

An Analysis of the Conservative Baptist Movement

by
Ernest Pickering, Th.D.

AN ANALYSIS OF THE CONSERVATIVE BAPTIST MOVEMENT

Ernest Pickering, Th.D.

INTRODUCTION

For a number of years the author was involved in the Conservative Baptist movement as the pastor of a Conservative Baptist church, dean of a Conservative Baptist Seminary, and a member of the board of the Conservative Baptist Fellowship. During that time, I attended a number of Conservative Baptist conferences at the state, regional, and national level and spoke at several of them. It was also my privilege to write articles for several Conservative Baptist organizations and to have fellowship with a considerable number of Conservative Baptist leaders. During those years, the movement was passing through a turmoil, which finally resulted in the loss of a goodly number of leaders and churches who were of a more separatist persuasion. Some of these went into the GARBC, some affiliated with various independent Baptist local, state, or national fellowships, and quite a few remained unaffiliated.

Since there is currently renewed discussion among some Baptists concerning the position of the Conservative Baptist movement, it was thought helpful to produce this brief study. There are good men in the Conservative Baptist movement, and it is not our intent to defame anyone nor to attack the character of Christian brethren. It is possible in the heat of theological and ecclesiastical conflict to err in this direction. It is necessary, however, to delineate clearly the positions of men and movements so that pastors and churches may be properly informed and make intelligent decisions regarding matters of fellowship.

THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE CONSERVATIVE BAPTIST MOVEMENT

The Struggle Within the Northern Baptist Convention

The Conservative Baptist movement has its roots in the old Northern Baptist Convention (later called the “American Baptist Convention” and now named the “American Baptist Churches”). Theological liberalism was ingrained within that body from its very inception since it was the brain-child of Walter Rauschenbusch and others like him, who were far from evangelical. The liberalism began to grow rapidly and manifest itself in the churches, the schools, and the mission agencies. Bible-believers became alarmed and began to expose and oppose the liberals and their liberalism. Debates raged on the floor of the convention meetings and in the pages of periodicals. The Bible-believers gradually lost ground, and it became evident that they would not win control of the convention apparatus.

The Organization of the Mission Societies

Bible-believers, frustrated with their attempts to cleanse the American Baptist Foreign Mission Society of its unbelief, organized the “Conservative Foreign Mission Society” in 1943. It was intended to provide a channel through which fundamental churches within the American Baptist Convention could support missionaries. At that time, while there was a protest against the liberalism of the Convention, there was no requirement that the board members of the new society nor its supporters be outside the Convention. From the beginning, it was built upon the concept that matters of affiliation were in the domain of the local church and that no requirements would be made that those officially connected with the society be separated from the Convention.

One Conservative Baptist leader, in commenting on the origins of the movement, wrote thusly:

The Conservative Baptist movement did not come into being to provide a fellowship for Bible-

honoring Baptist churches, as good a cause as this may be. It came into existence for a cause of greater significance than this, a cause far closer to the heart of God . . . the cause of reaching the world with the wondrous story of God’s love When it became evident that this new missionary society would not continue within the framework of the unreformed Northern Baptist Convention, a fellowship of churches was considered desirable and the Conservative Baptist Association of America was organized, but this was forty-two months later (Robert Hubbard, “Issues CBs Face at Detroit,” *Conservative Baptist Witness*, March 1962, p. 7).

This statement is instructive because it reveals a mind-set which plagued many of the Conservative Baptist leaders, namely, that the missionary effort was really more important than the association of churches. It was a “cause far closer to the heart of God.”

In 1950 the Conservative Baptist Home Mission Society was organized in order to provide a similar channel for home missionary efforts.

The Organization of the Conservative Baptist Association of America

In 1948 the Conservative Baptist Association of America was formed. Under the leadership of Myron Cedarholm, for years its general director, it flourished and grew. Several hundred new churches were planted across the nation. While the Conservative Baptist Association of America had no organizational ties to either of the mission societies, there were historical and sympathetic bonds, and there was some interlocking of board members.

THE CONSERVATIVE BAPTIST VIEWPOINT ON ECCLESIASTICAL SEPARATION

Varying Positions Among the Early Founders

The men who helped to form the Conservative Baptist movement had varying convictions regarding separation.

1. Some were separatist “in spirit and objective” (words taken from the “Portland Manifesto”) from the start and eventually became organizationally so. These constituted what was called the “hard core” of the movement during the struggles of the 1960s.
2. Some were never separatist at heart but became so organizationally because of pressures from within the Convention, because they wished to obtain a pastorate, or for other circumstantial reasons.
3. Some were never separatist at heart and never became so organizationally.

When men of such varying positions help to lay the foundation of a movement, it will naturally reflect some of the weaknesses that are bound to accompany such a broad spectrum of thought. It produced a spirit of tolerance within the movement, which many believe is still residual. It produced a *mood* or *attitude* that continued to allow for a larger theological and ecclesiastical umbrella than many feel is wise or scriptural. From the beginning, leaders within the movement did not agree on the nature or extent of separation. When leaders of the General Association of Regular Baptist Churches and of the Conservative Baptists met in Atlantic City in 1947 to discuss the possibilities of merger, the chairman of the gathering (a Conservative Baptist) read the proposed Conservative Baptist constitution and stated that if that wasn't a separatist document, he had never seen one. A Conservative Baptist leader from the East arose and stated emphatically that this was the first time he knew that it was a separatist movement and, if it was, he wanted no part of it. The General Association of Regular Baptist Church leaders who were present suggested to their Conservative Baptist brethren that perhaps it would be good for them to decide what they were before further progress could be made on discussions of a merger.

The Philosophy of Separation

From the beginning, Conservative Baptists espoused a different approach to the matter of separation than did, for instance, the founders of the General Association of Regular Baptist Churches. The Conservative Baptist leaders had the idea of coming out of the old convention “with the faith and the furniture,” as some put it. For this reason, they espoused what might be called an *en masse* approach to the problem. “We will come out as a movement.” It was a kind of “ecclesiastical gradualism” and accounted for the resultant position which was established. Rather than an exodus church by church, they would come out in a group. There were probably several reasons for this approach.

1. It would create competition for the American Baptist Convention.
2. It would embarrass and harass the American Baptist Convention as much as possible.
3. It was calculated to avoid having a small handful to begin with.
4. It would make it easier for a church to change affiliation.
5. It would save church properties where ownership might be challenged by convention forces.

The Resultant Position

Conservative Baptists founded a movement which allowed for “dual affiliation,” that is, a church could be in the Conservative Baptist Association and also in the American Baptist Convention. The original constitution of the Conservative Baptist Association of America read: “The affiliates of the Association shall consist of:

(1) Autonomous Baptist churches without regard to other affiliations.” Commenting upon this statement and its implications, Shelley, a Conservative Baptist historian, wrote, “. . . Conservatives were trying to define separation by what one believed rather than by one’s affiliations” (Bruce Shelley, *A History of Conservative Baptists*, p. 75).

Another Conservative Baptist leader, in speaking to the position of the movement, noted, “We hold that the principles of separation of our Conservative Baptist movement were formulated basically by doctrine, and that this distinguishes our position on separation from that of other Baptist groups whose separation is formulated largely by affiliation” (“Where We Stand,” *Conservative Baptist Witness*, January 1965, p. 7).

There is a gaping hole in the reasoning behind such statements. One’s affiliation must be determined by one’s doctrine. Doctrine and affiliation (or organizational fellowship) go hand in hand and cannot be divorced from one another. If one believes scriptural truth, one cannot continue to hold hands with those who do not.

Within the old Northern Baptist Convention were two groups that held different views about how to deal with apostasy. They were the Fundamentalist Fellowship (forerunner of the Conservative Baptists), a group much more moderate in their approach to the problem, and the Baptist Bible Union (forerunner of the General Association of Regular Baptist Churches), who were more aggressive and more disposed to attack the problem frontally.

As we have seen, the differences between the Fundamentalist Fellowship and the Baptist Bible Union were revealed as early as 1923. These differences were not so much in theology (though there were minor differences here) as in attitude toward separation from other Christians. The fact that the churches forming the GARBC separated from the Northern Baptist Convention earlier than

the Conservatives, underscored the fact that they were more militant in their view of separation. This difference revealed early, persisted and was the major reason for the failure of all merger attempts (Shelley, *op. cit.*, p. 54).

Vernon Grounds, longtime president of the Conservative Baptist Seminary of Denver, was originally in the General Association of Regular Baptist Churches and served on the faculty of one of their colleges. He left that movement primarily because he disagreed with its position on separation. In expounding the meaning of the Conservative Baptist Association “dual affiliation” clause, he wrote:

It means that a church may join the Conservative Baptist Association of America and at the same time belong to the Southern Baptist Convention or the General Baptist Conference or the North American Baptist Convention or even the American Baptist Convention The CBA trusts the guidance of the Holy Spirit together with the logic of events to show a church when any such membership is no longer tenable. It is built exclusively upon a positive principle. If a particular church accepts the Association’s confession of faith, it may join the Association regardless of other affiliation And, because of this difference in principle, the CBA and the GARBC decided they could not merge into a single organization despite their theological concurrence (“Is God’s Word a Nose of Wax?” *Conservative Baptist Witness*, January 1962, p. 4).

Grounds became a chief spokesman within the Conservative Baptist movement for new evangelicalism. When the controversy over that position was raging within the movement back in the 1960s, he inveighed against what he called the “new-style separatists,” “who oppose affiliation with the NAE and support of

such groups as Youth for Christ, Gideons, Christian Businessmen's Committee, etc." He goes on to state that the "new-style separatist views the Conservative Baptist Theological Seminary of Denver as a 'hot bed' of compromising inclusivists because it opposes the kind of separation demanded by the GARBC" (Grounds, *op. cit.*, p. 4).

The Difference Over "Secondary Separation"

After sitting in as an observer on one of the early meetings of the World Conservative Baptist Mission (now called "Baptist World Mission"), a Conservative Baptist leader wrote an extensive report on his reactions and repudiated the mission and its founders. He wrote:

In the Augsburg brochure previously quoted he states, "That there has been an ideological difference within the ranks of Conservative Baptists is no secret either to those within or without our movement" This is the crux of the matter. Early in the Conservative Baptist movement we decided, after long and prayerful deliberation, not to unite organizationally with the GARB brethren. The difference between us is essentially that which has tragically divided evangelicals on the national scale and resulted in two organizations, The American Council of Churches and the National Association of Evangelicals. In all ethical procedure some of our separated brethren should long ago have associated themselves with the GARB. In Dr. Pickering's address before the World Separatist Baptist Mission (Hart's own title) in Atlantic City, he stated that his church could not support Youth for Christ or Inter-Varsity, or other like interdenominational organizations. In this he is consistent with the ACCC position and clearly supports the GARB ideology. The undercurrents of many years within

our CB movement are now better understood as attempts to impose upon it the ideology which was rejected at the beginning as incompatible with the spirit of the CB movement It is this SECONDARY SEPARATION concept which our separatist brethren have long endeavored to force upon the classic passage in 2 Corinthians 6, which underlies our pathetic disturbance of fellowship and service within our CB responsibility. This secondary separation interpretation separates Christian from Christian rather than the obvious cleavage of Christian from non-Christian, of the temple of God from idols (Edward Hart, "My Personal Observation of the World Conservative Baptist Mission," *Conservative Baptist Witness*, June-July 1963, p. 6).

It is to be noted that the distinction between the Conservative Baptist position and the GARBC position, according to Hart, is not in reference to separation from apostates, but rather in the area of so-called "secondary separation," that separation which removes one from the fellowship of other believers.

The NAE Connection

Certain writers already quoted have referred to some Conservative Baptist ties with the National Association of Evangelicals (NAE). These ties basically come in two areas: (1) the affiliation of some Conservative Baptist churches with the NAE and/or its local affiliates and (2) the inclusion of both Conservative Baptist mission agencies in the Evangelical Foreign Missions Association. No Conservative Baptist church is required to be in affiliation with the NAE, but, as we have mentioned, a goodly number are. The director of the Conservative Baptist Association of America has declared that the CBA has a larger percentage of churches in affiliation with the NAE than any other denomination. While some individual churches do not affirm the position of the NAE by

actual membership in it, they do approve its general philosophy by their affiliation with the CB movement, which certainly has a strong affinity with the NAE.

What is the NAE? It is an interdenominational organization composed of many churches, organizations, and individuals that provides certain services, publishes a paper, and holds an annual convention, which features preaching, workshops, and interaction. It has a very minimal evangelical doctrinal basis. Its numerical strength traditionally has been drawn from holiness and Pentecostal groups such as the Assemblies of God and the Free Methodists. It allows those to participate who are in the apostate denominations, as long as they can subscribe to the doctrinal position of the NAE.

The Evangelical Foreign Missions Association (EFMA) is closely tied to the NAE, being one of the officially-related organizations. There are many missions of varying doctrinal persuasions who belong to this group. Among them are Assemblies of God, Christian and Missionary Alliance, Evangelical Free Church, Free Methodist Church, Pentecostal Holiness Church, World Vision, and Youth for Christ International. While, as has been stated, Conservative Baptists are not forced to participate, the cause of the NAE has certainly been promoted among their ranks. In an official position statement, the writer declared:

“As a matter of fact, we commend support of the National Association of Evangelicals—to which we are already deeply indebted for our status in the armed forces chaplaincy program—as a superb means of manifesting outwardly the inner spiritual unity which is the result of our Savior’s prayer, ‘that they all might be one’” (“Where We Stand,” *Conservative Baptist Witness*, January 1965, p. 7).

The broad position of the NAE is evident when one ponders the remarks of NAE President John White given in Columbus, Ohio, in March of 1989.

Though we stress a carefully defined theological a priori, we must stress our amazing breadth and openness. We encompass Pentecostal, Baptist, Wesleyan, Anabaptist, Reformed and Presbyterian traditions. The massive renewal movements within Presbyterian, Reformed, Lutheran, Methodist, and the United Church groups are committed to a biblically conservative ideology. Can we refrain from reaction to the NCC, and from being predominantly representatives of non-mainline churches and embrace these people as brothers and sisters? Are we prepared to make aggressive advances toward them and in new, creative ways bring them into the NAE? (“White Outlines NAE’s Driving Force and Central Passion,” *United Evangelical Action*, July-August 1989, p. 13).

One of the biggest objections to the NAE position on the part of separatists has been their tolerance of affiliation with apostate groups such as the National Council of Churches. An official of the NAE explains their viewpoint:

Evangelicals within the mainline denominations have participated in the work and ministry of the National Association of Evangelicals (NAE) since its beginnings Most of the mainline denominations had cast their lot with the National Council of Churches (NCC) at the time of NAE’s founding NAE has frequently been accused of compromise simply because we welcomed local churches that were solidly evangelical, but members of a denomination that held membership in the NCC (Billy Melvin, “A Plea for All Evangelicals,” *United Evangelical Action*, November-December 1985, p. 18).

To summarize, we note that: (1) a goodly number of Conservative Baptist churches are involved with the NAE; (2) both

Conservative Baptist mission agencies are members of the EFMA, which is a part of the NAE movement; and (3) important Conservative Baptist leaders have and do commend the position and work of the NAE. Robert Dugan, longtime leader in the Conservative Baptist movement, is now the director of the NAE Office of Public Affairs and was a featured speaker at the 1985 Conservative Baptist annual meeting. Many NAE members promote theological dialogue with apostates. David Wells, a professor at Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, asked, “Should we dialogue with Catholics? Yes, I believe we should” (*United Evangelical Action*, March-April 1987, p. 9). He says that, in his opinion, such dialogues are “truly important for evangelicalism.”

The broad position of the Conservative Baptists is reflected in the speakers they use from time to time in their annual meetings. The following are examples of speakers used at Conservative Baptist annual conferences:

1974 in St. Paul—Dr. W. A. Criswell, Southern Baptist leader

1975 in Tucson—Dr. Jess Moody, prominent Southern Baptist pastor

1978—Mrs. Hudson Armerding, wife of the president of Wheaton College, who spoke to the women’s luncheon

1980 in Portland, Maine—Dr. Myron Augsburger, president of Eastern Mennonite College and Seminary

1982 at Northwestern College in Roseville, Minnesota—Dr. David Hocking, Grace Brethren pastor at the time; Dr. Ray Ortlund, pastor of Mariner Church in Newport Beach, California; Dr. Gordon MacDonald, pastor of Grace Chapel in Lexington, Massachusetts; and Dr. Joseph Aldrich, president of Multnomah in Portland, Oregon

1983—Dr. Richard Chase, president of Wheaton College

1986 in Fort Collins, Colorado—Dr. Luis Palau, ecumenical evangelist

ESCHATOLOGICAL DIFFERENCES

Conservative Baptists are not united in their views of eschatology. While the movement as a whole is premillennial, a continuing controversy raged for years over whether or not to actually amend the doctrinal statements of the mission societies in order to insert the word “premillennial.” The author was present during many of the debates on this question. Various specious arguments were put forward by opponents of such an action. We cannot take time in this paper to recount all of those, but the fact that the matter was debated and the change resisted is significant. At the time, Dr. Richard Weeks authored a very fine paper analyzing the entire debate (“Conservative Baptists and the Doctrine of the Church in Our Premillennial Crisis,” published by the Conservative Baptist Fellowship).

The Eastern Regional of the Conservative Baptist Association of America (from which much of the opposition arose) rejected any insertion of a premillennial confession in the doctrinal statements of the mission societies “because unity in the interpretations of the term ‘premillennial’ does not appear to be probable in the light of the historic Baptist position We are recognizing the differences that exist among our brethren” (Shelley, *op. cit.*, p. 81). Included in a position paper presented at the Chicago Area Conservative Baptist Koinonia was this statement:

The fathers of the Conservative Baptist movement carefully drew up a doctrinal statement, now signed yearly by all voting constituents It was not, however, a definitely premillennial statement Thus it is obvious that they did not consider the doctrine of the premillennial return of Christ crucial enough to be a test of fellowship. We believe

that this is sound baptistic reasoning . . . (“Where We Stand,” *Conservative Baptist Witness*, January 1965, p. 6). Conservative Baptists have taken no official position regarding the pretribulation question. Various views of this are found within the Conservative Baptist movement. It was admitted by one of their leaders that there are differences and that these should remain.

Lastly, we are accused in the area of Eschatology of “disparaging an important doctrine in order to maintain an outward unity.” The reference here concerns the pretribulation rapture of the church . . . There can be no question whatever of the pre-millennial position of Conservative Baptists . . . Baptists have never made details of eschatology a test of fellowship . . . I . . . rejoice in our definitive position as Conservative Baptists who proclaim Christ’s premillennial return. Beyond this we dare not imperil our spiritual heritage in Christ among Conservative Baptists (Edward Hart, “My Personal Observations of the World Conservative Baptist Mission,” *Conservative Baptist Witness*, June-July 1963, p. 7).

At the annual meetings in Boston (1960), a premillennial clause was inserted in the Constitution of the CBFMS but not in the doctrinal statement. It was included rather in the declaration of purpose. Later CBHMS took a similar action.

There remains within the Conservative Baptist movement men who are pretribulation in their convictions and men who are post-tribulation as well. Particularly at the Denver Seminary the post-tribulation position has been well represented.

INTERDENOMINATIONALISM

Conservative Baptists have always had a liberal dose of interdenominational thinking within their ranks. Most of the interdenominational agencies, schools, and programs that many of them promote would certainly not be viewed as separatist in

conviction. This author recalls his dismay at viewing the prolific assemblage of interdenominational exhibits at the annual Conservative Baptist conferences.

Shelley, the Conservative Baptist historian cited earlier, has perceptive comments on this aspect of the Conservative Baptist movement. He notes that the Conservatives

. . . show first, the marks of their Baptist past . . . They assented to the cluster of historic Baptist beliefs . . . Conservative Baptists also reveal the marks of the fundamentalist movement. Sharing many of the values of fundamentalism, they gravitated toward extra-church ministries approved by moderate fundamentalists: Youth for Christ, Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship, Billy Graham Crusades and a host of other agencies and endeavors (Shelley, *op. cit.*, p. 2).

In discussing further the development of the Conservative Baptists, he says, “Thus their hybrid character remained: part Baptist, part fundamentalist-evangelical” (Shelley, *op. cit.*, p. 120). “In short, Conservative Baptists are a hybrid of denominational values and interdenominational ones” (Shelley, *op. cit.*, p. 3).

In a more recent evaluation of the Conservative Baptist movement, the same author makes some penetrating observations. As a professor of church history at the Denver Conservative Baptist Seminary for many years, he would be well-qualified to give such insights.

In my book *A History of Conservative Baptists*, I have argued that the movement is a hybrid organism. It combines elements of Baptist life with elements from fundamentalism. My personal conviction is that the Baptist character is waning and the fundamentalist-evangelical (interdenominational) character is growing. I see this in the so-called elder question, in the sources of candidates for the ministry, in the tendency to drop the name *Baptist* in churches, and in a host of other ways.

The reasons for this increasing interdenominational character are not hard to find . . . Conservative Baptists have no significant relationship with other Baptists . . . Yet, at the same time, interdenominational publishing houses provide Sunday school literature for their churches, interdenominational magazines go to their homes, interdenominational superstars hold their interest (Bruce Shelley, “The Fruit of a Fundamentalist Fellowship,” *Conservative Baptist*, Fall 1982, p. 9).

NEW EVANGELICALISM

A good many years ago a movement arose which was identified by Harold Ockenga, one of its founders, as the “new evangelicalism.” It has many facets which have been outlined in my book *Biblical Separation*, as well as in many other books and periodicals. The Conservative Baptist movement was permeated years ago by this philosophy, which stemmed mainly from the Denver Seminary while Dr. Vernon Grounds was its president. He was the author of many study papers, articles, and books expounding this approach in one way or another. Years ago when the Conservative Baptist conference was held in Detroit, Dr. Charles Woodbridge was asked to give a major address on the subject of the new evangelicalism. At the conclusion of this masterful analysis, I met Dr. Grounds in the elevator going down to the lobby. I asked him what he thought of Dr. Woodbridge’s message. He said, “Not a word of it applies to Conservative Baptists.” Unfortunately, the statement was inaccurate.

It was the intrusion of the new evangelicalism into the Conservative Baptist movement that caused the tremendous controversies and eventual divisions that took place back in the 1960s. Illustrations of this would be the following:

1. The repeated refusal to reaffirm the “Portland Manifesto” originally passed in 1953, which declared that the Conservative Baptists were to be “separatist in spirit and

objective.” In the 1960s efforts were made to reaffirm this stated position, but such efforts were continually opposed by many Conservative Baptist leaders, particularly those connected with the Denver Seminary.

2. Continued cooperation with the NAE, which had, by this time, become a center of new evangelical thinking
3. The appointment of missionaries who were graduates of new evangelical institutions such as Wheaton, Gordon, Fuller Seminary, etc.
4. Commendation of new evangelical goals by Conservative Baptist leaders. For instance, Bruce Shelley remarked, “The ecumenical age is with us. It is no longer a question of ‘if we have Christian unity’ it is now a question of ‘how’ . . . The ecumenical quest is a biblical quest” (*United Evangelical Action*, February 1967).
5. The use of prominent new evangelical speakers such as Clarence Roddy, then professor at Fuller Theological Seminary, was a major source of new evangelical thought. He was featured by the CBFMS at one of their anniversary meetings.
6. Strong opposition to the organization of a new mission—The World Conservative Baptist Mission (now called “Baptist World Mission”)—an out-spoken opponent of the new evangelicalism.

We will not consume further space documenting the persuasive influence of the new evangelicalism within the Conservative Baptist movement save to mention one last, but important, fact. Support for ecumenical evangelism has always been strong among Conservative Baptist churches and mission leaders. There are some Conservative Baptists who have opposed it, but sympathy for the evangelistic philosophy spawned by Billy Graham has been

very noticeable within the movement as a whole. A spokesman for the Conservative Baptists declared on the issue:

Separatist leaders who feel they must proclaim publicly the error of Graham's way would be well advised to heed the admonition of Gamaliel to the Pharisees of old: "Refrain from these men and let them alone . . . if this work be of God ye cannot overthrow it, lest haply ye be found to fight against God" (Acts 4:30-39) (Gordon Whitney, "Evangelicalism Revisited," *Conservative Baptist Witness*, May 1964, p. 5).

In 1981, in connection with their annual conference, Conservative Baptists sponsored a "Congress on Evangelism." Speakers included a wide variety of persons, many of whom are known advocates and supporters of the Billy Graham philosophy. Some of the men were Stephen Olford, Haddon Robinson, Earl Radmacher, C. Peter Wagner, E. V. Hill, and Hudson Armerding (then president of Wheaton College). One Conservative Baptist writer defended his cooperation with Billy Graham thusly: "Instead of standing aloof as a critic, I desire to make the best use of the opportunity during the coming Crusade in Los Angeles to help in reaching the lost for Christ. If all evangelicals should take the position of the hard-core separationists Billy Graham would have only liberals to work with" (Edward Hart, "My Personal Observation of the World Conservative Baptist Mission," *Conservative Baptist Witness*, June-July 1963, p. 7).

Back in the 1970s, under the leadership of Billy Graham, a worldwide conference on evangelism was held at Lausanne, Switzerland. In 1989 the second Lausanne Congress on World Evangelization (LCWE) met in Manila in the Philippines. Leighton Ford was the chairman. Dr. Warren Webster, general director of CBFMS, served on the International Lausanne Committee. Other Conservative Baptist participants included Dr. Earl Radmacher, president of Western Baptist Seminary; Dr. Donald Smith and Rev. Charles Kelly from Oregon; missionaries

Dr. Fran Wood, Dr. Roberta King, and Dr. Roger Hedlund; and Mr. Ricardo Jumawan, a leader in the CBA of the Philippines who served as operations director in charge of local arrangements for the Congress (information obtained from *Impact*, August 1989, a paper published by CBFMS).

CONCLUSION

As in most movements, there is within the Conservative Baptist group a "right wing" and a "left wing." Some are more conservative than others. While this is true, it must be remembered that all of them are in fellowship together in one body, and all are working through common agencies—the Conservative Baptist Foreign Mission Society and the Conservative Baptist Home Mission Society. In order to do this, those who are more conservative must go along with the philosophy, approach, and procedures of those who are less conservative. Such cooperation is founded upon compromises in important areas.

Copies available from:

Baptist World Mission
Post Office Box 2149
Decatur, AL 35602-2149
Phone: (256) 353-2221
Fax: (256) 353-2266

www.baptistworldmission.org
books@baptistworldmission.org