and state, the religion of the New Age sits in many government offices. Gnosticism is again becoming very popular. It is the elitists who float to the top of the septic tanks in the political conventions. It is rare today to see a man or woman of God lead anyone in America. To most politicians, religious leaders and capitalists, the Bible is only useful as a propaganda tool or as an adornment for special events. Like honey attracting bees, holding a Bible can attract votes, donations and sympathies.

The Bible clearly teaches us that the symptoms of the end of this age, revolve around the rejection of God's Word. When not being openly rejected, it is being altered by many religious societies and degree bearing scholars. Its not "twist and shout" its twist and trick.

*Do not love (agape) the world, nor the things in the world. If anyone loves the world, the love of the Father is not in him. For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh and the lust of the eyes and the boastful pride of life, is not from the Father, but is from the world. And the world is passing away, and also its lusts; but the one who does the will of God abides forever. 1 John 2:15 -17.*

*If you were of the world, the world would love its own; but because you are not of the world, but I chose you out of the world, therefore the world hates you.*

John 15:19

(to the 11 apostles after Judas had departed). The "world" of John 3:16 is the world of the elect, via my personal studies.

God's written Word needs to be used in all of our public grammar schools, as it was in the 1700s and 1800s. It needs to guide all of our law-makers and peace officers. It should be promoted by every means our government has at its disposal. We need a sense of honor in this nation, a sense of what a Biblical based family is, and a sense of moral standards. Without the Word of God permeating our society, we too, like Rome stand doomed. All is relative, pleasure and selfish agendas prevail, as this is human nature. Sin is real and has its familiar consequences. Ignoring sin, or pretending it does not exist will not remove it. Labeling sin as good, does not alter its evil nature. Evil is evil, it cannot be converted to good. Evil, will, as God declares be destroyed. This is good!

Personally, I do not believe this nation [the United States] will turn around, though President Trump [2018] is trying! It may be too late. Entropy has advanced rapidly. The cancer is in its final stages. But we as Christians can still STAND for the truth, even if it is only within the walls of our homes. We may still reach out and assist other Christians, and help them endure. This will keep each of us busy, very busy in countless ways!

Instead of lamenting about the removal of the 10 commandments from our government buildings, or current abortion policies, or about school textbooks, or about the spread of evolution, or of false doctrine, or of the corruption of all of our medias and educational systems; **I would rather point you to God's Word.** Slow down read the Bible, and KNOW that He is God. This is comforting, encouraging and empowering! *You shall know the truth, and the truth shall...*" hopefully you know the rest.

