

*"... Hereby know we the spirit of truth and the spirit of error"*

*The*  
**DISCERNER**

AN  
INTERNATIONAL  
HERESY-EXPOSING  
QUARTERLY

**Volume IV                  Number 9**

2. THE ERRONEOUS CONCEPT OF  
CO-EXISTENCE
6. MAY A CHRISTIAN BELIEVE IN  
ACADEMIC FREEDOM?
11. THE IDOL OF INTELLECTUALISM
15. COMMUNIST RETREAT TO VICTORY
16. PERTINENT QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

CONTENTS

January — March, 1964

# The DISCERNER

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

John E. Dahlin, *Chairman*

George Darby

C. Victor Nyquist

Dr. Ernest Pickering

Published Quarterly

Price \$1.00 for 6 issues; \$2.00 for 12 issues;

20 cents a copy; for foreign

subscription add 4 cents per issue.

Copyright 1964 by Religion Analysis Service, Inc.

902 Hennepin Avenue, Minneapolis 3, Minn.

Printed in the United States

---

## THE ERRONEOUS CONCEPT OF CO-EXISTENCE

*Prof. John E. Dahlin, Editor*

Perhaps no phrase has been more widely used in recent years than that of co-existence. It is a streamlined expression which fits an age during which there is a break-down of convictions, especially among a number of leaders in the present-day society. First, I wish to deal with co-existence as it involves political relationships, and secondly, it will be my purpose also to discuss co-existence as a religious concept and practice of our time.

### **Co-Existence as a Current Political Policy**

Political co-existence in the present-day has reference to an attempt by free nations to live side by side with nations which have embraced a totally opposite political ideology, particularly communism. It is the political aspects of communism with which I wish to deal in the first place.

Unfortunately those who advocate co-existence with atheistic communism seem to fail entirely in taking seriously the blue-print of communism as presented over a century ago by Karl Marx in his production, *The Communist Manifesto*. Even a casual reading of this document should convince an open-minded reader that Communism does not recognize such a relationship as co-existence. This godless and diabolical leader (Karl Marx) openly and blatantly declared war against capitalism and

Christianity. His blue-print involves the destruction of the capitalistic order with a substitution of the rule of the proletariat. Karl Marx also stigmatized religion as "an opiate" designed to put people to sleep mentally while the capitalistic robber barons (so-called) were busily engaged in sapping the economic life-blood from the workers. Indeed, it may be said the founder of modern Communism did not believe in co-existence in any shape, manner, or form. It is equally true that the Russian leaders during the first decade of the Bolshevik Revolution followed the Marxian blue-print rigidly, and it should be pointed out also that the present rulers of Communist China adhere to this original doctrine of Karl Marx. Temporarily Joseph Stalin and Nikita Khrushchev side-tracked this doctrine in favor of a nationalistic brand of Communism. When Leon Trotsky, a Bolshevik of the old school, opposed Stalin in his deviation, it led to the former's exile and subsequent assassination. The temporary change of tactics among the present Russian rulers has led many political leaders in the free world to believe that there is a desire on the part of the leading Kremlin bosses to seek co-existence with countries which adhere to a different political ideology. As a student of History and Political Science, I believe this is a very

dangerous conclusion reached by leading officials of our time. In order to build up rapidly a great military power the Russian leaders in recent decades were forced to temporarily give priority to nationalism along with a de-emphasis of the internationalization of their Communist ideology. But I find no evidence whatsoever of a permanent change in the ultimate goals of Communism. Nikita Khrushchev himself has declared openly, "We will bury you," and he has predicted that our children and grandchildren will live under Communism. Again and again he has declared that the aim of the Soviet Union is to overtake and overcome the West both economically and militarily. We need to be reminded also that he has spoken of his 100 megaton nuclear bombs, and he has threatened to send them our way should it appear necessary for him to do so.

Communitic propaganda of peaceful co-existence is simply a kind of window dressing to deceive people who are naive or those who have an affinity for gullibility. Obviously if a supreme necessity requires the Soviet Union to restrain temporarily its original program of world revolution, it should not be interpreted as a change in the fundamental philosophy of Communism. The destruction of capitalistic nations, and the elimination of Christianity, are the long-range goals of the Marxists. It is understandable that the Soviet Union cannot carry on such a dual program during the time when it is girding itself to reach a position of incomparable strength. Temporarily Communist rulers will maintain diplomatic, economic, and cultural relations with non-communist countries. But it has not become their permanent objective to maintain co-existence with the West.

For 15 consecutive years following World War I, four of our Pres-

idents in the period, seemed to understand Communism and take it seriously and realistically. Woodrow Wilson, Warren Harding, Calvin Coolidge, and Herbert Hoover consistently refused to accept co-existence as a policy for the United States. Properly they refused to recognize the Soviet Union. Their position was based on the knowledge that Communism was engaged in an international conspiracy to undermine and overthrow all non-communist states. These Presidents knew that by opening the door for an exchange of ambassadors, and allowing consulates and economic agents to occupy strategic places, the free nations would be taking a risk which would be incompatible with our way of life. Since 1933, however, our nation joined many other countries which had earlier recognized Communist Russia. From the deductions which we may make of this new attempt in dealing with Communism, it is simply an expressed belief that co-existence is possible, and that such a policy will be pursued by our government. It obviously would be difficult now to reverse the policy which has been pursued since 1933 because it would have considerable repercussions in international circles. Therefore, it has seemed preferable to invite certain Russian leaders here, including Nikita Khrushchev, in order that we might expand the prevalent concept of co-existence.

Anyone who is able to recite the record of Communism in recent years should be able to see that their rulers have in practice repudiated the concept of co-existence. The nearly hopeless situation in Laos and Vietnam has stemmed from the policy of the West, namely, co-existence and neutralization of those areas. Moreover, the infamy of Castro's Cuba, at our very doors, ought to be an object lesson for us that the purpose of Rus-

sia is not co-existence but a communization of Cuba, and also to use the Island as a base from which operations may be directed against Central America and South America. Already the Communist propaganda has succeeded in breaking down government leadership in some of these poverty-stricken areas of Latin America. There is now no longer a desire in some of these nations to resist Communism. Unquestionably the policy of co-existence has led to a series of political disasters during the past decade. The recent step by France in recognizing Red China is simply a wedge which will make it easier for this lawless nation to maneuver itself into membership in the United Nations. Blindly nation after nation continues the policy of co-existence.

#### **Prominent State Department Official Rejects Co-Existence**

The weak policy of co-existence pursued by western nations was criticised severely by Robert Murphy top diplomat who served under three Presidents. In a new book entitled, *Diplomats Among Warriors*, he writes, "The United States has been periodically misled by Soviet drives for peaceful co-existence. It is only a Kremlin feint to obscure its aggressive threats and pressures." He warns us against the danger of the current policy by men of influence in government who seek a co-operative understanding with Moscow. Recalling that America once "preferred fighting pirates to bribing them" this diplomat goes on to discuss the whole matter objectively. He fears our attempts in buying off Cubans and Russians. Murphy's book with its charges of United States' blunders in dealing with Russia, constitutes one of the most sweeping criticisms of United States Policy in World War II, the Korean War, and the Cold War period. Rightly, he believes

the United States was bluffed out of victory in Korea and in Berlin. Murphy rose to under-secretary of state before his retirement in 1959. In fact, he was for years the foremost professional diplomat of the State Department. (A full account of Murphy's position on peaceful co-existence was given in the *Minneapolis Star*, Feb. 21, 1964)

When the United States had the full confrontation with the Soviet Union regarding Russian missiles in Cuba not long ago, there was a complete backing down by Krushchev. But unfortunately we failed to take advantage of a complete victory in Cuba which was within grasp. The concept of peaceful co-existence was so strong, however, that the President compromised our position with the results that we were denied a real victory. Actually our government manifested considerable concern in saving face for Krushchev who found himself in a real predicament. With co-existence continuing as a policy of those who are in charge of our foreign affairs, we may expect to see further communistic gains in many areas of the world. Let us not soon forget that Chamberlain and Delander who headed the British and French governments respectively in 1938 were firm believers in peaceful co-existence with Hitler and Mussolini. This policy became totally unworkable in the end. Communist leaders are not easier to deal with than those just mentioned. For a while peace-co-existence may work, but in the end it will prove disastrous to the free world.

#### **Co-Existence as a Christian Policy**

It is only natural that liberal leaders within the ecumenical movement should be found promoting a policy of co-existence. For several decades many of these leaders have worked feverishly to build the kingdom through the in-

genuity of church federations and a massive over-all church union. On Feb. 17th this year, O. Fredrick Nolde, head of the World Council of Churches' International Affairs Commission, called when in Moscow, for a "peaceful-co-existence between religion and atheism." He made no mention of the Soviet Union but urged that the right to conduct religious and anti-religious propaganda should be guaranteed to all. In early February, this year, the executive committee of the World Council of Churches was entertained in Odessa, Russia at a reception which featured Cuban cigars, caviar, cognac and champagne. Dr. Franklin Fry of New York, N. Y., explained at that gathering that the committee represented 200 church organizations from 80 countries. Pyotry Ivanhuk, a Russian government official, was present to wish the group success. He made it clear that he understood that the council's work was committed to peaceful, co-existence and disarmament. Later he led the group into a room overlooking Odessa harbor, where the cigars, cognac, champagne and chocolates were waiting. W. A. Visser't Hooft of the Netherlands, and secretary-general of the World Council of Churches put it in these words: "I found the reception was unusual, as the fact we have been permitted to meet here." (Minneapolis Star, Feb. 10, 1964).

It is understandable that peaceful co-existence as a religious and political policy should be pursued by people who believe men have the power to build the kingdom on earth. But it is much more difficult to understand how some evangelical leaders are being led into a policy of fraternization with those of the liberal persuasion in the Christian sphere. And those who practice and advocate the Biblical policy of "come-outism" and "separation" are the objects of rebuke by the self-appointed

leaders of the new concept of co-existence. Certain periodicals published by so-called conservative men frequently open their columns for discussions by such leaders as Bultmann and Barth. Their articles are placed alongside those of an evangelical persuasion. The theory is that a policy of rapprochement and generosity will serve the cause of Christianity. No doubt many of these leaders are sincere and want to do what is right. This is, however, a circumvention of the Scriptures, especially a point such as Amos makes, "Can two walk together, except they be agreed?" Those who practice this policy of co-existence must have forgotten the parable of the Arab and the camel. By exercising peaceful co-existence the Arab soon found no room when all of the camel moved into his tent. Recently a well known Protestant church featured a Roman Catholic priest speaking on penance during the Lenten period. This is one of the most extreme positions of co-existence demonstrated. While serving a demon as a teacher in another state. I saw at close range one of the largest and most historic of the churches within the state being taken over by the liberal wing of that particular denomination. Co-existence had been practiced, you see. It is not too uncommon these days to find certain churches inviting cult leaders to present their views. This is supposed to be helpful in the way of providing information. It nearly always has had very bad effects. Liberals gain advantages whenever evangelicals practice the spineless policy of co-existence. In 2 Cor. 6, Paul repudiates co-existence as a policy for believers. I am certain that the chapter applies in the current situation.

A position of non-coexistence does not imply the necessity of

(Cont. on page 10)

# MAY A CHRISTIAN BELIEVE IN ACADEMIC FREEDOM?

*Dr. Ernest Pickering*

*Central Conservative Baptist Theological Seminary  
Minneapolis, Minnesota*

In the public press recently there was published a letter from Professor Mulford Q. Sibley of the political science department, University of Minnesota. Among other things Sibley, arguing for academic freedom on university campuses, said, "If we don't sow seeds of doubt and implant subversive thoughts in college, when and where, in heaven's name (if there be a heaven), will they be implanted?" In other words, to this professor academic freedom consists of the right to implant subversive thoughts in impressionable minds. He went on to say,

We need students who will challenge the orthodoxies. American culture is far too monolithic for its own good. Personally, I would like to see on the campus one or two Communist professors, a student Communist Club, a chapter of the American Association for the Advancement of Atheism, a Society for the Promotion of Free Love, A League for the Overthrow of Government by Jeffersonian Violence (LOGJU), and Anti-Automation League and perhaps, a Nudist Club. No university should be without individuals and groups like these.

To many professors the words of Sibley would be viewed as extreme and yet there is represented here a sharp picture of ideas concerning academic freedom being presented today to the youth of the world. Unfortunately, many Christian young people, lacking maturity and proper grounding in the faith, are influenced by those who present a false concept of academic freedom.

## **I. Some Guiding Principles Influencing Much Contemporary Secular Education**

Academic freedom is generally thought of as the right to the unfettered pursuit of truth in the various fields of learning. One must realize, however, certain principles which underlie much of the contemporary educational philosophy. While it is true that under the sharp criticism of some discerning scholars these principles are being re-examined in a more critical light, it is also true that they still are guides to the average teacher today who has been indoctrinated with them in the course of preparation for the teaching vocation.

Under the influence of John Dewey and his associates the theory of evolution was adapted to the field of education, creating an entirely new philosophy of teaching. While some of Dewey's ideas have been rejected by current authorities in the field, and while others have been modified, certain important ideas remain. Many modern educators operate upon the presupposition that there is no fixed truth. This is a logical deduction based upon the premise of evolution. Everything in the universe is in flux, including ideas and philosophies. From this thought stems the concept of education today that learning is better accomplished by "doing" than by "rote memory" (as some like to call it). Hence the modern classroom is a beehive of activity—sandboxes, projects, field trips, films, 'show and tell' times, and other similar efforts. The child is expected to learn to read by reading words, that is, by sighting or recognizing them. This is to remove the drudgery from learn-

ing, make it "exciting," "relevant to life," and "challenging." Whether or not the modern child is better educated than his predecessors is open to considerable debate. The main point to emphasize is this—if there is no fixed truth then true learning becomes a morass of human opinions, each competing with each other.

The general tenor of modern education reveals a rejection of the concept of orthodox Christianity that God has revealed Himself in a special way. Many college and university professors accept some concept of God, but do not believe in: (1) a personal, trinitarian God, nor (2) a God of redemption, revelation, and providence. In an interesting survey on some key college campuses recently (1963) the *National Review* published an extensive analysis of their findings (October 8, 1963). Among other things they found that "barely more than 40 percent of all students tested affirm a God Who is capable of exercising an effect on the course of their lives . . ."

Undergirding many misconceptions of the nature of academic freedom is the notion that all ideas are to be considered equally. This naturally follows if one rejects a personal God as the source of all truth, rejects the knowable revelation of such a Being, and refuses to accept any written communication from such a Being as a standard for truth. If God has not revealed truth, then one idea is as worthy of consideration as another. Education, then, becomes a matter of weighing all the various ideas of men and endeavoring to find the ones most relevant and most workable. According to this we should consider the system of Communism equally with the concept of the free enterprise system. Unfortunately for the life of our country, this is exactly the view that is taken on many university campuses.

If the above-going principles are in any measure adopted, one's concept of ethics becomes greatly weakened. To many modern educators ethics are relative, largely a result of social custom and the interaction of various forces in the evolutionary process. Many modern sociologists and psychologists deny any basic, fixed standards of morality. One student, in writing an article on "What I Learned About Ethics in College," said, "Morality is merely a formulation of the practices which were accidentally hit upon by a group of animals . . . Ethics or right conduct is that which tends to human happiness." Various quotations could be given to demonstrate the fact that professors often reject such a basic Christian ethic as monogamy, advocating in its place some type of free love.

Loquacious defenders of liberal views of academic freedom will, more often than not, be found to be deniers of the basic truths of the Christian faith. In the survey by *National Review* referred to earlier, a shockingly high percentage of students on the campuses of the colleges and universities represented, were found to repudiate basic doctrines of Christianity. The article states in summary:

1. Vast numbers of students who consider themselves Christians reject a central belief of Christianity 'the idea of God becoming flesh! . . . At Davidson College—a Southern school affiliated with Presbyterianism—half of the student body rejects this, the central tenet of Christianity!

2. Even fewer students are willing to say: 'I believe literally in the Gospel account of Jesus' resurrection as an historical event which occurred as concretely as Lincoln's assassination . . . (*National Review*, October, 1963, p. 293).

What is to be made out of this? Evidently many modern educators believe it an expression of academ-

ic freedom to propogate ideas which contradict the Christian faith, and thus destroy such faith in the minds and hearts of their students.

In conclusion, it should be pointed out that much that is in the modern system of education is built on the theory that the main aim of education is that of "life-adjustment." For this reason, the older grading system has been abandoned, particularly in the lower grades, and the only indication of grade is "satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory." Care must be given, say educators, not to embarrass the child with a poor grade. Children who have not grasped the work are passed along from grade to grade and finally graduated and woe betide the teacher who interrupts this process! The children must learn to adjust to life and society, get along with their neighbors, and in general be well-integrated persons. Whether or not they know American history or English literature is a secondary matter.

## II. Some False Concepts of Academic Freedom which have been accepted by certain Evangelical scholars.

While the ideas presented above would only be accepted in their fulness by unbelieving scholars, yet Christian scholars are sometimes influenced by the secular academic world to such an extent that they, wittingly or unwittingly, adopt erroneous principles. For instance, some evangelicals feel that included in the realm of academic freedom is the right, and obligation, to have rapport with unbelieving scholars (particularly in the realm of theology and related subjects). The evangelical scholar, if he accepts this idea, would seek to join in discussions, interchanges, and other forms of intellectual fraternization with non-evangelicals. Such fellowship,

of course, to have what some feel is "integrity" and "respectability," must be done with the thought that the unbeliever *has something to contribute to the evangelical*. Now while it is true that an unbeliever may be equal to, or superior to, the evangelical scholar in realms such as physics, chemistry, biology, etc., it is also true that in the realm of theology and related subjects the unbeliever cannot make a spiritual contribution because he does not possess the Spirit of God who is the only Teacher of divine truth. We cannot be edified by blasphemers of the faith.

Some evangelicals have also fallen prey to the idea that it is an expression of academic freedom to invite representatives of erroneous systems to a professedly Christian campus in order to present their errors in person. Some Christian schools, for this reason, have invited liberals, neo-orthodox scholars, Catholics, Jews, Communists and Socialists to their campuses in order to expose their students to these systems in the name of academic freedom. Much ado is made over the notion that these students must learn to be mature thinkers, independent researchers, and must develop their convictions by personal confrontation with those who hold various views. Much of this is rooted in the concept of modern education that learning is through personal participation rather than by the dogmatic teaching of truth and error. Those who maintain that the truth is to be clearly taught and error clearly repudiated are referred to as "legalists," "indocctrinators," or perhaps advocates of a "rigid intellectualism." But the Lord Jesus Christ, the greatest teacher who ever lived, indocctrinated. He did not spread an intellectual smorgasbord and invite his hearers to partake according to their choice.



Some evangelical educators feel that true teaching is not indoctrination, but the presentation of various views for evaluation by the student. One professor of theology remarked on one occasion that he taught eschatology in such a way that his students did not know what he himself believed. He presented all sides of the questions and left the students to make their choice. According to the Word of God, this is not teaching. Teaching, from a Christian standpoint, is the explanation, elucidation and, we trust, impartation, of the truth to the mind and heart of the pupil.

### III. Suggested Guidelines for a Christian Approach to Academic Freedom

A teacher, if he is to be worthy of his calling, is not free to teach *anything* as if it might be valid. He is bound by truth. What is truth? This is a vital question for a teacher regardless of his subject. If he holds to a system of thought which rejects the validity of fixed, eternal truth, he cannot be a genuine and effective teacher. He may be masterful at presenting his material, but effective presentation does not mean he is a genuine teacher. There are some points where there may be cause for legitimate debate or discussion. But academic freedom, rightly understood, does not allow promiscuity in teaching.

Certainly a Christian is not free to present theories as possible live options which contradict the doctrines or principles set forth in the Word of God. Some contemporary evangelical theologians, for instance, hold to the so-called "double revelation theory," maintaining that God has revealed Himself in nature and in the Bible and that we must make the two agree in our system. They view God's revelation in nature as equal to His revelation in the Bible, where-

as the proper view is that God's special revelation in the Bible should govern our interpretations of His general revelation in nature. The Bible, therefore, sits in judgment on all scientific theories. We do not have to accommodate the Bible to the scientific theories. But some evangelicals feel that in the name of academic freedom they are "free" to reject certain clear truths presented in the Scriptures because they *seem* to clash with modern scientific theories. In other words, they feel they are free to reinterpret the Word of God to coincide with the latest guesses of science, and that Christian institutions should pay them for this display of their academic freedom.

Mention already has been made of the fact that some professing Christian institutions have advocated, and in some cases permitted, the presence on their campuses of Communists or Communist-fronters, allowing them to speak to public assemblies. How an institution calling itself Christian could permit such things is a puzzle to many. Persons desiring to learn about Communism can learn more in a few hours of careful reading than they will ever learn from listening to the double-talk of Communists and their sympathizers. Some Christian schools, however, feel that they are obligated to earn and maintain respect in the academic world by demonstrating that they are very "broad-minded" and intellectually "honest" by permitting such ambassadors of evil to appear. It should be clearly discerned by an examination of the New Testament that Christian education includes the direct, specific, and uncompromising repudiation of error, and no where instructs us that we are to give error a "fair hearing" before pronouncing judgment upon it.

The Christian student or scholar is free to pursue knowledge in

every area, *but he is bound by the Word of God in so doing.* Academic freedom does not include the right to question the accuracy of the Word of God on subjects concerning which it plainly speaks. Nor does it include the privilege of denying the inspiration of the Word of God under the guise of "interpretation." Some evangelical scholars are denying plain and vital teachings of the Bible, excusing their unbelief as simply a "variant interpretation" when in real-

ity it is a denial of inspiration.

A list of great Christian scholars in all fields of learning would be impressive and could be readily compiled. These men did not feel "hemmed in" by their Christian faith. To the contrary, their faith gave meaning to, and a framework for, their pursuit of knowledge. "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." "If the Son make you free, ye shall be free indeed."

---

(Cont. from page 5)

becoming harsh or unbrotherly, nor a seeking to splinter religious bodies for the sake of splintering as an end in itself. There obviously must be room for shades and variations of theological interpretations and practices involving believers.

But there should be no attempt, however, in practicing co-existence between those who accept the authority and the infallibility of the Scriptures with those who deny the fundamentals of the Christian faith. Personally, I have conducted scores of services and fellowshipped with groups representing many denominational bodies, and I will continue to do so. However, I have not knowingly practiced any sort of co-existence or co-operation and fraternization with those who have rationalized the Bible, and who have set aside the divine injunction concerning separation. The minimum requirement for Christian fellowship and co-operative activities, is the unreserved acknowledgement of the fundamentals of the historic faith by those involved. I grant, that separation may be a lonely road at times, but it is the Scriptural way of maintaining an effective testimony.

---

## Listings from our Catalog

(Add 10% for mailing  
on orders up to \$5.)

1. CHRISTIANITY AND LIBERALISM, by J. G. Machen. It deals with Doctrines, God and man; The Bible; Christ; Salvation and the Church. Cloth, 190 pages, \$2.50.
2. THE BIBLE ITS CHRIST AND MODERNISM, by T. J. McCrossan. 215 pages, cloth, \$2.50. (A very interesting book).
3. NEO-ORTHODOXY, by Charles C. Ryrie. What it is, and what it does. 62 pages, 75¢.
4. AN EXAMINATION OF THE TEACHINGS OF MODERNISM, by Lehmann Strauss. 48 pages, 40¢.
5. THE CASE AGAINST THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES, by Chester E. Tulga. 60 pages, 35¢.
6. THE CASE FOR DIVINE REVELATION, by Chester E. Tulga. 64 pages, 35¢.
7. IS JESUS GOD? by Dr. John R. Rice. An answer to infidels in the church and out. 207 pages, cloth, \$3.
8. CHRISTIANITY IS CHRIST, by W. H. Griffith Thomas. It deals with the fact of Christ, His character; Claims; Teachings; Miracles; Death; Resurrection; His gospel, etc. 161 pages, cloth, \$2. Cont. on p. 15

## THE IDOL OF INTELLECTUALISM

*C. Victor Nyquist, Pastor  
Park Avenue Covenant Church  
Minneapolis, Minnesota*

A number of years ago there appeared an article in "Christianity Today" (Oct. 13, 1961) with the caption "Scholars' Panel Identifies Contemporary Idols." Outstanding Christian leaders from both Europe and America expressed quite freely their opinions as to what "deities" are menacing our world today. They ran the gamut from secularism and sex to self-indulgence and status-symbols. We are in full agreement with the majority of these reactions, but they could easily have added one more, one which in a very definite sense is not only an idol in itself, but is the progenitor of this entire unholy brood.

It isn't exactly a modern concoction. Satan whispered it into Eve's gullible ear in the Garden of Eden. First there was the sinister enquiry, "Yea, hath God said?", and then there was the subtle encouragement, "Your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil", you will become mental giants, not needing God, and not needing a Divine Revelation. Dr. G. Campbell Morgan in his "The Corinthian Letters of Paul", commenting on the "wisdom of words" which had become such a plague to that church, quotes his colleague, Dr. Lloyd Jones, now his successor in the Westminster Chapel in London, as saying, that "the whole drift towards modernism that had blighted the Church of God and nearly destroyed its living Gospel may be traced to an hour when men began to turn from revelation to philosophy", and then goes on to say, "Although my friend was referring to what may be described as certainly a recent movement of fifty or sixty years ago, here it is seen in its beginning. In

this respect also there is nothing new under the sun. That is one reason why I do not like to call it modernism. It is an ancient antique that is being dug up! It is all here, and it all comes to this: the difference between the wisdom that results from what is known as philosophy and the wisdom or philosophy that is built upon Divine revelation" (Pp.30,31).

It was back in the 17th and 18th centuries that it began to raise its ugly head in the philosophy of "Deism", a peculiar form of unbelief that sought to produce a philosophy of religion independently of a Divine revelation. It placed human reason above the Scriptures, and refused to accept anything that did not come within its comprehensions. It made rationality the measure of credibility. Dr. A. H. Newman, the Baptist church historian, writes, "It well-nigh wrecked the religious thought and life of England, exerted a profound influence on the men who became leaders of skeptical thought in France and propagated it in other European countries, and along with French skeptical influence, produced a deep lasting impression on Dutch and German thought during the middle years of the eighteenth century" ("A Manual of Church History," Vol. II, p. 634).

Dr. Philip Schaff, the Presbyterian church historian, remarks, "The Reformation, it is said, took the first step in the emancipation of reason: it freed us from the tyranny of the church. Rationalism took the second step: it freed us from the tyranny of the Bible!". He then goes on to quote Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, known as "the Father of German Criticism", as saying, "Luther, thou great, mis-

judged man! Thou hast redeemed us from the yoke of tradition: who will redeem us from the unbearable yoke of the letter!" (Referring to the literal interpretation of the Word of God!) (History of the Christian Church, Vol. VII, p. 27). Dr. Elgin Moyer in his "Who Was Who in Church History", speaks of Lessing as one "in sympathy with a lofty and tolerant Christianity", and that "his views stood in striking contrast to the old religious philosophy", and that it was he that laid the "foundations of the Protestant liberalism that was to hold sway in Germany throughout the nineteenth century" (p.248).

This is the "Idol of Intellectualism", the spirit of rationalism, that is being slavishly followed in most of our colleges and seminaries today. With the pen-knife of human reason these modern Jehoiakims are cutting into shreds the sacred scrolls of God, and throwing the mutilated remnants upon their own man-made altar-fires.

And we might add with propriety that this is the root of all "isms". When men follow their own limited reasoning they inevitably end up with all kinds of vagaries. "There is a way which seemeth right to a man and appears straight before him, but the end of it is the ways of death" (Prov. 14:12, Amp. O.T.).

What are the symptoms of this "Intellectualism?" *Carnal Callousness! Carnal Conceit! Carnal Compromise!*

Our Lord was angered at the "hardness" of the hearts of the Pharisees (Mark 3:5). The Apostle Paul wrote concerning the "blindness" of men relative to the light of the Gospel (II Cor. 4:4; Eph. 4:18). The Greek word used in these instances is "porosis". W.E. Vine in his "Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words" defines it as a term that "denotes a hardening, a covering with a *poros*, a

kind of stone, indicating a process". Paul puts it rather eloquently in Eph. 4:19, "Who being past feeling have given themselves over to lasciviousness, to work all uncleanness with greediness". It was Dr. Charles Hodge that wrote, "The soul in its natural state cannot discern the things of God, therefore it does not know them, therefore the heart is hard".

It is, therefore, not surprising to read that Thomas Edison, a giant in intellect, made the statement, that, "A personal God means absolutely nothing to me. I have never seen the slightest scientific proof of a heaven and hell, of future life, or of a personal God!". The human heart is constitutionally darkened, calloused by sin.

The consummate arrogance of these professed intellectuals is astounding. They sit unabashed and unblushing as judges of the Scriptures. They are not afraid to insinuate that our Lord was both deceived and deceptive in His teachings concerning Moses (John 5:45-47), and Isaiah (John 12:39-41), and Daniel (Matt. 24:15). Dr. John Owen, one of England's most distinguished Puritan divines, analyzed it well, when he wrote, "The innate pride and vanity of the minds of men is another means whereby they are disposed and inclined unto an apostasy from the profession of the evangelical faith . . . In all things the mind of man would be its own measure, guide, and rule . . . It makes itself the sole and absolute judge of what is divinely proposed unto it, whether it be true or false, good or evil, to be received or rejected, without desire or expectation of any super-natural guidance or assistance; and whatever is unsuited unto its own prejudicate imaginations, it is ready to scorn and despise" (Quoted by Wilbur M. Smith, "Therefore, Stand", p. 153).

In fact, they seem to delight in finding "error." The psalmist hunt-

ed for the "gold of the Word"; these hunt for the "garbage," and shout their "eureka" with glee whenever anything is uncovered, which from their point of view further proves the fallibility of the sacred text. If one dares to suggest to them that there are reasonable explanations for these seeming inconsistencies, one is immediately laughed out of court as being unschooled, unread, and naive.

One of the reigning weaknesses of the Christian Church has been the attitude that "if you can't lick them, join them!" We have been so anxious to be accepted by an unbelieving world that we have lowered more than one standard. We have called it brotherliness, expediency, and fair-mindedness. We have even dared to call it the "spirit of Christ." But in God's sight it has been an unholy alliance. Instead of being dressed in garments of pure white, we have mixed in the black until our raiment is a dirty gray. "Ephraim, he hath mixed himself among the people . . . Strangers have devoured his strength" (Hos. 7:8, 9).

What are the tragic results?

*Increased Callousness! Increased Confusion! Increased Corruption!*

Dr. Wilbur M. Smith, that giant of present-day Biblical apologists, in his classical study, "Therefore, Stand," writes, "It is sometimes difficult to distinguish between the *causes* for unbelief, *manifestations* of unbelief, and the results proceeding from unbelief" (p. 142). To feed constantly on the things of doubt and skepticism is bound to lead us deeper into carnal callousness. Shailer Matthews, who for years was actively connected with the University of Chicago Divinity School both as professor and as dean, wrote a book at his retirement entitled "New Faith for Old—An Autobiography." The first

chapters speak of the deep spiritual influences that made abiding impressions upon him. He writes, "It was while I was a boy in high school that the wave of evangelism inaugurated by Dwight L. Moody swept across New England. These evangelists were not as commercial as some of their successors but their theology was that of orthodoxy; in many cases committed to premillennarianism. George C. Needham conducted in 1877 a series of largely attended revival meetings in the city of Portland and one phase of the revival was the meetings for boys. A number of boys of high school age, among them myself, became members of the church" (P. 12). He speaks further of his earlier years as a Sunday School teacher, a youth leader, and a seminary student. He moved gradually, step by step, into the rationalistic camp. It proposes to be a pilgrimage into the light. It is factually a journey into night. In the very last paragraph in his book he speaks of deity as "that cosmic activity we know as God!"

That there should be confusion in so-called Christian circles is self-evident. "For if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself unto battle?" (I Cor. 14:8). We have lost our "Thus saith the Lord," and have put into its place "Thus saith the intellectuals!" We have substituted the wisdom of men for the wisdom of God. We have become critics of the Word instead of permitting the Word to criticize us (Heb. 4:12). And lawlessness stalks uncurbed throughout the earth. Dr. Timothy Dwight, president of Yale University from 1795 until his death in 1817, describes what he found at his arrival at the school; "Youths particularly who had been liberally educated, and who, with strong passions and feeble principles, were votaries of sensuality and ambition, delighted in the prospect of unrestrained gratification, and, panting to be enrolled with men

of passion and splendor, became enamored with the new doctrines . . . Revelation was found to be without authority or evidence, and moral obligation a cobweb which might indeed entangle flies, but by which creatures with stronger wing nobly disdained to be confined . . . As, therefore, animal pleasure is the only happiness, so they resolved that the enjoyment of that pleasure is the only end of his creation" (Timothy Dwight, "Travels," Vol. IV., pp. 376, 379, 380). Although this was written over a century and a half ago it is a perfect commentary on the conditions of our own age.

What is the proper antidote for "Intellectualism"? Ignorance? By no means! We need our higher education, but we need more a higher enlightenment. John Calvin was very much to the point when he wrote, "The testimony of the Spirit is more excellent than all reason. For as God alone is a fit witness of himself in his Word, so also the Word will not find acceptance in men's hearts before it is sealed by the inward testimony of the Spirit. The same Spirit, therefore, who has spoken through the mouths of the prophets must penetrate into our hearts to persuade us that they faithfully proclaimed what had been divinely commanded. Isaiah very aptly expresses this connection in these words: "'My Spirit which is in you, and the words that I have put in your mouth, and the mouth of your offspring, shall never fail.' Some good folk are annoyed that a clear proof is not ready at hand when the impious, unpunished, murmur against God's Word. As if the Spirit were not

called both 'seal' and 'guarantee' for confirming the faith of the godly; because until he illumines their minds, they ever waver among many doubts!" (Keesecker, "A Calvin Treasury," Pp. 56, 57). This is what Dr. Bernard Ramm so aptly calls "The Testimonium" ("The Witness of the Spirit", P. 12 etc.) The late Dr. A. W. Tozer, one of our generation's most astute Christian thinkers, wrote, "Through the light of nature man's moral reason may be enlightened, but the deeper mysteries of God remain hidden to him until he has received illumination from above. 'But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.' When the Spirit illuminates the heart, then a part of the man sees, which never saw before; a part of him knows which never knew before, and that with a kind of knowing which the most acute thinker cannot imitate. He knows now in a deep and authoritative way, and what he knows needs no reasoned proof. His experience of knowing is above reason, immediate, perfectly convincing and inwardly satisfying" (The Divine Conquest," Pp. 77,78).

This is the only Scriptural answer. It is the only satisfying answer.

"The Spirit breathes upon the Word.  
And brings the truth to sight;  
Precepts and promises afford  
A sanctifying light"

—William Cowper

---

NOTE—Rev. George Darby, a valuable member of our Board and the Editorial Committee has moved to Kansas City after many fruitful years at the Calvary Memorial Church at Navarre, near Mound, Minn. He has done much to help our agency, and we hope he will be able to give us help and counsel while now at a more distant locality.

# COMMUNIST RETREAT TO VICTORY

James D. Bales, Ph.D.  
Harding College, Searcy, Ark.

There are those who think that the Communists have undergone a change of heart when they have simply changed their tactics without changing their goal of world conquest. When Communists indicate that they are willing to enter into agreements with non-Communists, some think that a new day of cooperation has arrived and that the era of brotherhood may not be far away.

When the Communists retreat, the prophets of the mellowing of communism are again heard in the land. The fact of the matter is that both Communist theory and history show that all sorts of turns, twists and retreats are but a part of their struggle for victory. If a robber seizes two million dollars and returns one million has he ceased to be a robber? If an aggressor advances one hundred miles and finds that he has over-extended himself, has he ceased to be an aggressor because he re-groups his forces at the 50-mile line?

How long will people be deceived by their wishes and by their ideological illusion? How long will it take them to learn the meaning of the following statement of Lenin, which was quoted by Stalin in a book currently emphasized by Communists?

"To carry on a war for the overthrow of the international bourgeoisie," says Lenin, "a war which is a hundred times more difficult, protracted and complicated than the most stubborn of ordinary wars between states, and to refuse beforehand to maneuver, to utilize the conflict of interests (even though temporary) among one's enemies, to refuse to temporize and compromise with possible (even though transient, unstable, vacillating and conditional) allies — is not this ridiculous in the ex-

treme? Is it not the same as if in the difficult ascent of an unexplored and heretofore inaccessible mountain we were to renounce beforehand the idea that at times we might have to go in zigzags, sometimes retracting our steps, sometimes giving up the course once selected and trying various others?"

Unless we keep in mind this statement of Lenin, or similar statements by other Communists, we shall be so deceived by their "retreats" and zags that we shall end up in slavery with time to meditate on how easily we were deceived by the Communists in spite of the fact that they make clear their strategy and tactics both in their writings and in their actions.

Taken from *Christian Economics*  
Jan. 21, 1964

---

## Listings from page 10:

9. Communism, Its Faith and Fallacies, by Dr. James D. Bales. This logical and documented book is one of the best on this subject. 214 pages, \$3.95.
10. COMMUNISM IN OUR CHURCHES, by J. B. Mathews (Former Chief Investigator for the House of Representatives Committee on Un-American Activities in the U.S.). 24 pages, 10¢.
11. COMMUNISM AND RUSSIA IN BIBLE PROPHECY, Lehman Strauss. A Major World Problem; Communism Dethrones God, Deifies Man; The Christian's Hope. 40 pages, 35¢.
12. THE HEART, MIND AND SOUL OF COMMUNISM, Dr. Fred Schwarz. Communism and Atheism; End of Capitalism; Dictatorship; Liquidation of Social Classes; Labor Camps; Mass Re-education. What can I do? 30 pages, good print, 50¢.

RELIGION ANALYSIS SERVICE, INC.  
902 Hennepin Avenue  
Minneapolis 3, Minnesota

Return Requested

## PERTINENT QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

*By Pastor "Mac" McIlmoy  
Powderhorn Park Baptist Church of Minneapolis*

Question . . . *What is the meaning of the "total depravity" of man?*

Answer . . . First of all, by depravity we mean man's want of original righteousness and of holy affections toward God, and also the corruption of his moral nature and his bias toward evil. Its existence is easily seen from both Scripture and human experience. The teaching of Scripture that ALL men must be born again shows the universality of its existence.

The doctrine of "total depravity" has been misunderstood and misinterpreted by many. From the negative viewpoint, it does not mean that every sinner is devoid of ALL qualities pleasing to men; that he commits, or is prone to every form of sin; that he is as bitterly opposed to God as it is possible for him to be. Traces of man's original condition are occasionally seen: Jesus recognized the existence of pleasing qualities in some individuals (Mark 10:21); He said that the scribes and Pharisees did some things God commanded (Matt. 23:23); Paul asserted that some Gentiles "did by nature the things of the law" (Rom. 2:14); God told Abraham that the iniquity of the Amorites would grow worse (Gen. 15:16); and Paul says that "evil men and imposters shall wax worse and worse" (2 Tim. 3:13).

From the positive viewpoint, it does mean that every sinner is totally destitute of that love to God which is the fundamental requirement of the law (Deut. 6:4,5; Matt. 22:35-38); that he is supremely given to a preference of himself to God (2 Tim. 3:4); that he has an aversion to God which on occasion becomes active enmity to Him (Rom. 8:7); that his every faculty is disordered and corrupted (Eph. 4:18); that he has no thought, feeling, or deed of which God can fully approve (Rom. 7:18); and that he has entered upon a line of constant progress in depravity, from which he can in no wise turn away in his own strength (Rom. 7:18). Thank God that the grace and Spirit of God are ready to enable men to repent and believe in Jesus Christ unto salvation!