

Why I Am Not a Calvinist, or Against the Young Fundamentalists
by Pastor John Cereghin, Grace Baptist Church, Smyrna, Delaware
Preached Sunday, September 27, 2009
Edited transcription with additional material

Text: Colossians 2:6-8

The burden of this message is something that I have been dealing with for a while because this is something that greatly disturbs me. Within the professing fundamentalist churches, we have a group that has referred to as the “Young Fundamentalists”. These are men who profess to be fundamental, who tend to be rather young, in their 20s and 30s. (I wouldn’t qualify since I’m 45 years old and after preaching for 24 years). These younger men are portrayed to be the “wave of the future” in both evangelical and fundamental churches. Many of them have blogs and websites and they participate on various internet message boards, like Sharper Iron. I keep up with these men and I follow what they are doing and what they are saying. That is part of my responsibility as a pastor. I have to know which way the theological winds are blowing. And I have been greatly disturbed by what I have been seeing and reading.

Most of these men have abandoned the King James Bible and have taken up with the English Standard Version, which is the new current darling (or “flavor of the month”) in contemporary evangelicalism. These younger men don’t have enough discernment to see what is wrong with the ESV and why it should be rejected by orthodox men. The ESV is nothing more than a re-hash of the old Revised Standard Version of 1952, that attacked the virgin birth (among other doctrines) by mistranslating “virgin” in Isaiah 7:14 as “young woman”. This was before my time as I was born in 1964, but I read about the holy uproar over the RSV. Now, the “Revised” RSV, in the guise of the ESV (maybe we should call it the RRSV, the Revised Revised Standard Version), is being embraced and promoted by the sons and the grandsons of the men who went to war against it.

The music of a lot of these younger fundamentalists is disturbing. They have no discernment as to what qualifies as proper Christian music. They promote Christian rap, Christian rock, Contemporary Christian Music, and the like. They seem to have little love for the old, classic hymns of the faith and the grand old English hymns. Their music standards are low.

Their spiritual discernment in relation with their fellowships is weak. They are recommending and following all the wrong men. They do not promote the writings, sermons and ministries of great fundamental men of the past. Instead, they have been captivated by men like John MacArthur, John Piper, Albert Mohler and other non-fundamentalists. Men like these are the Pied Pipers of this younger generation, leading them away from the strength of classical fundamentalism. How can you claim to be a fundamentalist when you don’t associate yourself with fundamental men?

These are all serious issues, but the thing that disturbs me the most about these younger men and their movement is their infatuation with Calvinism. I call them “neo-Calvinists”. They are trying to convince us that the solution to the many problems in modern fundamentalism can all be solved if we simply resort to Calvinistic methods and philosophies. Now there are many problems in the church and in modern fundamentalism. Amen. There are. No one will debate that. That’s one reason why I’ve distanced myself from the fundamentalist movement in recent years. But with whatever ails fundamentalism, Calvinism is not the answer. I’ll explain why as we go further into this message.

I doubt a sermon like this will change many minds, especially of these younger men. But this sermon stands more of a public declaration as to my opposition to Calvinism and why Grace Baptist Church rejects Calvinism and the presuppositions of these younger men. I have serious theological disagreements with the system of Calvinism. I don’t believe that Christ only died for some. I don’t believe that God has unconditionally elected some to go to heaven and some to go to hell, without any opportunity to be saved. That is clearly and obviously contrary to the Scriptures. I don’t believe in the doctrine of reprobation. I don’t believe that the grace of God is irresistible. Neither did the martyr Stephen, in his dying sermon in Acts 7, condemn the Sanhedrin and the nation of Israel of “always resisting the Holy Ghost” (Acts 7:51). Stephen was not a Calvinist. Neither was the Lord. He wept over Jerusalem and lamented that how often would He have gathered them as a hen gathers her chicks under her wings, but they would not (Matthew 23:37).

I am not preaching against the so-called “Five Points” today, but that could be another series of messages. But I just wanted to lay out my “issues” with Calvinism as a whole and why I reject it as any sort of remedy to fix the problems in fundamentalism.

This year of 2009 is the 500th anniversary of the birth of John Calvin so we have been hearing about “Calvin this and Calvin that” all year long. This feeds into the current revival of Calvinism in certain sections of the church these days. Everyone is just lauding Calvin these days, as if this man can do no wrong and as if his theological system was handed down from heaven on gold plates or on tables of stone. He is supposedly the greatest theologian the church ever produced. There have been many conferences on Calvin all year. I have been following one up in Minneapolis (thank God for the internet that allows me to do this without having to actually attend or to pay any money!), put on by John Piper, entitled “With Calvin in the Theater of God”. Piper is one of these staunch Calvinists who is against the King James in his promotion of the ESV (he has a section on his website with advice for pastors who are having trouble convincing their people to abandon the King James and take up with the ESV instead). He is one of the idols of these young fundamentalists. And everything is “John Calvin this and John Calvin that”. You get sick of it after a while. Remember when Jack Hyles died a few years ago? After his death, “Jack Hyles Memorial Conferences” began to pop up around the country. We condemned that as idolatry and man-worship. These “Calvin conferences” and veneration of Calvin is no different than the idolatry that surrounded (and still surrounds) Hyles. It’s okay to “like” Calvin and to appreciate his

writings, but these men are getting very close to a very dangerous boundary of idolatry, if they haven't crossed it yet.

Knowing the age we live in and seeing the apostasy in the church, you cannot help but be suspicious when you see a large-scale theological movement like this. It is no different than the Promise Keepers movement of several years ago. Everyone was all a-twitter over Promise Keepers. Discerning Christians refused to get caught up in that ground swell. We must be as vigilant in standing our ground against this onslaught of the neo-Calvinists of our current day. The crowd is usually wrong. Great men are not always wise. The masses usually don't find the straight gate and the narrow way.

I am being told by these men that the only way to rescue fundamentalism is to take a more Reformed approach. I need to dump my King James Bible. We have to soften up in our ecclesiastical separation. We have to modify our standards. We need to adopt contemporary forms of Christian music. We need to be more broad-minded and tolerant. We need to adopt Calvinism. The Fundamental Baptist Fellowship is going in this direction, as is the Southern Baptist Convention and the General Association of Regular Baptist Churches.

The first reason why I cannot adopt Calvinism is that it is nothing more than a manmade, uninspired theological system. It has no claim to any sort of divine inspiration. John Calvin, or his mentor, Augustine, wrote under any sort of divine inspiration. Calvinism is nothing more than another attempt by limited man to systematize and organize Biblical truth into a framework that he can understand. It is one of many such systems. In reality, Calvinism is more of a philosophical system than it is a theological system.

Calvinism is not the gospel and the gospel is not Calvinism. The gospel is the gospel and nothing else. Charles Spurgeon erred greatly when he tried to equate Calvinism with the gospel. I appreciate Spurgeon, but he was wrong when he said "I have my own private opinion that there is no such thing as preaching Christ and Him crucified, unless we preach what nowadays is called Calvinism. It is a nickname to call it Calvinism; Calvinism is the gospel and nothing else". He was wrong when he said that. "What! You dare accuse the Great Spurgeon of being wrong?" Yes, I do. "Who are you to disagree with Spurgeon? Who are you to stand against these great Calvinistic men of history?" This is what Calvinists like to do. They throw out a laundry list of "big names" in church history to try to intimidate you into going along with their Calvinism. After all, who are you to disagree with such men? That is man-worship of the worst sort. Since you are a "little nobody", you have no basis to oppose them or to criticize them, they say. I reserve the right to disagree with any uninspired man on any topic if I believe him to be wrong, regardless of who he is. If I have Scripture to back up my position, then I will not hesitate to disagree with anyone. I refuse to be intimidated by any "big name preacher", living or dead. That should be your position, too. After all, you are a believer-priest, just like they are. You have the indwelling Holy Spirit, just like they do. You have a Bible, too. You also have the liberty, yea, the spiritual right and authority, to disagree with any man who tries to bully you into accepting error or false doctrine. Just

because that person may have more education than you means nothing. Great men make mistakes and they are in error just as much as anyone else.

I saw where a Calvinist tried to pull this stunt once. In an attempt to infect the first church I belonged to with Calvinism (and unsuccessfully trying to split the church), he printed a homemade magazine (back in the mid-1980s, before desktop publishing programs). In it, he listed about 50 “big name” Calvinists. He then asked the question “Could all of these great men of history have been wrong about the truth of Calvinism?” The short answer is “Yes, they could have been wrong, every last one, down to the last man”. Great men are not always wise and none of those 50 men were apostles and none wrote or ministered under any divine inspiration. It matters not how many name a Calvinist cares to trot out. He could have listed 500 names of “great men” if he wanted. It matters nothing, as truth is not determined by numbers of majorities. Truth is often found in a minority, anyway, so the more “big name Calvinists” they bring out, the more they really end up undermining their argument.

The Scriptural position you should take when confronted with this tactic is “When as man is right, I will use him. When he is wrong, I will not hesitate to say so, as long as I have Scripture to back me up.” Don’t let anyone intimidate you like this! Stand up to them if you think you have a basis to do so!

Secondly, I cannot adopt Calvinism because John Calvin had no love for the Baptists. In Calvin’s day, the Baptists were called “Anabaptists”, which means “re-baptizers”. Just read Calvin’s *Institutes of the Christian Religion* to see how often he vented his spleen against the Anabaptists. Calvin could get very harsh in his language and in his denunciations against those who would dare disagree with him and our Baptist forefathers were not spared his venom. The Anabaptists would re-baptize converts who came into their churches if they were not scripturally baptized by immersion upon a profession of faith. Many Calvinists and other Protestants, as well as all Roman Catholics, would have needed to be re-baptized if they wanted to join an Anabaptist church. That is a practice today in most Baptist churches. I was “sprinkled” as a baby as I was born into a Roman Catholic home, but when I wanted to join a Baptist church in 1985, I was properly baptized by immersion upon my public confession of faith. But that infuriated Calvin and the other Protestants. Rebaptizing became a capital offense in Reformation Europe since it called into question the validity of Protestant and Catholic baptisms. It was a blow against the sacralism (the merger of church and state) of the Protestants and Catholics of the Reformation era. This carried over into the colonial period of America with the persecution of the Baptists in Massachusetts over the very issue of baptism.

I can’t think of any Reformer except Erasmus who had any love for Baptist people. You must remember that another reason for this hatred against the Baptists is because we are not Reformed. We did not start in the Reformation. Baptists pre-dated the Reformation. Our lineage is ancient, going back to the early church. There were Baptist people in Wales before the end of the apostolic age. We trace our spiritual lineage back through the Donatists (who were persecuted by Calvin’s idol, Augustine),

the Waldensians (and I have family members on my father's side of the family who were Waldensians), Paulincians, Albigensians, and other similar groups. They were not called "Baptists" but they were Baptist people. Baptists were not part of the Reformation and we are not Protestant. Both Protestants and Catholics persecuted us because of our position on baptism and because we opposed any state-church establishment. All the Reformers held to a state church, Calvin included. Just look at his "Geneva theocracy".

Calvin didn't like the Baptists yet some Baptists like Calvin. I can't figure that out. Why follow a man who hates you and would not have hesitated to persecute you? Calvin got that persecution mentality from Augustine, a Church Father who lived in the 4th and 5th centuries. He has rightly been called the first Roman Catholic theologian. What a strange place for a Protestant to get this theology! If you read Calvin's *Institutes* (and I read that thing twice while in seminary), you will see Calvin quoting Augustine over and over and over again. You might find yourself asking "Whose *Institutes* are these- Calvin's or Augustine's?"

Augustine was also no friend of the Baptists in his persecution of the Donatists. Augustine was a very strong promoter of the merger of church and state started under Constantine. The Donatists rightly opposed it, saying "What does the Emperor have to do with the Church?" Since the Donatists wouldn't cooperate or conform, they had to be eliminated and Augustine was the biggest promoter of their persecutions.

Religious freedom and liberty of conscience is an unknown thing in genuinely Calvinistic churches. Just check out a website like Still Waters Revival Books at swrb.ca to see this intolerance on full display. The *Institutes* is also another showcase for it, as well as the Puritan Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Also, if Augustine was the first Roman Catholic theologian and if Calvin was so heavily influenced by Augustine, put two and two together. What are you going to get? Calvin was simply re-hashing Roman Catholic doctrines and practices he got from Augustine, although he did put a Protestant "spin" on them. But Calvin shared the Roman Catholic attitudes toward persecution, sacralism (state churches), baptism, religious intolerance and hatred of Baptists. Calvin was smart enough to know that salvation was not by works and that a genuinely saved man could not lose his salvation. We'll give him credit for that. But there isn't too much more that we can admire. After all, if Calvin is so closely tied to Augustine and if he was still under so much Roman Catholic influence, I have to reject that. I left the Catholic Church in 1983 and I want to get as far from that as I can get! I want as little to do as possible with the Church of Rome. Adoption of a Calvinistic mentality would undermine what I have been trying to do for all these years in separating from Rome.

Calvin administrated a state church in Geneva, which was something the other Reformers would have supported and argued for, despite the fact that state churches must, by their very nature, engage in persecution of dissidents and stifle religious liberty. Calvin broke no new ground in this area but went along with the spirit and sin of

his age. There was a reason why his enemies referred to Calvin as a “Protestant pope”. During his time in Geneva, no fewer than 47 people were executed by the state church monstrosity. The most notable of these was a Spanish medical doctor Michael Servetus. Calvin had him executed for what was basically a theological disagreement, since Servetus was not orthodox on the doctrine of the trinity. And yes, despite attempts of Calvinistic apologists to whitewash Calvin’s participation in this, he was directly responsible for Servetus’ death. No Baptist would ever have someone killed over a theological issue, but it was part and parcel of Calvin’s theological system. How can a Baptist think so highly of such a man or of his theological system? The foundation of Calvinism is theological intolerance and persecution.

Calvinists have their “boogey-man” like all theological systems must have. For the Calvinist, it is Arminianism. The fundamentalist has the neo-evangelical. The preterist has the dispensationalist. The Catholics needed the Protestants. It reminds me of George Orwell’s novel *1984*, where Big Brother needed Emmanuel Goldstein and the daily “two minute hate”. Arminianism is simply a modified version of Calvinism, where a few of the more extreme and radical ideas of Calvin were modified to bring them closer to the Scriptures. James (Jacob) Arminius was a Calvinist of some degree but he was more Biblical in his ideas than was Calvin. I have read Arminius’ three volume *Works* (I wonder how many Calvinists have?) and while I naturally don’t agree with everything he says, I did not find where he is supposed to be the Devil Incarnate as Calvinists have portrayed him to be. But whenever a Calvinist finds himself on the losing end of an argument with a Bible believer, he will trot out “You’re an Arminian!”, as if that is an unanswerable charge. It is hoped by throwing the “A” word around that the non-Calvinist will be silenced, but it never works. It reminds me of certain political operatives who throw charges of “You’re a racist!” toward their opponents in the hopes of ending any debate.

The charge of “Arminianism” is nonsense anyway. To the Calvinist, you have to be either Calvinist or Arminian. There is no third option. But they are wrong in their attempt to pigeon-hole every single Christian into only one of two categories. I am not a Calvinist but neither am I an Arminian. I am a Biblicist. I am a Bible Believing Independent Remnant Baptist. That’s how my “dog tags” read. When you call yourself a “Biblicist” or deny both systems, the Calvinist goes ballistic and accuses you of dodging the issue. But all we are doing is saying that both theological systems are not worthy of our support and we reject both and seek only unto the Scriptures alone. Isn’t that what the Reformation was all about, *sola scriptura*? Why do Calvinists get so agitated when we adopt that Reformation slogan?

It was this Calvinistic intolerance that allowed for the creation of Rhode Island. Roger Williams was exiled from Massachusetts in the middle of a harsh New England winter because of various doctrinal disagreements with that Puritan Commonwealth. We went south and bought land from the Indians for a new colony built on the Baptist ideals of religious liberty. In this case, God made the wrath of man to please him. Rhode Island was the first spark in what would become a flame that would lead the way to religious liberty in America. It didn’t come from Massachusetts. It came from Rhode Island and

Pennsylvania. You can thank the Baptists for that, even in Quaker Pennsylvania, where a large number of German Brethren and other Anabaptist groups settled. The Calvinists like to claim that they are the supporters and defenders of religious liberty but only the Baptists can make that claim historically. Other groups took it up after the Baptists had established it.

They whipped Baptists in Massachusetts for opposing the Calvinistic doctrine of baptizing infants. Calvin brought that over from the Church of Rome and the Protestants held to it. Only the Baptists held to believer's baptism, by immersion, upon a profession of faith. But the persecution and intolerance of Massachusetts provided the seed for religious liberty elsewhere in America. They whipped and persecuted my spiritual forefathers! How can I take up with that same theological system today? How can any Baptist?

One reason why I am a Baptist is that we don't persecute. We hold to soul liberty, freedom of conscience and the priesthood of all believers. We may oppose doctrines and practices but we do not persecute. We will oppose by debate, sermons and writings, but we would never whip anyone, imprison anyone, exile anyone or murder anyone over theological disagreements. I may think you are wrong, but I will grant you the right to believe what you want to believe and leave you to the judgment of God. And I don't understand how these so-called Reformed Baptists can adopt a theological system that persecuted and murdered their spiritual forefathers. The Reformation was not friendly to the Baptists.

A third reason why I don't accept Calvinism is because it tends to lead to a spirit of conceit that does not speak of Christ. I could bring in a whole library of quotes of statements by Calvinists where they proclaim themselves to be so much smarter, historic, godly and advanced than other Christian groups. I have already cited a few examples of this attitude by Charles Spurgeon. They seem to have the idea that if you are not a Calvinist, then there must be something wrong with you. You may not be very smart or spiritual. You may not even be saved, especially if you are an Arminian. Some Reformed Baptists and Primitive Baptists will even deny that a Baptist Church can be a valid Baptist Church if they are not Calvinist. I've seen all this in print. This arrogant and condescending spirit really turns me off. These young fundamentalists who are going over to Calvinists paint themselves as so educational, so scholarly, so spiritually advanced and mature. That is not a very Christian attitude and they have a great need to develop some humility. If a theological system encourages such a mentality then it shows up an inherent flaw in that system. Theological systems, if they are Scriptural, should engender humility, not arrogance. But many Calvinists are "crippled too high for crutches" and you can over-educate yourself right out of the truth. Simply because you have a doctorate in theology does not automatically mean you understand the Bible better than anyone else. I have a doctorate, too. I know of many non-Calvinists who have doctorates. What of them? We have education. We've studied this thing out. We're not stupid. We simply have come to a different conclusion. Don't insult our intelligence or spirituality because of that. Don't question our salvation or whether or not we belong to a legitimate local church. One of the worst offenders in

all of this was a newspaper called *The Baptist Examiner*, which was published by a church in Ashland, Kentucky, back in the 1960s and 1970s. I read a lot of back issues of it. This paper insulted and continually attacked any and all Baptists who would not hold to the Five Points, and denied that you could even be a Baptist if you were not Calvinist, or that a Baptist Church could be anything but Calvinist. It was an infuriating thing to read.

This carries over to the Calvinist claims that they and they alone preach the doctrines of grace. That would be defined as preaching that salvation is totally by the grace of God and not by any works of man. Who doesn't preach that? We teach that, too! But are we Calvinists? No! I heard Dr. O. Talmadge Spence once say that no Protestant theological system (Calvinist or otherwise) ever preached salvation by works, not even the dreaded "Arminians". In my 24 years of preaching and after over 4,700 sermons, I have never once preached that salvation was by anyone other than by the free and unmerited grace of God. Yet in all that time, I have never associated with or identified with any Calvinistic system in any way, shape, manner or form. So I also preach the "doctrines of grace". I resent any idea that because I am not a Calvinist that I must be preaching salvation by works. They think they have an exclusive lock on preaching salvation by grace and that simply is not true. Or they claim that I don't believe in the sovereignty of God or in the doctrine of election since I reject Calvinism. But such charges are slanderous and grossly inaccurate. You don't have to be a Calvinist to preach the free grace of God in salvation or to believe in the sovereignty of God or to believe in election. You simply have to believe your Bible! They claim that only Calvinists teach this. Well, John Wesley taught it and preached it and he identified with the Arminians. I've read Wesley. I've read his 4-volume *Journal*. I've read his sermons. Wesley preached the so-called "Doctrines of Grace" as did any Calvinist. That man never taught salvation by works. He knew better than that. He opened the question as to whether a man could lose his salvation, something I don't believe in. But when it came to grace, there is no basis for the charges of him being in error. His real crime was that he was not a Calvinist.

Another reason why I reject Calvinism is that it splits churches and fellowships. I know of a church right now a half hour from here that split over Calvinism recently. The pastor wanted to go Calvinist, the congregation said no. He left and took about a dozen families with him to start another church (just what we need- another church off of a split!). The Southern Baptists are split over this. The Fundamental Baptist Fellowship is moving in a more Calvinistic direction, led by the so-called "young fundamentalists".

Grace Baptist Church of Smyrna, Delaware takes a stand against Calvinism. We do not support it or hold to it. I don't think Calvinism is healthy or edifying. I say this in spite of the fact that many of my "heroes" in the ministry were Calvinistic, like Robert Murray McCheyne or Edward Payson. But it was not their Calvinism that made them great, it was their heart for God! That's what I am looking at when I consider a man! Does this man love God? Does this man go on with God? God will straighten out our theological mistakes at the bema seat. I have never read or heard a man where I didn't agree with something he said. I disagree with every man in my library on something. If two people

agree on everything, one of them isn't thinking. But this is what I base my fellowships on. I can fellowship with a Calvinist as long as he doesn't make a big issue of his Calvinism. I appreciate a lot of Calvinistic men, despite issues I have with them. I want a "Whitefield Spirit" where George Whitefield could fellowship with a John Wesley despite their differences. I think Spurgeon had that heart, too.

I simply believe Calvinism is an unreliable theological/philosophical system. I'll use it when it's useable but I am not putting all of my theological eggs in Calvin's basket. I use other theological systems, such as dispensationalism and premillennialism, but I don't call myself by those names, as they are not perfect either. I may quote a Calvinist in one of my commentaries but that doesn't make me a Calvinist. I may collect editions of Spurgeon's sermons but that doesn't make me a Calvinist. Nor am I going to make my belief and usage of dispensationalism into a personal theological system. It is an interpretative tool and nothing else. The Bible should be sufficient in and of itself. I don't need to add an "-ism" to it. You can use the writings of men to help you understand the Scripture, just don't make an idol out of it. Remember that the man you are following wasn't inspired and that did make mistakes. He wasn't inspired like John or Paul or James. There will be things in his life you will not like. Just because he is a "big name" does not mean that he has any special exemption from all of this. When he is right, use him. When he is wrong, correct him. If he is wrong too often, toss him.

We have to stand against this movement promoted by these young fundamentalists. I don't like the fruit I am seeing from this. I used to participate on a message board named Sharper Iron. It advertised itself as a fundamentalist message board and I thought I might get a blessing from it. After a few months, I got so frustrated with those men that I gave up on it. Most of them were against the King James Bible. If you argued for the superiority of the King James and attacked the modern versions (like the ESV), you would be branded as a "Ruckmanite" and not a few King James men were banned from the board. If you criticized Calvinism, you would be attacked. If you talked against John Piper or John MacArthur, they would swarm at you as bees. I criticized John Piper for having a "Christian rap" concert in his church and all hell broke loose. This is supposed to be a fundamentalist message board? They had no love for the "old guard" of the fundamentalist movement and were promoting non-fundamentalists in their place. This is fundamentalism? This is the future of the movement? It's no kind of fundamentalism I recognize. I gave up on these men. I just couldn't take it anymore.

I was with the Fundamentalist Baptist Fellowship from 1986 until 1990. I joined when I started preaching because my pastor was in it. Every year my church would have an FBF Conference, usually with Rod Bell and Chuck Cofty preaching, among others. But around 1990, Chuck Cofty noticed that the FBF literature had removed the word "militant" from describing the Fellowship. Then Rod Bell began to take a stronger stand against the King James Bible, no doubt under pressure from Bob Jones University, from where he had graduated. There followed an exodus of men, like Allen Dickerson, Chuck Cofty, Don Jamsin, Gary Webb and others, from the FBF. I left too, but I'm hardly to be considered with these other men in that regard! I thought that if an organization could lose men like this in such a short period of time without missing a

beat, then there was something fundamentally wrong with the Fundamental Baptist Fellowship. And it did continue merrily onward after the exodus. I thought that when those men leave, there would be a leadership vacuum within the FBF and that it would be filled by weaker men and younger men, and that is exactly what happened. These men don't have the discernment as the older men had. They hadn't fought the battles and they didn't have the scars. The FBF then weakened and softened up until it got to the point that it was toothless. Now the FBF is in the process of being hi-jacked by these neo-Calvinist young fundamentalists. It has been taken over by men who promote modern English translations. Calvinists are now prominent in the Fellowship. It has been hi-jacked by men with poor music standards and weak separation standards. I don't recognize the FBF anymore. I don't recognize what passes off as "mainline fundamentalism" anymore. This is not the fundamentalism I grew up with. This is now an alien movement.

Fundamentalism is dead. You write that down, that I said that, here, at Grace Baptist Church in Smyrna, Delaware, at 12:10 pm on September 27, 2009. It is dead, but it keeps jerking around like the proverbial chicken with its head cut off. These men think that the way they can revive the corpse is to inject Calvinism into it. "We have to get rid of that King James, that separation, those stodgy old English hymns and gospel songs! We'll put an ESV Bible in one I.V. tube and Calvin's *Institutes of the Christian Religion* in the other! We'll inject these into the corpse and it will come back, better than ever!" No, you'll kill it once and for all! Or you may end up with a theological Frankenstein, the Movement of the Living Dead! That's why I left fundamentalism a number of years ago and now call myself a Remnant Christian.

We are not a Calvinistic church. We do not subscribe to the teachings and philosophies of John Calvin. We are not Arminian, we are Biblicists. We will not allow anyone to force us into either a Calvinistic camp or an Arminian camp. Paul warned us about this in our text here in Colossians 2:8, not to let anyone carry us away with these philosophies, vain traditions and rudiments of the world, all of which are not after Christ. Beware! Beware! Beware, lest any man, any "big man", any Christian personality, spoil you, or carry you away as a prisoner of war, into this. Many men have been caught in the dragnet of neo-Calvinism and have been carried away captive.

I conclude with an illustration. A number of years ago, I wrote an article summarizing some of my thoughts on Calvinism for the Maranatha Baptist Watchman. It wasn't a strong or a nasty article, but I did lay out some issues that I had with Calvinism. A local Presbyterian pastor saw that article. He called me up and wanted to take me out to lunch to discuss that article. Since he was paying, I accepted. Anticipating a theological discussion, I brought my Bible. **That pastor brought no Bible but he brought his copy of Calvin's *Institutes of the Christian Religion*.** That right there showed me all I ever needed to know about this philosophical system of Calvinism.