



The PROJECTOR

"Projecting the Light of the Word of God on the Issues of the Day"

Dr. Dayton Hobbs, Editor

P.O. Box 643, Milton, Florida 32570

VOL. 10, NO. 4

APRIL, 1981

United States and Canada — 1 Year \$4.00
Foreign — 1 Year \$6.00

THE CHRISTIAN, THE MOVIES AND TV

Pastor John E. Ashbrook
Bible Community Church
Mentor, Ohio



I cannot believe the change which 35 years have made in Christian standards. Thirty five years ago Bible-believing churches had a clear-cut stand against the movies. For instance, Moody Church in Chicago, which was one of the outstanding fundamental churches of that day, required every person who applied for membership to renounce attendance at the movies. The question was frequently asked, "When the Lord comes would you want Him to find you in a picture show?" Every Christian knew that the right answer was a resounding, "No!"

One warm spring night in 1946 I was aboard the Cruiser Denver crossing the Gulf Stream north of Bermuda. After dark a movie, featuring Bob Hope and Bing Crosby, was to be shown on the fantail for all hands. A Christian friend,

who shared with me the teaching of a Bible study aboard ship, and I slipped into the back row just as the show was beginning. A fellow by whom we sat leaned forward and, looking directly at us, asked, "What are you Christian guys doing here?" That ended my movie watching. In 1946, even non-Christians knew that Christians had no business at the movies.

A SATANIC BREAKTHROUGH

In that same year of 1946, Satan scored a new breakthrough for his communication of evil to the human mind. Commercial television began. The Devil placed in the living room of Christian homes the same movies which Christians had never attended. Bible-believers had always

stood against smoking, drinking, dancing, petting, nudity and gambling. Satan wrapped them all up in one package folks could own themselves. Christians began to watch in their homes what they had rejected in the theatre. The purity and holy attitude of the church hit the skids.

I want to point out three things about movies and television. First of all, **MOVIES AND TELEVISION ARE MADE BY AN EVIL CROWD.** Matthew 7:16 presents a Biblical principle for judging things:

Ye shall know them by their fruits.
Do men gather grapes of thorns, or
figs of thistles?

See p. 5

THEY WENT OUT FROM US

BY DR. DAYTON HOBBS

Many of the men who today populate the ranks of New-Evangelicalism, in time past stood where the Fundamentalists stands. We sadly say that too many have gone out from our ranks to espouse the cause of compromise — to bear the flag of the evangelical, the neo-evangelical, and even the apostate.

One such man is Richard C. Halverson, the present Chaplain of the United States Senate. In the fifties, Halverson was on the staff of Hollywood First Presbyterian Church and often wrote articles for *King's Business*, a thoroughly sound and Fundamental paper dating from the early days of *BIOLA*. The *King's Business* is now defunct, and *BIOLA* has, of course, gone New Evangelical. Halverson went east and for some time was at the Fourth Presbyterian

Church in Washington, D.C., later becoming Chairman of the Board of World Vision. It was through the influence of the New Evangelical Senator, Mark Hatfield, that he got his present position as Chaplain of the United States Senate.

The following excerpts from an article by Richard Halverson, which appeared in *King's Business* in June, 1955, entitled "How to Tell a False Religion," will give you some idea of the strong position Halverson professed to hold at that time. Judging from his present positions and associations, it should be obvious to Fundamentalists that Halverson has indeed gone "out from us."

The day of compromise is not over. Sadly, we must recognize that other men have followed, and are now

following, the road of softness and compromise that leads to New-Evangelicalism. We should all be warned and beware lest we follow that road. Those who stray from the path of Fundamentalism do so by choice; they veer at some point and continue on a course that leads away from a separated position. They convince themselves, and they try to convince others, that they are the same as they always have been, but such is not the case. It has been my experience that those who stand and fight for truth do not have any problem convincing others of their separated position; their enemies will speak for them.

The apostle, John, makes it quite clear that the Christian has

See p. 3

Editor's Desk

The following address was given by the Rev. John Ashbrook, pastor of the Bible Community Church of Mentor, Ohio, to a subcommittee of the State Board of Education at a hearing concerning the revision of the minimum standards for public schools of the state of Ohio.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Standards Revision Advisory Committee, I appreciate the opportunity granted in this hearing to speak on behalf of the religious convictions of many of us in the Christian school movement.

I have read your document entitled, "A General Education of High Quality." The fifth paragraph of that document begins with the sentence: "A general education of high quality is a responsibility shared by the school, the home and the community." I would respectfully disagree with that statement for the simple reason that God, in the Bible, has assigned the responsibility for an education of high quality to the parents of the children involved. I would submit the following Scriptures:

Deuteronomy 4:9: "Only take heed to thyself, and keep thy soul diligently, lest thou forget the things which thine eyes have seen, and lest they depart from thy heart all the days of thy life: but teach them thy sons, and thy sons' sons."

Deuteronomy 11:19: "And ye shall teach them your children, speaking of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, when thou liest down and when thou risest up."

Proverbs 4:1: "Hear, ye children, the instruction of a father, and attend to know understanding."

Proverbs 5:1, 2: "My son, attend unto my wisdom, and bow thine ear to my understanding: That thou mayest regard discretion, and that thy lips may keep knowledge."

Ephesians 6:4: "And, ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath; but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord."

In all of these passages, and many more

which might be quoted, the responsibility for education is assigned to the parents. You might wish to remonstrate with me that these verses have to do mainly with spiritual instruction. So they do. It is our conviction that spiritual instruction is the core of true education. Proverbs 1:7 states: "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge." We are not against a thorough education. We believe in an education of at least twelve grades which deals with every traditional discipline of knowledge. But, every discipline must be related to God. Dr. George Washington Carver expressed this well as he reflected on his life:

When I was young I said to God, "God, tell me the mystery of the universe." But God answered, "That knowledge is reserved for me alone." So I said, "God, tell me the mystery of the peanut." Then God said, "Well, George, that's more nearly your size." And he told me.

The purpose of our Christian schools is to help Christian parents to carry out their divine mandate to teach their children. In carrying out this mandate we cannot be governed by the minimum standards of the State of Ohio which are based on an entirely different philosophy of education; but, we must be governed by the standards of the Word of God.

In holding these convictions we are not charting a new course. We are following the footsteps of our New England forefathers. In 1647, the General Court of Massachusetts issued the following statement:

It being the chief project of the old deluder, Satan, to keep men from the knowledge of the Scriptures, effort must be made to thwart this old deluder. It is therefore ordered that every township in this jurisdiction, after the Lord has increased it to the number of 50 households, shall then appoint one of their town to teach all such children as shall report to him to write and read.

For our forefathers the chief end of education was religious, and the responsibility for organizing the school reposed on the parents of the households whose children were involved. That, too, is our conviction. We do not ask you to agree with our conviction, but to recognize it. We do not represent schools which happen to be connected to churches. Rather, we represent churches which provide schools to help parents carry out their God-given mandate.

Psalms 127:3 states: "Lo, children are an heritage of the Lord; and the fruit of the womb is his reward." Since we believe that God has given us our children as his heritage, we believe it our responsibility to rear them to his glory. All that we ask is the freedom to educate our children according to our Scriptural convictions at no cost to the State of Ohio. We believe

that our freedom, in which you as public officials have an interest, would be best served by writing into your minimum standards an exemption from those standards for the schools which hold these convictions.

LLOYD-JONES

REJECTS CULTURAL MANDATE

Moody Monthly for September, 1980, had an article by Ted Miller which quoted a Christianity Today interview with Britain's retired pastor of renowned Westminster Chapel, Martin Lloyd-Jones: "I disagree entirely with the 'social and cultural mandate' teaching and its appeal to Genesis 1:28. It seems to me to forget completely the Fall. You can't Christianize the world... I believe the Christian people — but not the church — should get involved in politics and in social affairs. The kingdom task of the church is to save men from the wrath to come by bringing them to Christ... The main function of politics, culture, and all these things is to restrain evil. They can never do an ultimately positive work. Surely the history of the world demonstrates that." (BP) A number of Cultural Mandate adherents are enthusiastic supporters of the Moral Majority program, because it provides them with a program of action to reach their dreamy objective.

From The BLU-PRINT
February 17, 1981

NO SECURITY IN HIGH WALLS

In ancient China the people desired security from the barbaric hordes to the north so they built the great Chinese wall.

It was so high they knew no one could climb over it and so thick that nothing could break it down. They settled back to enjoy their security.

During the first hundred years of the wall's existence, China was invaded three times. Not once did the barbaric hordes break down the wall or climb over the top.

Each time they bribed a gatekeeper and then marched right through the gates.

The Chinese were so busy relying upon the walls of stone that they forgot to teach integrity to their children.

—Copied

The PROJECTOR

EDITOR

Dr. Davison Hubbs



MANAGING EDITOR

David Johnson

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Christian Hubbs

Peter Lark

The PROJECTOR is published monthly except July and December by Gospel Projects, Inc., Post Office Box 642, 611 Chestnut Street, Milton, Florida 32570, U.S.A. subscription rate is \$4.00 per year (10 issues). Copyright 1981 by Gospel Projects, Inc.

From p. 1

THEY WENT OUT FROM US

no option in this matter of false prophets (1Jn. 4:1-3). The Bible warns us over and over again that there are many false prophets going out into the world masquerading often as angels of light, as servants of Christ, taking portions of the Bible and using them in a way to deceive the children of God.

So much of Christianity has been watered down that we have become infected with an innocuous climate that has generated a sickly, thin, anemic attitude of tolerance. We're supposed to tolerate everybody and everything. And if we raise our voices against anything, we're accused of being unChristian. This, however, is not the spirit of the New Testament or of Jesus Christ Himself (as we shall see). He loved men, but He was indignant against false teachers. "Better a millstone"... "Better never born"... said He concerning those who would lead astray.

If one will not tolerate poison that can destroy a man's body, how much less should one tolerate poison that can destroy a man's soul? If we are careful of what we put into our stomachs, how much more ought we to be careful of what we feed our minds? Once in a while a good, strong, healthy dose of intolerance is legitimate for a Christian. We ought to be intolerant of sin. We ought to be intolerant of error. We ought to be intolerant of heresy. We ought to be intolerant of falsehood. We ought to be intolerant of false prophets and anti-Christians that do everything they can to lead people away from Jesus Christ and do it in His name.

THE STANDARD OF MEASUREMENT

Note that we do not judge false prophets; they judge themselves by what they teach. Jesus Christ said, "by their fruits ye shall know them," and He was talking about false prophets when He said it.

What we propose to do is not to judge any teacher or prophet (if the shoe fits, put it on), but to lay down scriptural standards by which the teaching of every prophet ought to be judged. At the outset, let it be understood that we recognize the Bible to be the final authority — the final arbiter — the last word. What we say must square with the Scriptures also.

It's not what someone else says the Bible teaches, not what

some other book says the Bible teaches: it is what the Bible itself says about itself. The only correct interpretation of scripture is scripture itself. We compare scripture with scripture, passage with passage until the balance of teaching is reached in the Scriptures. One is not qualified to say "this is what the Bible teaches" about any single subject until he has everything the Bible has to say about that subject.

The Bible takes a very serious view of false prophets. Paul says in Gal. 1:8, "Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." Those are strong words. Jesus said, "Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves. Ye shall know them by their fruits" (Matt. 7:15, 16).

Let us be reminded that Christians have been admonished to test for truth. We have no right to listen to any teaching, whatever it is, and accept it gullibly. We have been commanded to be sure to find out whether what we listen to is true or false. That is a command — that is an order from the Lord! "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world. Hereby know ye the Spirit of God: Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God: And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of anti-christ, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world" (1 Jn. 4:1-3).

A word about antichrists. I'd like to quote Dr. James Stewart of Scotland. He says, *The really sinister thing about antichrist is not, as might be supposed, his radical difference from Christ but precisely a diabolical resemblance to Christ. He is so like Christ that he can successfully masquerade as Christ, as the word antichrist itself suggests, and claim to stand in Christ's place deceiving the very elect.* Now listen to what Paul says: "For such are false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ. And no marvel; for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light. Therefore it is no great thing if his ministers also

be transformed as the ministers of righteousness" (2 Cor. 11:13-15). Jesus said false prophets shall arise and show great signs and great wonders so as to lead astray if possible even the elect (Matt. 24:24). If you're a Christian, you have no right to read anything or listen to anything any more than you have a right to eat anything or drink anything. You are bound under God to see to it that you listen to and read the truth.

There are many different things that are distinctive about false teachings, which claim to be Christian. We can test any teaching to see whether these things are true of it. Not all false teachings will bear all of these signs, but one or more of these characteristics will be true of all false teaching. It is important also to remember that if a person is really concerned about the truth, the Holy Spirit, who leads into all truth, will give insight and discernment when necessary.

THREE WAYS A TEACHING CAN BE WRONG

There are three ways in which teaching can be wrong.

1. It can be wrong in what it affirms.
2. It can be wrong in what it denies.
3. It can be wrong in what it omits (and of course, that's the most subtle).

Prophets may be false in their affirmation or in their denial or in their omission; they may be wrong in any one of them — in all of them — or in any combination of them. For example:

A prophet may be right in what he affirms, wrong in what he denies

and what he omits.

He may be right in what he denies, wrong in what he affirms, what he omits.

He might be right in what he affirms, in what he denies and wrong in what he omits.

He might be right in what he omits and wrong in what he denies and what he affirms.

But the omissions are the most subtle. Often one who reads the teaching of a false prophet, when he has read the whole thing through, will be able to say, "There's absolutely nothing wrong with this."

Now that's quite possible. What he read is right as far as it goes, but it doesn't go far enough. It stops short. It isn't just enough to see what a prophet says; one must see what he leaves unsaid, what he denies. To illustrate: one may emphasize the ethics of Jesus, as

Stars of the Morning

By "Aunt Carolyn"

PRAYER AND PAINS



"Ho, Brother John," came the brusque rebuff. "It is useless to waste your talent and education upon such human nuisances as these Indians!"

"Yes, Master Eliot, these devils are the very ruins of mankind. 'Tis a shame to see you suffer loss and deprivation to try to convert these wolves with the brains of men!"

Such taunts and jibes from his fellow colonists only added to the heavy burden of the work of Master John Eliot's ministry to the Indians. Later to be called "the apostle to the North American Indians," this humble man of God received no such recognition in the early years of his ministry. In fact, he not only bore the reproach of many of the colonists; he also faced the fierce hatred and opposition of the Indian priests and witch doctors. They made deadly threats and laid treacherous plots against his life, but God wonderfully protected His servant. All this opposition only made John Eliot more determined to carry the Gospel to his Indian friends, and he threw all his energy, ability, money, and resources into evangelizing the precious souls God had laid on his heart.

"Ah, John," the antagonists continued, "You know these devils only pretend to get saved and please you in order to receive the gifts and help and training you give them."

Now John was no dupe. His knowledge of God's Word, of people, and of the sinful human heart told him that not all who professed salvation were indeed true converts, but time and fruitfulness would tell the genuine from the false. Eliot felt that if only a few, or even one, were genuinely converted and his life changed by the power of the blood of Jesus Christ, all of his trials, efforts, sweat, tears, and time would be worthwhile. His work would be judged by God, and it was

He whom John Eliot was determined to please.

Where did such a man of faith, humility, dedication, and love come from? Why was he in such a forsaken wilderness as the northern coast of New England? Was he not an honorable Englishman from the prosperous rolling hills of Old England? Indeed, he was born in 1604 in Widford, Hertfordshire. God began working in the heart of the young English farm boy, but little did John realize that God had a great job for him to do. He was converted under the testimony of Thomas Hooker, a great Puritan Christian who had separated from the Church of England because of his convictions. From then on; it was a matter of step-by-step, day-by-day following truth and obeying God's Word. He avidly studied the Scriptures, and as an outstanding student at Cambridge, he became a master of the original languages of the Scripture. Through his own studies, and through the influence of his friend, Mr. Hooker, he realized the clear stand a Christian must take and soon separated from the Church of England as many Pilgrims before him had done. An outcast in his native country and in his own church, he, too, left his home shores for conscience's sake to sail for the new frontier in America. Home, friends, possessions, meant nothing to Eliot if they meant the compromise of his Biblical convictions or his testimony for the Lord Jesus Christ.

Life in New England was any-

thing but easy. The gifted young preacher soon became a teacher in the church in Roxbury. He carried on this work for over fifty years until he died. Certainly he was no fly-by-night man who moved from one church to another when difficulties arose, and his dear wife, Ann, stood by him and helped him in his work. He faithfully maintained his Roxbury ministry, but his heart also was drawn out toward the Indians. He had an intense desire to work among them and to reach them for the Lord Jesus Christ. No trial, no discouragement slowed his efforts.

He loved the children and was patient with them. He gave them gifts and taught them carefully. One Indian boy, Job Nesutan, became a special teacher and helper in learning the Indian language. Eliot worked feverishly to decipher and learn their language. At last, in 1646, in the wigwam of a Waaubon (chief), Eliot preached the first sermon ever known in their language. His text was "Prophesy unto the wind" (Ezek. 37:9), which seemed appropriate, because the Indian group's name was "Waban," which meant "the wind." The sermon lasted an hour and fifteen minutes, but the Indians stayed to hear every word. From that time, the fires of conviction began to spread, and many Indians were won to the Lord. Bringing them out of superstition and uncivil living was no easy task, but John Eliot worked patiently and lovingly to win these treasures.

(TO BE CONTINUED NEXT MONTH)

From p. 3

THEY WENT OUT FROM US

in the Sermon on the Mount, to the complete exclusion of the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. Now there's nothing wrong with the Sermon on the Mount. Jesus taught it and meant us to keep it (Matt. 7:24-27). But it is what is left out by the false teacher that is damnable. A soul can be eternally damned while devoutly struggling to follow the ethics of some teacher.

You pay attention to what is affirmed. You pay attention to what is denied. You pay attention to what is left unsaid. Note 1 John 4:3: "[He that does not confess] that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God." He doesn't deny it, he just doesn't

confess it. It's not a question of what He said, nor a question of what he denied. It's a question of silence. Having pointed this out, let us consider general characteristics of false teaching. Bear in mind always 1 John 4:1-3. Remember also that all of these characteristics probably are not true of any one false teaching; that some of them may not be true of any one false prophet. One or more of them may be...but the real Biblical test is 1 John 4:1-3. This is to show you some things that are characteristic. If these things are true of a prophet, then you had better examine his teaching in the light of 1 John 4:1-3.

THE CHRISTIAN, THE MOVIES AND TV

That verse tells us that we are not going to get good things, pure things, lovely things, wholesome things, from bad people.

The high percentage of movie and television actors and actresses are drinking, divorcing, adulterous, drug-addicted people. There is a reason for their conduct. They have spent a lifetime acting out the parts of drunks, harlots, gunmen, adulterers, perverts, pushers and addicts. They have accepted in their own lives the parts they have played on the screen.

WHO ARE YOUR CHILDREN'S HEROES?

Let me ask you a question. Do you want your children's heroes to be that sinful crowd? Young people are hero worshippers. They admire daring, beauty, talent, and courage. They see such things portrayed on the screen by the sinful people who make the pictures. Their heroes become the daring tough guy with the blazing gun and the beautiful woman that men covet.

Who ought to be the heroes of Christian children? Their heroes ought to be missionaries, martyrs, pastors, Christian statesmen, faithful teachers; — those who have surrendered their lives to the Lord.

THE WRONG FRIENDS

We restrict our children's friends. We won't let them hang around with some because of bad language, fast driving, cigarettes, drugs or loose morals. However, when you take them to the movies or let them spend hours before the TV, they are hanging around with those who do such things and who portray them in a suave and appealing way. They have a stronger influence than evil companions.

Move on to a second point: MOVIES AND TELEVISION SELL THE LIFE OF SIN. Another Scriptural principle is set forth in Galatians 6:7:

Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap. For he that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting.

Henry J. Taylor, the newspaper columnist, wrote a column several years ago titled, "TV, the Third Parent in Your Home." In referring to the major TV networks he said:

Their Neanderthal standards are destroying parental influence with a hit as powerful and smooth as the

three-inch jab made famous by Joe Louis.

How on earth can conscientious mothers and fathers face the dreadful competition in the upbringing of the children? Millions of impressionable children spend more time at the feet of this Third Parent, TV, than they do listening to their parents. And the dreadful competition only starts with that insidious fact.

We spend additional vast sums on preaching better nutrition. If what goes into children's stomachs is so important, how about what goes into their minds?

When you realize the repetition, repetition, repetition of this TV diet — morning, noon and night, years on end — how can parents safely permit this Third Parent to take over?

Those are the discerning words of an unsaved columnist. How can Christian parents fail to see their truth?

In 1957 Oswald J. Smith, then Pastor of one of the most missionary-minded churches in the world, wrote:

The atomic bomb is bad; the hydrogen bomb is frightful; but television is going to be worse than either and far more destructive. It will completely wreck the rising generation, and before long it will turn the United States and Canada into a Sodom and Gomorrah, infinitely worse than the Sodom and Gomorrah of Bible times.

Mr. Smith, you were a prophet.

A HARD SELL FOR SIN

Dr. I. Keith Tyler, Director of the Institute for Education by Radio and Television at Ohio State University, speaking before a session of the 1960 White House Conference on Children and Youth, declared:

Children turn to the mass media for models to imitate and forms of behaviour to adopt.

They absorb codes of dress and behaviour, what to wear, to say, to sing and to do . . . They perceive that problems are solved by violence rather than reason. They learn the virtue of "getting by," of avoiding unnecessary exertion. It becomes clear to them that ends justify means and that love and sex are a major preoccupation of modern living.

I recently read a study made among delinquent boys who were imprisoned for their offenses. They were asked, "What started you in crime?" Over 50% said that they saw on TV or in the movies the success of the tough guy, the thief, the criminal. Furthermore, they gave credit to the same source for their education in thirty-two techniques of crime. They saw on TV or in the movies how to force a lock, jump a car, cut alarm wires and maim a policeman. Movies and television sell the life of sin with a hard sell that parents cannot combat with years of teaching.

There is a third matter: MOVIES AND TELEVISION FOCUS THE MIND ON THE WORKS OF THE FLESH. Galatians 5:19-21a lists the works of the flesh:

Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these; adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like . . .

Let me submit to you that in this listing you have the plot of almost every movie playing in your county this week and the theme of almost every TV show. What does God say about the works of the flesh? Complete Galatians 5:21:

. . . I tell you before, as I have told you in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God.

Paul does not comment on the end of those who "watch" such things. However, can you watch them and say, "I am a better man for Christ's sake"? Can you say, "My testimony has been greatly helped by watching Johnny Carson, *Jaws* or *The Exorcist*"?

CAN YOU BEAT SCRIPTURE?

Proverbs 6:27 asks, "Can a man take fire into his bosom, and his clothes be not burned?" Can you allow the movies and TV to inflame your imagination, arouse your sexual passion, fill your mind with lewd pictures and be just as holy and pure in heart as before? I think not. Proverbs 6:27 is true.

Philippians 4:8 expresses a divine principle for keeping a healthy mind:

Finally, brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things.

God knows that we can think only about

See p. 6



**Focus
On
Religion**
BY
ETER J. FOXX

Billings In Education Department

The Reverend Robert W. Billings has been named as the Assistant Secretary of Education for Non-Public Education. Billings is the co-founder of Hyles-Anderson College in Hammond, Indiana, and the former executive director of Moral Majority. The new appointee is also the founder of the National Christian Action Coalition, which assisted private Christian schools in their fight against the senseless and harassing rulings of the Internal Revenue Service. Billings' appointment is considered a victory for Christian Education, and hopefully this will prove to be true.

Shadrach Meshack Lockridge

In recent years, several black preachers have been invited to preach at various supposedly Fundamental Baptist conferences. While the desire to share these conferences with blacks is certainly valid, it seems that more importance has been laid on skin color than on theological position and personal stand on the issues. A case in point is S. M. Lockridge, pastor of Calvary Baptist Church in San Diego, California. The Plains Baptist Challenger (February, 1981) shares this following information taken from a publicity folder of the Criswell Bible Institute:

Lockridge has served as vice-president of the National Baptist Convention of America and president of the California Baptist State Convention. In addition, he has been a guest in nine of the Billy Graham crusades and has served on the faculty of the Billy Graham School of Evangelism in both Detroit and Hollywood. He also has been guest speaker at 28 colleges and 11 seminaries in recent years.

A man with these credentials has no business speaking at a Fundamental meeting of any kind, whether he be black, white, red, or yellow.

From p. 5

THE CHRISTIAN, THE MOVIES AND TV

one thing at a time. All of us have one-track minds in this sense. In order to keep them clean we are to fix them diligently on the things which are right. Television and the movies will never help you to practice Philippians 4:8.

Just as surely as movies and TV always sell the works of the flesh, they never sell the fruit of the Spirit. Galatians 5:22,23 lists the fruit of the Spirit:

But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, faith, meekness, temperance: against such there is no law.

When was the last time your spiritual life was helped by a TV show? When was the last time a movie inspired you to spend an hour in your Bible? When was the last time you could rise from your seat before the screen and say, "I am a more spiritual man for having seen that"?

Can you soak up the devil's entertainment and not be the worse? We talk about the effect of TV and the movies on children. How about its effect on Mom and Dad? Has it improved your spiritual life?

There are several trite statements Christians make about movies and television. First of all, "We only go to see the good films." Do the theatres ever show "good films"? Suppose that they do. The same evil people make, and the same immoral entrepreneurs profit by the "good films" as do by the bad ones.

Hutson Withdraws From Robison Conference

Curtis Hutson, the editor of The Sword of the Lord, has withdrawn from the 1981 James Robison Bible Conference because of the presence on the platform of the Roman Catholic anti-feminist, Phyllis Schlafly. Hutson said he could not appear with a Roman Catholic because, "...the Catholic Church does not accept the Bible as the inspired, inerrant Word of God" (Christianity Today, March 13, 1981).

One has to wonder why the Roman Catholic view of inspiration upset Hutson, when he is seemingly comfortable with the liberal and apostate views of the Southern Baptist Convention on the inspiration of Scripture. The presence of Southern Baptists on the Robison conference program, such as Freddie Gage, Paige Patterson, Adrian Rogers, Baily Smith, and Rick Stanley, apparently posed no problem for Hutson, nor did the presence of E. V. Hill, the black preacher and Billy Graham supporter. Compromise brings its own set of problems and difficulties, does it not?

CHILDREN'S NIGHT AT THE CORNER BAR

Suppose that the local bar sponsored "Children's Night" once a month. No booze would be served, just soft drinks. Would you let your children go on "Children's Night"? I think you would see through the plot. If you can see through the one, can't you see through the other?

MISSION IMPOSSIBLE

Then, I often hear it said, "We police our TV set very carefully." That sounds good. The only problem is that it is impossible. If you don't want your family to watch nudity, listen to profanity, be exposed to suggestive talk, be exhorted to dance, smoke, drink or covet, you will wear out the on-off switch the very first week.

Would you bring home *Playboy* for your teenage son because of a good article on cars? No, the percentage of filth completely negates the usefulness of any thing good.

Christian people sometimes say, "We only go to the theatre to see the Christian films." Sadly, some Christian groups have decided to air their films through the same network which purveys the filth. The policy is unscriptural. Any time you give in to this lure, you contribute to the filth peddlers in your community.

Further, whenever you attend the theatre you give testimony that it is proper for a Christian to attend the movies. Those who see you go or come never look at the marquee. After all, when you see a man coming out of a bar at 11:00 P.M., you don't assume that he was there for 7-Up.

THINK ABOUT IT

Could you picture your holy Saviour watching the screen with you in pleasure? Would you open the door to Jesus Christ and say, "Oh, Lord Jesus, you are just in time to sit down and watch this new show with us"? If you would not be delighted to ask the Lord to watch, then you are out of place watching.

Lot got out of Sodom. He took his two daughters with him. But, alas, it was too late. He could not get Sodom out of his daughters. He couldn't even get it out of himself.

A WORD ABOUT SALVATION

This leaflet will come into the hands of some who see the wisdom of the argument, but who have never been born

See p. 8



The Other Side

with Dave Johnson

Identity Politics

In the spring of 1814, British troops were once again on American soil. The city of Washington had been captured and burned, and the British soldiers, under the leadership of General Ross, were advancing to North Point and Baltimore. American troops numbering less than 3000 met the 7000-strong British army, and on September 12, engaged them in bloody combat.

Meanwhile, a young American patriot had been sent from Frederick, Maryland, to Baltimore to secure the release of Dr. William Beans, who had been captured and was being held on a British ship which had recently sailed into Chesapeake Bay. Francis Scott Key was successful in his mission, but the British would not allow the Americans to leave the British ship because the bombardment of Fort McHenry was underway. Fort McHenry was the major means of protection for the city of Baltimore, and the British were sure that the fort and Baltimore would fall before dawn.

As the night passed, Key witnessed the entire bombardment of the fort. As the rockets and bombs lit up the sky, he was greatly encouraged by the sight of his flag—the star-spangled banner—still waving above the fort. When dawn came, Francis Scott Key was moved to write a poem which he entitled, "The Defense of Fort McHenry." One hundred and seventeen years later, on March 3, 1931, that poem, put to music, officially became our National Anthem which we know as "The Star-Spangled Banner."

The legislation to make "The Star-Spangled Banner" our national anthem was introduced by the Honorable Charles Linthicum of Maryland, in 1929, after a ten-year battle to get the original bill out of the pigeon hole. There was a very strong movement in America to replace our national anthem with "America the Beautiful" and/or "God Save America." The opposition to "The Star-Spangled Banner" and the source of this opposition are the basis of this article. A typical example of the efforts of British "agents" within the United States

follows.

In the New York Times of August 5, 1925, a paid article appeared under the headline: "The Star-Spangled Banner Can Never Become Our National Anthem." This article was paid for by Mrs. Augusta E. Stetson who had also paid for similar articles which appeared in the press of Washington, Baltimore, Boston, and Albany.

Mrs. Stetson lived on 96th Street West in a house located behind the Christian Science Church. Across the entire front of her house was a huge sign showing clasped hands, biblical references, and the words "Ephraim and Manasseh." This is the symbol for the reuniting of America with Great Britain in order to bring about a world empire under British control. This movement is known as British Israelism, or Identity, and is one of the most powerful political movements in the world today.

Before we get a closer look at the background of British Israel politics, though, we must see why the adherents of British Israelism object to "The Star-Spangled Banner." When one considers the goals of the British Empire in relationship to the words of our national anthem, one can easily understand why the British dislike our anthem, especially the third verse. There were actually four verses to Mr. Key's poem, and for years it was always published in its entirety. However, since the British Israel adherents were unsuccessful in replacing the national anthem, they made sure that the majority of publishing houses left out the third verse. Have you ever heard these words?

*And where is the band who so vauntingly swore
That the havoc of war and the battle's confusion
A home and a country they'd leave us no more?
Their blood has washed out their foul footsteps' pollution.
No refuge could save the hire-ling and slave
From the terror of flight, or the gloom of the grave.
And the star spangled banner in triumph doth wave
O'er the land of the free, and the home of the brave.*

The first three lines point out the goal of the British in the War of 1812 by asking a question. The question is answered by giving the American opinion of having those British troops on American soil, and then equating those soldiers with hirelings and slaves who ran away terrified (only 1700 Americans saw action against the 7000 British at Baltimore and North

Point. The hirelings did indeed flee).

Put yourself in the position of the British Empire. If you could not bring the colonies back under the domination of the Empire by force, you would probably change your tactics to those of gradually "wooing" the erring children back. Now, how are you going to woo them back when they are all singing the third verse of "The Star-Spangled Banner"?

The politics of British Israelism can be traced back to Cecil Rhodes and the man who greatly influenced Rhodes—John Ruskin. Cecil Rhodes, and his good friend, Andrew Carnegie, both shared a common dream—a world government under the control of a reunited British empire. Carnegie went so far as to fly a flag over his castle in Scotland which was a Union Jack and Old Glory joined together. While these two men realized that the British Israel religion was powerful, they also recognized the additional power of politics by which they could speed up the realization of their insidious goal.

CECIL RHODES

Rhodes' commitment to a British world empire is set down in a series of wills which he made between ages 24 and 26 (he died at age 48). His first will, the Secret Society will, stated his aim and the means to achieving that aim. "The extension of British rule throughout the world, the foundation of so great a power as to hereafter render wars impossible and promote the interest of humanity." Rhodes was to accomplish this "world empire" goal through the use of a secret society which was patterned after the Society of Jesus (Jesuits) and the Masons. By February 5, 1891, his secret society was formally established. This society was known in England as the Round Table Group. A few years later, the American branch of the Round Table was formed by Col. E. Mandell House. The name of this organization was the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR). In 1929, the Rockefeller family donated a piece of property and a building at 58 E. 68th Street in New York as a permanent home for the CFR. Financing for this organization has come, since 1925, from foundations and wealthy individuals which are related in some way to the international banking firms of the Empire.

Most conservatives associate the CFR with world government, but not with British world government. It is a well-known fact among conservatives that in 1945 there were

See p. 8

From p. 7

Identity Politics

47 CFR members in the United States delegation to the meeting in San Francisco which gave birth to the United Nations, but we get confused when we see the "communist" domination of that body. Nearly every Secretary of State in our government has been a member of the CFR, but they keep promoting a pro-communist foreign policy, not a British one. Are we seeing what we think we are seeing, or are the clever British Israelites painting a picture for us? I don't know the answers to all of the questions concerning the politics of British Israelism, but I do get suspicious when everybody is talking about the communist conspiracy, while Great Britain and the United States keep the communists fed, clothed, and armed at the United States taxpayers' expense.

Cecil Rhodes' third will left his entire fortune to Lord Rothschild who was his financier in

various mining enterprises. In a later will, this seems to have been changed somewhat. It appears that Rothschild's son-in-law, Lord Roseberry, became the beneficiary of Rhodes and shared the wealth of Rhodes with the "scholars" which were financed and trained as a result of the benefactor's final will.

The seventh will set up the Rhodes Scholarships which provided for bringing scholars from the Empire, Germany, and America to Oxford for training in internationalism. It should not be surprising to us that Rhodes Scholars share the same dreams of Cecil Rhodes — world government under the direction of the Empire, Great Britain and America united.

If you are confused by all of this, don't feel bad. You are not alone. Perhaps you are wondering about some inconsistencies which seem to be bringing some questions

to your mind. For example, how can a patriotic American, who professes to be a born-again Christian, be against the CFR and at the same time be for British Israelism? If we follow logic at all, this position is not possible. The CFR and British Israelism are waters from the same fountain. One cannot spit out half of the water! For a believer in British Israelism to oppose the CFR, he would have to admit to opposing what he believes to be the purposes of the God whom he claims to serve — that purpose being one and the same with the goals of Cecil Rhodes, the Round Table, and subsequently, the CFR, i.e., a world government with the king on the throne of David, which is to again return from London to Jerusalem. (*Where the throne of David is actually expected to reside determines which branch of this cult one is studying. Some of the Identity people claim that Zion is the United States, and when they say Jerusalem, they are not referring to literal, but figurative, Jerusalem.*)

British Israelism is a dangerous cult which needs to be exposed from our pulpits. It is not only unAmerican, but it is also unBiblical and unChristian.

From p. 6

THE CHRISTIAN, THE MOVIES AND TV

again. If you are such a person, I want to point out to you that Christianity is not just abstinence from what is wrong. Shunning the movies and setting the TV out for the trash man are excellent things to do, but they will never save you.

We were born into this world with evil hearts. Our innermost being is self-willed, deceitful and unbelieving. God's answer to this human problem is that a part of the Godhead, Jesus Christ the Son, came into the world to die for sins. When He was crucified on the cross, He vicariously accepted the wrath of God which deservedly should have fallen on us. God's terms for salvation are that we must repent of our sin and cast ourselves fully on what Jesus Christ did for us. If you have never taken that step with all your heart, why not kneel beside your chair, confess your sins to the Lord and ask Jesus Christ to be your Saviour today? Then, begin to read your Bible for further instructions and find a Bible-teaching church where you will be taught God's Word.

REPRINTS AVAILABLE

10 for \$1.00

25 for \$2.00

100 for \$7.50

Write: Mr. W. R. Sanders
13060 Centerburg Road
Sunbury, Ohio 43074

Make checks to the Ohio Bible Fellowship.

MODERATION

By Sam Morris

"But," somebody says, "I am not a drunkard. I drink only in moderation."

There is no difference in your state and standing before God.

The Bible puts adultery, fornication, stealing, idolatry, hate, murder, extortion, seditions, covetousness, revelings, and drunkenness in the same category, as lusts of the flesh.

You may as well talk about committing adultery in moderation.

You may as well talk about worshipping idols in moderation.

You may as well talk about committing murder in moderation.

You may as well talk about stealing in moderation.

You may as well talk about envying in moderation.

You may as well talk about hating in moderation.

You may as well talk about lusting in moderation.

These are all marks of carnality. They are all "works of the flesh." None of them have a place in a Christian's life.

They are not to be indulged in at all to any degree. They are to be wholly given up, abandoned, forsaken, put under foot and crucified.

"And they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts" (Gal. 5:24).

