

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

The
DISCERNER

AN
INTERDENOMINATIONAL
HERESY-EXPOSING
QUARTERLY

Volume VI

Number 7

2. HAS THE END-TIME APOSTACY ARRIVED?
4. THE NEW EVANGELICALS — BYSTANDERS OF THE FAITH.
11. AN AMERICAN PLEADS — "NOT GUILTY."
15. BOOK REVIEW
16. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

July—Sept. 1969

CONTENTS

The DISCERNER

Published Quarterly
Price \$1.00 for 4 issues;
\$3.00 for 12 issues.
30 cents a copy; for foreign
subscriptions add 6 cents per issue.
Copyright 1969 by Religion Analysis Service, Inc.
902 Hennepin Avenue, Minneapolis, Minn. 55403
Printed in the United States

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

John E. Dahlin, *Chairman*

Rev. John Bellshaw

Rev. Clifford Holm

HAS THE END-TIME APOSTASY ARRIVED?

Prof. John E. Dahlin

Every careful student of Prophecy will find an amazing correlation of contemporary events with the New Testament predictions. Despite the clear teaching of the Word of God in this regard, many present-day religious leaders, even evangelists, are frantically casting about for some magic formula by which they hope to evangelize the world in this generation. Optimistic reports are given these days about certain organizations which are endeavoring to overcome the greatest apostasy in the history of Christianity. It is unrealistic, however, in seeking to circumvent or set aside a dispensational situation revealed in the Scriptures pertaining to the end-time. Our Lord said "The Scripture cannot be broken."

THE BIBLICAL REVELATION ON THE APOSTASY

With reference to the time of Christ's return, the Lord pointed out, "As it was in the days of Noah, so shall it be also in the days of the Son of Man" (Luke 17:26). Christ referred to a great historical analogy, that is, a repetition of Noah's days. Those were days of materialism, immorality, and a spiritual declension of the entire generation. And, the Lord provided additional information on the matter, when he said, "Also as it was in the days of Lot; they did eat, they drank, they bought, they sold, they planted, they built; But the same day Lot went out of Sodom, it rained fire and brimstone from heaven, and destroyed them all. Even

thus shall it be in the day when the Son of Man is revealed" (Luke 17:28-30). The context indicates that violence on earth was unprecedented in those days, and a moral rot had permeated that whole generation. Any fair-minded student of contemporary life must concede that Noah's days, and Lot's time are being repeated, and that this generation is guilty of the very same sins which brought about the fearful judgment described. In the following chapter, our Lord brought to a climax his discussion and He used these words: "When the Son of Man cometh shall He find faith on the earth?" (Luke 18:8). As Christ looked down the corridor of time He envisioned no sweeping revival or a universal turning to God by multitudes of people. On the other hand, He depicted the scarcity of faith as a dominant characteristic as the age draws to a close. This is precisely what Paul mentions as e.g., "Now the spirit speaketh expressly that, in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of demons" (I Tim. 4:1). In his final letter the apostle writes, "This know also in the latter days perilous times shall come" (II Tim. 3:1). And in the next chapter the apostle declares, "For the time will come when they shall not endure sound doctrine but, after their own lusts they shall heap to themselves, teachers having itching ears, and they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall

be turned unto fables" (II Tim. 4:3-4). Moreover, to the Thessalonians Paul refers to the "falling away" or the great apostasy which will precede the Lords return. (See II Thess. 2:3-12). Other New Testament writers also predict uniformly that apostate conditions will dominate the earthly arena at the time when the age draws to a close. Despite this clear New Testament verdict, prominent personalities in the religious sphere of our day seek to rationalize their hope for a massive spiritual conquest by raising such questions as these: Doesn't God always hear prayer and respond to the yearnings of His people? And, don't we have the promise "Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, today, and forever?" It should be pointed out that these blessed promises must be placed in the proper context or relationships. What God has announced or decreed cannot be altered or reversed. To illustrate, Moses prayed and pleaded for the opportunity of entering the Land of Promise. God responded to Moses, however, in these words, "Speak no more unto me of this matter" (Deut. 3:26). The prayer of Moses remained unanswered because God had determined that Moses could not enter the Land because he had failed to honor God before all the people at a very important moment. God's prophetic declarations cannot be altered despite all human desires for a different course.

THE GREAT APOSTASY OF THIS GENERATION

It is altogether true that dark ages have characterized certain past centuries. But in those epochs of history, there had been no general enlightenment and spiritual impact such as most of the western world has experienced in later centuries. Following the darkness of the medieval times came the pietistic movement, the great awakening and revival periods in Europe and America. And, the extensive home and foreign missionary

movements are well known developments during the last two centuries. In addition, the Word of God was recognized as authoritative in all matters of life and conduct. A complete reversal has come about in recent decades. Rejection of Biblical authority is becoming a standard position of denominations. Former theological institutions, known as citadels of faith, have been honey-combed with liberalism. Other institutions of the church, as well as leading publications, have embraced the new theology, and many are quite willing to accept the new morality. Compromise and accommodation are being witnessed on every hand. Certain denominations have yielded to blackmail and voted to pay reparations and huge sums to meet demands of minority pressure groups. Major denominations have passed resolutions manifesting defiance of the course charted by the government. Aid and comfort have been given to draft evaders and lawless elements. Sponsors of demonstrations and opposition programs of law and order have been eulogized. Divorce, pre-marital relations, and abortion are being widely considered as acceptable steps by religious spokesmen. Dancing in formerly well known Christian institutions have been given clearance quite generally. Social drinking has been given status and respectability. The social aspects of the Gospel have been given precedence over the message of redemption. Enormous effort and energies are being expended by the church in general with the purpose of providing social and economic panaceas. True witnessing and winning of people to Christ are matters nearly completely neglected by the religious majority. The separation of believers from the world is being abandoned more and more. Dialogues and discussions with liberals are popularized. The historical dignity and high quality of music in the churches have been frequently substituted with

popular and cheap music with tunes and arrangements borrowed from the world. Along the whole front apostasy is sweeping through. The Biblical principle of "going outside the camp bearing His reproach" is now regarded as irrelevant and unnecessary. Statistics and numbers are becoming increasingly important. Denomination-

al mergers and ecumenical activities seem to be uppermost in the thoughts of those who lead the largest religious bodies of our time. The form of godliness is retained, but the power thereof is absent. We are witnessing a clear parallel with the New Testament presentation concerning the end-time apostasy. It has arrived.

THE NEW EVANGELICALS — BYSTANDERS OF THE FAITH

By Dr. Robert Lightner of the Dallas Theological Seminary

About fifty years ago the Christian community was startled by two great events. One of these events—World War I—was political in nature, and it disproved the naive belief that the world was getting better and that the dream of a utopia was about to be realized. Thus, too, the old liberal ideas of the inherent goodness of man and of his native abilities to save himself were shattered. The other event—the introduction of Karl Barth's neo-orthodoxy—was religious in nature served to underscore further the failures of the old modernism. Neo-orthodoxy claimed and still claims to be a return to the theology of the reformers. However, even a cursory examination of the system will demonstrate that it is neither new nor orthodox. Though neo-orthodoxy strongly criticized the old liberal school of thought, yet it built its own system of theology on the very same premise—the rejection of the Bible as the only verbally inerrant rule of faith and practice.

The introduction of neo-orthodoxy into the theological scene served to produce a response both on the part of the liberals and on the part of the fundamentalists. The liberals reacted by acknowledging some of their own failures and extremes and by introducing what has come to be known as neo-liberalism. This contemporary liberal approach has, without question, retained what its proponents call "the values" of old liberalism. By this is meant, at least in part, the higher

critical view of the Scriptures. Neo-liberalism has likewise been so influenced by neo-orthodoxy that today it is very difficult to separate the theology of the one from the theology of the other.

But the liberals were not the only ones who responded to the neo-orthodox bombshell. Fundamentalists also responded to both neo-orthodoxy and neo-liberalism. Some fundamentalists viewed these new forms of unbelief as Gresham Machen viewed the modernism of his day. Machen in his classic book, *Christianity and Liberalism*, presented the issue with crystal clarity. Said he, Christianity is one religion and liberalism is another religion. His whole thesis was that liberalism should not be viewed as a form of Christianity, not even a weak and watered down form of it. Rather, it must be viewed as anti-Christian and as another gospel entirely foreign to the Christ and the Christianity of the Bible.

Now, if all fundamentalists or, if you wish, evangelicals, had responded in this way, the present scene would be very much different, and it would also be very much easier for Bible-believing Christians to carry out the God-ordained commission of the church. Had this been the case, there would still be today the two great camps that existed before ever there was a neo-orthodoxy or a neo-liberalism. But instead of this, the religious scene has been further divided by the introduction of those who wish to

occupy a position which is characteristically midway between that of the liberal and that of the fundamentalist.

This view has been labeled by its founding father, Dr. Harold John Ockenga, as "the new evangelicalism." He states that the term was coined at Fuller Theological Seminary in a convocation address in 1948. Ten years later he stated further, "The new evangelicalism breaks with . . . three movements. The new evangelicalism breaks first with neo-orthodoxy because it declares that it accepts the authority of the Bible . . . He (the new evangelical) breaks with the modernist, however, in reference to his embrace of the full orthodox system of doctrine against that which the modernist has accepted. He breaks with the fundamentalist on the fact that he believes that the Biblical teaching, the Bible doctrine and ethics, must apply to the social scene, that there must be an application of this to society as much as there is an application of it to the individual man" (*The Park Street Spire*, February, 1958).

The dissatisfaction of these, former fundamentalists, who initially wanted to be called "neo" or "new evangelicals" but who now seem to prefer the simple term "evangelical," have been variously expressed. Usually, however, they all say essentially the same thing—too much insistence on "the fundamentals," borrowed academic strength, intellectual stagnation, tendency toward anti-denominationalism, emphasis upon premillennial dispensationalism, failure to win in the modernist-fundamentalist controversy, and lack of social concern. For these and other reasons the new evangelicals wishes to abandon the fundamentalist ship. Thus to be called a fundamentalist today would, in the minds of some be quite a stigma. A Fundamentalist is about as outdated as high buckle shoes.

The new evangelical mood is articulated through various means and is present in many quarters today.

The founding father claimed Fuller Theological Seminary, Evangelist Billy Graham, and *Christianity Today* among other things as representatives of the new evangelicalism from the very beginning. Presently there are many more voices promoting this position. Surely, the stated aims, purposes, and policies of the National Association of Evangelicals from its very inception to the present hour place that ecclesiastical organization squarely on the side of the new evangelicalism. It is no secret, of course, that most of the spokesmen for the new evangelism are either affiliated or in sympathy with the National Association of Evangelicals.

It is my firm conviction that the ecclesiastical and doctrinal position commonly held by the new evangelicals presents the gravest danger for Bible-believing Christians and the most serious threat to the faith once delivered unto the saints which the church has ever encountered.

That which is the greatest antithesis to one's position can always be detected far more easily than that which has much in common with it but which at the same time either omits, soft-pedals, or restates those matters which constitute the distinguishing features. Contemporary liberalism and neo-orthodoxy, in spite of all the camouflage, can still be detected quite easily. The unbelief, rejection, and blasphemy are evident to all informed and discerning Christians. The case is very much different with the new evangelicalism. This position involves brethren who insist that they accept the great fundamentals of the faith, and yet for various reasons they are attempting to re-think some of the most basic doctrines. They are attempting to make biblical Christianity acceptable to the unbelieving theological and philosophical world. They are also engaged in the hopeless and fruitless endeavor to make the Bible fit the discoveries of science, falsely so-called. Now, all of this means that sympathy is shown

to the enemies of Christ and the Gospel in classrooms, in books, in periodicals, in evangelistic crusades, on the mission fields, and from pulpits, thus presenting a hazy picture and sounding an uncertain note to the evangelical world.

Now that we are somewhat oriented in our thinking concerning the new evangelicals, it is obvious that they may be rightfully called bystanders of the faith. At this juncture we now wish to ask and attempt to answer two questions regarding them. First, what makes them bystanders of the faith and second, What is the greatest danger which they face?

I. WHAT MAKES THE NEW EVANGELICALS BYSTANDERS OF THE FAITH?

Sherman Roddy, who is by no means a defender of fundamentalism, has correctly evaluated the new evangelical position when he said, "These new evangelicals are involved in a dilemma. They must wear the old garments of fundamentalism while changing the man within. For political and economical reasons they are reluctant to appear as friends of the enemy, even though privately they recognize the enemy as part of the Christian community. They live a double standard" ("Fundamentalism and Ecumenicity," *The Christian Century*, October 1, 1958).

The new evangelicals themselves have observed the perils of both ecumenicity and of independency ("The Perils of Independency," *Christianity Today*, November 12, 1956 and "The Perils of Ecumenicity," *Christianity Today*, November 26, 1956). They reject candidly the alleged extreme position of the American and International Councils of Christian Churches. By their own admission they wish to break with neo-orthodoxy, modernism, and fundamentalism (Harold John Ockenga, "The New Evangelicalism" *The Park Street Spire*, February, 1958). That the new evangelicals wish to occupy a place of neutrality in re-

lation to the present liberal ecumenical movement and to the separatist position is known to all.

These renegade fundamentalists reminds us of men who are eligible for the military draft but who, although they say they desire peace and liberty, do not feel these things are worth fighting for. And so they busy themselves with pursuits which will keep them out of the conflict of battle. They claim to be neutral—not on either side in the battle—when in reality their neglect aids the enemy and hinders the work of those who are seeking to defend freedom and liberties. So it is with the new evangelicals.

The first thing then which makes them bystanders is their rejection of the Biblical doctrine of separation.

A. Rejection of the Biblical Doctrine of Separation

1. The Biblical Doctrine

Perhaps it would be well for us to remind ourselves that the teaching of separation from apostasy is, after all, a scriptural mandate. If we are going to be obedient to the Word of God, we really have no choice in the matter.

The certainty of wide-scale departure from the faith is declared many times in Scripture. Paul warned the elders that after his departure grievous wolves would come to destroy the flock (Acts 20:28-30). He warned explicitly that in the latter times some would depart or apostacize from the faith (I Tim. 4:1). He spoke, too, of perilous times to come (II Tim. 3:1).

The Bible also gives clear commands to the believer to separate from that which is not according to sound doctrine. No option of some middle position is given the believer between truth and error. Those who do not hold sound doctrine concerning Jesus Christ are not to be allowed into the believer's house nor bid men God-speed (II John 10). According to Scripture, fellowship and association with such false teachers and systems

makes one a sharer of the same evil (vs 11). Never are we urged in Scripture to cooperate with those who hold and promote false doctrine; instead we are commanded to "turn away" and to "withdraw" from such (II Tim. 3:5; I Tim. 6:5). Likewise we are told to "purge" ourselves from vessels of dishonor (II Tim. 2:21). No statement could be more opposed to the compromise position of the new evangelicals than Paul's command, "And have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them" (Eph. 5:11).

Evidently, new evangelicals do not interpret literally these and a host of other passages like them, for they surely do not practice them.

2. The New Evangelical Practice

Surely it is no longer a secret that the new evangelicals do not believe or practice biblical separation from apostasy. Their attempts to make orthodoxy respectable and to engage in dialogue with those who reject Biblical Christianity are clear evidences of their refusal to accept the scriptural injunctions. Evidences of repudiation of the biblical doctrine of separation abound from new evangelical quarters.

The National Association of Evangelicals, so influenced by the new evangelicalism, was not, according to its founding father, designed to combat or to infiltrate any existing church organizations (Paul Petticord, *True Ecumenicity*, pp. 9, 10). The subsequent historical development and present policies of that organization have proved nothing to the contrary.

Rather than separate from that which is anti-Christian, the new evangelicals often seek such cooperation. Witness some of the recent articles in new evangelical mouthpieces by those who could not possibly be considered evangelical. Elton Trueblood engages in dialogue in *Christianity Today* with editor Carl Henry on evangelical principles and practices (January 6, 1967). *Eternity* magazine car-

ries an article entitled "We Can Depend on the Old Testament" by Dewey M. Beegle who has just recently written one of the most damaging attacks against the inspiration of Scripture ever to be penned. Such attempts to court the favor of those who reject the most basic tenets of orthodoxy are not only unscriptural but also grossly deceptive, since the Bible believers who read these magazines and these articles assume the contributors are all brethren in the Lord.

The recent World Congress (Berlin) on Evangelism serves as another example of seeking to include non-evangelicals in theological table talk. There was no intention of instituting through the Congress any organization to compete with or to combat the World Council. In fact, two of the Council's former presidents, along with a number of other ecumenical leaders, were invited to the Congress. Its purpose was to provide discussion, consultation, and dialogue with those within the apostate National and World Councils and those outside these organizations.

Added to the ever-increasing cooperation of the Billy Graham evangelistic association with non-evangelicals is the recent appearance of Billy Graham at the National Council's seminar on evangelism in Florida. He expressed the new evangelical view regarding the National and World Councils quite well when he said to that seminar, "I am honored and privileged to be here to participate with you and I would like to put it in those terms, participate with you." He also said, "I promise you that you will be in my prayers and my thoughts, I wish that I could be here at every session just to listen and learn and to sit at the feet of many of you."

Voicing the new evangelical viewpoint Dr. Arthur Glasser, North American Home Director of the China Inland Mission, commented favorably on the National and World Councils of Churches at Wheaton College chapel in March, 1964. He rejoiced in the

present possibilities of dialogue with non-Christian religions. Mr. Fife of Inter-Varsity, who joined Dr. Glasser, lamented the fact that the National Council representatives are not yet welcome at Inter-Varsity meetings even though Inter-Varsity representatives are welcomed at the National Council youth meetings.

Edward John Carnell of Fuller Seminary in his book, *The Case for Orthodox Theology*, spoke critically of J. Gresham Machen. He chided Machen for taking what he called such an absolute stand on such a wrong relative issue as separation from the Presbyterian Church U.S.A. (pp 113-126). Carnell also insists that there is no biblical warrant for the separatist position. For him, separation is of the heart only. Harold John Ockenga believes that the younger orthodox scholars are repudiating the separatist position and are now willing to enter into dialogue with the liberals (*Christianity Today*, October 10, 1960, p. 13).

Ockenga also makes it clear that one of the major purposes of the new evangelical approach is to recapture "denominational leadership from within the denominations rather than abandoning these denominations to modernism" (*Christianity Today*, October 10, 1960, p. 14).

One of the clearest and most complete defenses of the new evangelicalism was written by Ronald Nash and published in 1962 by Zondervan Publishing Company. Nash criticizes the separatist position harshly on five counts. One of these is that separatists are to be blamed for the orthodox surrender of denominations, schools, and churches to the liberals. This criticism sounds very much like what we are hearing today from the liberal and neo-orthodox crowd in criticism of the Reformation. To the ecumenical enthusiasts the Reformation is viewed as a mistake. Too many new evangelicals view the great theological conflicts of the 1920-30's in the same way.

A second great reason which makes these new evangelicals bystanders of the faith follows closely on the heels of their rejection of the biblical doctrine of separation.

B. Desire to Make the Gospel Respectable to the Non-Evangelicals

Though stated in various ways, this becomes a driving force for the new evangelicals.

We are told that the fundamentalist variety of Christianity is no longer respectable. Thus, the new evangelical desires to gain a new respectability for Christianity in the intellectual world. He wishes to present Christianity as a live option along with the other religions of the world. There is a strong desire for theological dialogue with those who hold opposing views in the liberal and neo-orthodox camps. It seems as though the claims which the neo-orthodox and neo-liberal have made have been taken very seriously by these former fundamentalists. They often have high praise for the enemies of the cross but sharp criticism for the fundamentalists. They speak of the "marked swing to a greater theological conservatism" on the part of contemporary liberal theologians.

New evangelicals have been unduly impressed by the so-called "return" to "biblical theology" on the part of non-conservatives. Many new evangelicals are far more charitable toward the enemies of the cross than they are toward their fundamentalist brethren. While the apostates are called "repentant liberals," "chastened liberals," and Biblical theologians," the fundamentalists are called "ignorant" and "contentious," "cultic," right-wing extremists," "funny-mentalists," and "obscurantists."

Who of us would not rejoice at the salvation of a liberal or at the testimony on the part of leaders of liberal organizations that they are now returning to the Bible as the authoritative Word of God and to Christ as very God of very God? The sad fact is, neo-orthodoxy and neo-liberalism

are not evidences of the conversion of old-time modernism to the biblical faith. They are just as much the enemies of true biblical Christianity and just as false and foreign to the Word of God as was old-time modernism, their parent. Evidently, the new evangelicals are not quite sure this is so, at least they are not proceeding as though they believed it to be true. Like Peter of old, they can frequently be found warming their hands at the enemies' fire.

Those before whom the Gospel is to be made respectable also see this new evangelical desire and view it differently. Nels Ferré says, "Conservative Christianity is growing by trying to become respectable . . . The Conservative movement is neither an obscurantist fundamentalism nor a negative modernism—and it is making inroads everywhere" (*Time*, Dec. 20, 1963).

The *Christian Century* said the new evangelical leaders ". . . have also taken pains to spruce up in order to become even more attractive to the secular world and to Roman Catholicism. In the process of sprucing up and showing off, neo-evangelical leaders have unwittingly tipped their hand concerning the real nature of their movement and have made what appears to us to be irrefragable commitments on the very issues which they had attacked other Christians for being concerned about" (September 15, 1965).

John B. Sheering in *The Catholic World* said, "We can divide conservative evangelicals into fundamentalists and 'new evangelicals,' the latter being more ecumenically minded. With these new evangelicals Roman Catholics can engage in fruitful dialogue."

One of the areas of least acceptability in fundamentalism, or old-line evangelicalism, seems to be the literal interpretation of Scripture and especially as that relates to biblical matters which are also scientific. The impasse between the Bible's message regarding creation and the viewpoint

of all forms of evolutionary thought is supposedly being bridged by the mediating voice of the new evangelicals. This is a burning issue in the present hour. Through a barrage of words, which often prove to be mere semantic dillusion, many new evangelicals are evidencing their acceptance of some form of theistic evolution often styled "threshold evolution" or "progressive creationism." Many times the Bible's message on scientific matters is not deemed important enough to cause division, so that an attitude of indifference develops. Witness the view of Harold John Ockenga as an example of such an attitude: ". . . I contend that it makes no difference whether God used literally an anthropomorphic handful of dust or whether He used some creature already in existence when He 'formed man of the dust of the ground.' Such creatures are dust of the ground and no more. As to God's ability to do either, I strongly affirm it. I hold that the Bible does not tell us what method He used by which He did create" (*The Ohio Independent Baptist*, March, 1964). One finds it difficult indeed to know on what basis Dr. Ockenga can claim to accept the Word of God when it says that God did create, and at the same time remain indifferent to the same Word which specifically and most emphatically states how God created as well.

Bible-believing Christians have every right to become concerned when they read statements such as the following: "The fact is (and there is no harm to confess it), that we Christians do not have a model that will synthesize the findings in nature and the statements of Scripture. And until we do, we have to be careful about pulling down the scientific model that is functioning so well in all the laboratories of the world. We do not have a better one. We live in hope that a better one will be forthcoming, but it has not yet been advanced" (Donald Grey Barnhouse, *Eternity*,

May, 1960, p. 6).

Or again, "If the differences between the sciences and the Bible were to grow to a very large number and were of the most serious nature, it would be questionable if we could retain faith in Scripture. True, we may believe some of the Bible, 'in spite of' science, but certainly the situation would change if we believe all of the Bible in spite of science" (Bernard Ramm, *The Christian View of Science and Scripture*, p. 29).

This desire on the part of the new evangelicals to make Christianity acceptable has led to an unhealthy emphasis upon intellectualism. No one in his right mind desires to defend ignorance or to decry scholarship. The present trend is not to genuine scholarship, however. It is more toward scholasticism, and there is a difference between the two. As someone has said, "Scholasticism reverences scholarship for its own sake. It measures the authority of a written

work by the number of footnotes, and the value of what a man says by the number of degrees after his name. How often we hear that there is hope now for the church because Evangelicals have at last got scholarship on their side. What utter nonsense! The next thing we will hear is that man is a sinner because he has not yet heard a scholarly and convincing reason for being anything else. Scholarship will not bring the church back to the truth; the human heart has fallen in love with error" (*The Banner of Truth*, November/December, 1965).

Summing up then, the new evangelicals, though there are differences among them, may be rightly called bystanders of the faith because the movement is characterized by a rejection of the biblical doctrine of separation and a desire to make the Gospel respectable to the non-evangelicals.

(Second part continued next issue)

BOOKS BY ROBERT P. LIGHTNER

The writer of the above article received his Th.D. from Dallas Theological Seminary, and is now Assistant Professor of Systematic Theology at Dallas. He is a member of the Evangelical Theological Society and is listed in *Who's Who in American Education and Outstanding Young Men of America*, 1967.

1. NEO-EVANGELICALISM. Traces the developments, doctrines and difficulties of this contemporary approach to conservative Christianity. \$2.75.
2. NEW-LIBERALISM. Written to acquaint the layman with recent developments in liberal theology and to show that liberalism is not dead. \$1.00.
3. SPEAKING IN TONGUES AND DIVINE HEALING, \$.75.
4. THE DEATH CHRIST DIED. Did Christ die for only those who will ultimately be saved? With characteristic thoroughness, Dr. Lightner examines all aspects of the theme, including problems associated with both the limited and unlimited views of our Lord's atonement. His approach is fair and objective. \$3.75. Available at Regular Baptist Press, 1800 Oakton Blvd., Des Plaines, Ill. 60018.
5. THE SAVIOUR AND THE SCRIPTURE, Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co. \$3.75.

NOTICE

The subscription price of *The Discerner* is now 4 issues for \$1.00, 12 issues for \$3.00. For single copy mailed 30 cents. Increased costs and higher postal charges make this charge necessary. The price is still very modest when one considers the content of each issue. When a quantity is ordered for distribution a considerable reduction is made in the price.

AN AMERICAN PLEADS — "NOT GUILTY"

By Max Rafferty

*Superintendent of Public Instruction and Director of Education,
State of California*

Feeling guilty these days, friends? Looking sheepishly over your glasses at all and sundry just because you're an American? Taking all the woes of the world on your sagging shoulders with the hangdog look of a reluctant martyr?

Don't try to kid me. You know you are. How could you help it? There seems to be a kind of conspiracy afoot to make all of us feel this way.

Everybody and his grandmother are currently exhorting the rest of us to beat our breasts and head for the wailing wall, there to confess before a sardonic world the crime of being rich, powerful, and unpopular. More, we're being asked to repent for the sins of our ancestors as a sort of jackpot bonus to this orgy of absement.

In short, we're guilty of the crime of being Americans, and of having an American heritage. This, my friends, is something new—the first generation of Americans to be urged to be ashamed of themselves.

Well, if you happen to be a masochist, as some of our more fuzzy-minded and fuzzy-faced "intellectuals" are, I guess you can get all sorts of kicks out of this morbid self-laceration. But as Sam Goldwyn is supposed to have said, "Include me out." I'm tired of being told how disliked we Americans are, how mercenary, how warlike, how imperialistic, and so on, all the way down the dreary, modernized list of the Seven Deadly Sins.

Claptrap.

I'll be glad to repent for something I've done wrong, but I'll be hanged if I'll repent for something somebody else did. So I'm here to say a good word for the United States of America for a change, and in the process I'm entering an overall plea of "Not Guilty" to the charges we're hearing on all sides of late, and in addition

I'm prepared to get specific if I have to.

For instance:

It's not my fault as an American that there is mass starvation in Asia.

There has always been mass starvation in Asia, long before there WAS a United States of America, largely because most Asiatics insist upon breeding like rabbits despite gross overpopulation, wholesale misery, and recent advances in birth control techniques. Even if I gave up all my daily hamburger—and yours too—to be shipped to Calcutta and Peking, about the only noticeable result would be a 1 per cent rise in the birthrate over there and another 30 million or so born to starve next year or the year after. Sorry. I sympathize with the sufferers as much as anyone. I'm willing to help them all I can. But I don't feel even a teeny bit guilty.

Neither do I blame myself or my country for the ghastly civilian suffering in the Viet Nam ordeal.

I blame the sinister Ho Chi Minh and his blood-drenched Viet Cong and that murderous mandarin Mao Tse-tung who conspired to start the slaughter over there in the first place. If you yell for my help against some burglar who has smashed his way into your home, and if one of your kids happens to get stepped on as I battle the intruder in your living room, I'm going to get pretty steamed if you hold me responsible. Why not hold the burglar responsible? We Americans are getting nothing out of the swamps of southeast Asia except casualty lists and heartaches. No money. No territory. No glory. We're there only because the government of a defenseless little country begged us years ago to help it repel brutal aggression from the Communist north. And I don't know about you, but I

never yet felt guilty about trying to help somebody.
I don't feel guilty either about mounting crime in our big cities because I'm not committing any of it.

Neither are 95 percent of my fellow Americans. If I were a rioter or a sniper or a looter, I'd feel very guilty. But I'm not. And even if Hubert Horatio Humphrey implies that last summer's burning of Milwaukee and Detroit is my fault for not sharing my so-called wealth more equitably with the rioters, all I can do is invite him to examine my income tax returns. If I share much more with the Great Society, it will be taking care of me.

As an American, I feel concerned about poverty, but not responsible for it. I freely acknowledge the need to alleviate it, but I don't feel guilty about it. Why not? Because I didn't cause it. You didn't cause it. No one caused it, any more than any one "causes" heart disease or a cholera epidemic. We can and we should help the poor. We cannot and we should not blame ourselves for their poverty, unless we ourselves through malice or ignorance have made poor people poor.

I'm not guilty of racial discrimination nor of the tragedies which spring from it.

Our school books nowadays are childing the kids because their great-great-grandfathers enslaved Negroes. This is the first time since Old Testament days that children have been held responsible for the sins of their fathers. But even to this I plead "Not Guilty," and I plead on your behalf as well. My own great-grandfather wasn't even over here during slavery days. He scrounged his way here in an immigrant steerage shortly after slavery was abolished and for a good long time he was treated even worse than the slaves had been. I suspect that most of you in this audience share this heritage.

I live in an integrated neighborhood. I work in an integrated office.

I hire racial minority members and in recent years have paid some of them more than the state allows me to make. It has been my privilege to be an American during a time when the status and the dignity of our racial minorities have gone up like a skyrocket. Everywhere I look, I see improvement going on—improvement unprecedented in the whole history of the Great Republic—improvement which as a taxpayer and a voter I have helped to bring about. And so have you. What do we have to feel ashamed of?

I'm not responsible for the dirty novels, the perverted stage plays, and the filthy movies of today, because I don't patronize them.

I suspect that practically no one in this audience does, either. In this case, however, let's pin the tail on the right donkey—the crazy, mixed-up Hollywood film producers who buy all the dirty books and obscene plays, and makes movies out of them.

If any of you have any children, as I do, you'll know exactly what I'm talking about. Parents used to be able to bundle the kids off to the neighborhood theater on Saturday with a reasonable assurance that they wouldn't be relentlessly bombarded for three hours with enough rape, incest, and stomach-turning perversion to make Sodom and Gomorrah look like Disneyland by comparison.

Not any more.

Nowadays before any halfway conscientious Mom and Pop dare send an offspring to see a show, they have to curl up for a long session with Parent Magazine or the Legion of Decency to try and find something they can expose Junior to which won't turn him into a sex maniac. And this has become such a chore that most of us currently are throwing up our hands in despair and either unleashing a panting Junior completely to go see Susan Smut starring in "Lust Alley" or refusal point-blank to let him go to any movie at all.

Either choice is a bad one. What

really raises my hackles is that we parents find ourselves in such a bind that we have to opt one for the other.

I hasten to add that it's not just personal pique that's biting me in regard to the movie makers. I'm seriously concerned about their sanity

For example:

The last box office returns I got a good look at listed "My Fair Lady," "Mary Poppins" and Sound of Music" as far and away the biggest money-makers of the past five years. Rumor even has it that when all is said and done, "Sound of Music" may well rack up the absolutely astounding take of \$200 million.

Note that all of these blockbusters are clean. I mean really. No sick obsessions.

How can they possibly make so much money? Aren't they hopelessly corny? And everybody knows corn is "out" with the "in" group these days.

The critics, at least, assure us of this every time they write a column. True to their bilious form, they've hurled all kinds of dead cats at "Sound of Music."

"Treacly," one of them sniffed distastefully.

"Banal and goody-goody," another pontificated.

This I can understand, because I understand critics. But the wise guys among my producer friends are fond of sneering at the Julius Andrews opus, too. And this I can **not** understand at all. After all, the critics don't get a cut of the gate receipts, but the producers are very much in business to make money.

How can anybody sneer at \$200 million? Especially a producer?

When the three great box office bonanzas of the 1960's are all spotless in plot and dialogue, somebody just has to be wrong about what American audiences want. This is why I'm entering still another "Not Guilty" plea on behalf of all of us in regard to dirty movies.

The moral to this story is apparently that you can make a few fast and

filthy bucks by pandering to the rottenness which all of us have a little of, but if you want to make \$200 million, you'd better play up to the decency which is a lot more characteristic of the American people.

I'm not guilty of neglecting my children, and neither are you.

There's a kind of generally accepted myth abroad in the land of the sadly misunderstood adolescent nobly alone and defiant in a world he never made.

"Don't trust anybody over 30" is the slogan of this small segment of our youth, who mouth it while they are busy living it up in costly little foreign cars and ultra-modern pads, all given to them lock, stock, and barrel by people over 30.

The psychologists and sociologists call today's teenagers "the rejected generation." The kids are alienated, they say. All lines of communication between oldsters and youngsters are short-circuited as never before and are, in fact, about to burn out completely.

And who's to blame? Come off it. Who's always to blame? America's parents, of course. Us.

We're too immersed in our heated swimming pools, too absorbed in keeping up with the Jones, too submerged in the banalities of "la dolce vita" to know or care what Junior is doing. The poor kid is cut adrift practically at puberty and left to his own hopeless devices.

A heartrending picture is thus projected of Junior wandering aimlessly about the streets, pining lugubriously for the tender, loving parental care he has never known, and generally going to pot in more ways than one along a highway mapped out and paved by those two old devils, Mom and Pop.

Really, Now!

Oh, there are some cases like this, of course. But then there always have been. The fact is that the vast majority of modern parents are just as affectionate, far better informed, and

vastly more concerned over their offspring than any other mothers and fathers in all history. And if this be heresy, make the most of it.

What other generation ever had lavished upon it like dollops of hot chocolate such a superabundance of pediatricians, vitamin pills, hula hoops, Barbie dolls, Dr. Spock manuals, and free college scholarships?

What panting parents before our own time have ever knocked themselves out so doggedly leading Boy Scout troops, umpiring Little League games, patronizing family counselors, officering PTA's, and staffing community recreation programs?

What other kids in the history of the whole planet ever got away with dictating clothing styles, disrupting great universities, and in general making shrill and querulous nuisances of themselves as these our children?

This is rejection? What on earth do they have to feel rejected about? Too much affluence? Too much newspaper attention? Too much concern?

Could be.

Don't get me wrong. The kids don't manufacture this snivelling image of themselves. It's been built up for them during the past few years by adults who should have known better—by "experts" who got carried away by their own expertise.

If it will help to establish my national "Not Guilty" plea let me conjure up some real swinging examples of past small fry who really knew what rejection means.

Charles Dickens found himself farmed out to a blacking factory at the ripe old age of 11, and for the rest of his life woke up screaming from galloping nightmares as a result of his experience.

Mark Twain, an orphaned 12-year-old, worked six days a week and as a printer's apprentice for his room and keep.

And Andrew Carnegie, age 13 was slaving his little life away in a textile mill for the magnificent sum of \$1 per week.

Yes other generations than our own have had alienated offspring. I guess the big difference is that we worry more about ours. And probably we worry more because there are more children than ever before. In the 1970's, half our nation's population will be under 25.

And no, we haven't rejected our children. A lot of them have temporarily rejected us, true enough. So what's new?

'Twas ever thus. Sam Clemens once said: "When Joe was 16, he thought his father was an idiot. But when he turned 26, he was amazed to discover how much sense the old fellow had gotten in the last 10 years.

Finally, America is not guilty of all the things the crepe hangers are accusing her of.

The thing that really bugs me, as the kids say, is the way some of our college professors are teaching American history. Gloom and doom. Crime and corruption. Lynching and looting. Wanton wars and implacable imperialism. Bunk.

That country they're talking about isn't our country. What's more, that history they're teaching isn't history. It's frenzied fiction.

America is human. She has her faults—plenty of them—but they pale into insignificance alongside her virtues.

Our children should be taught in school that their country has always fought its greatest wars either to make or keep men free, even as it is fighting today.

America has always been the first appealed to and the first to respond vigorously and generously to cries for help from the starving and the suffering from all over the world.

After the last great war, America became the first victor nation in all history to give up voluntarily its territorial conquests and to concentrate instead upon feeding the hungry and binding up the wounds of a shattered civilization.

Why should these things be taught

our children? Because they are true.

Because we have built here on this continent a free society which in a desperate search for sanctuary less fortunate people in oppressed lands climb great walls and risk shots in the back from Communist guards in order to reach. **We build no walls.**

Because we covet no man's property or liberty or dignity.

Because we are the great defender of freedom and individualism and the right of a man to live his own life, and the totalitarians all around the world know this and hate us for it and are resolved to destroy us and don't hesitate to say so.

Yes, to all these things I plead

guilty as an American. But to the sneers of the subversives, the doom cries of the defeatists, the apologies of the appeasers, I plead the same ringing "Not Guilty!" which has echoed down the corridors of time since first our forebears trod this soil which we now tread, and which has made the United States of America at once the wonder and the hope of the human race.

Let's stand up and tell the world how proud and happy we are to be citizens of the fairest and the freest and the finest country ever created on this planet.

Let's stop apologizing for greatness!
(Used by permission from author.)

BOOK REVIEW

TONGUES, HEALING, AND YOU! *By Don Hillis, Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1969. 111 pages. \$1.00.*

This little paperback book written about two enormous subjects, tongues and healing is worth purchasing to read in those spare moments so many of you have. Mr. Don Hillis is a veteran missionary and now a mission leader with the Evangelical Alliance Mission. He has also written many interesting tracts and booklets. He deals with these subjects in two parts under the titles, "What Can Tongues Do For You?" and "Where is the Gift of Healing?" In writing about the tongues movement he states the underlying reason why the movement has gained in popularity. An interesting review is given of this phenomena in many of our major denominations with a chapter devoted to the Lutheran church itself. Then our author lays his groundwork in the Old Testament and deals with pertinent passages in the New Testament especially in the books of Acts and I Corinthians. As he builds his case from the Word of God, we discover that the modern tongues movement of today can find very little basis in scripture for what they do. Without leaving us in a vacuum he closes with an important chapter on "Majoring in the Majors" in which the author states, "May God give us an insatiable desire to rediscover the Person and work of the Holy Spirit in the realms of holiness, courage, unity, liberality, prayerfulness, Bible study, and a witness for Christ which is accompanied by sin-convicting, life transforming power."

In part two the author looks at the subject of healing. Kindly, but firmly he presents various groups, their writings, teachings and works in the area of healing. It is important to define terms and to find biblical definition. Mr. Hillis does this with three important terms, "divine healing", "prayer for the sick", and the "gifts of healing". Are these biblical terms? The author presents his view. Other subjects are considered, the curse of sin, the suffering of the saint, and the perennial problem of healing in the work of Christ on the cross and its relationship to us today. Mr. Hillis concludes with two generalizations from his study. We are in the midst of a revival of healing ministries and that healings have taken place in the past and are taking place in the present. He notes that "none of these generalizations have anything to do with the gift of healings."

—John G. Bellshaw

RELIGION ANALYSIS SERVICE, INC.
902 Hennepin Avenue
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55403

Return Requested

PERTINENT QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Prof. John E. Dahlin

QUESTION . . . Is the negative approach effective in exposing error and in combatting liberalism?

ANSWER . . . Yes. Exposing error may not be a popular work, but from the Scriptural standpoint it is necessary and exceedingly important. We are called upon to "contend earnestly for the faith once for all delivered to the saints." Truth mixed with error is equivalent to error in totality, except it is more innocent looking, and therefore more dangerous. Paul writes "A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump." And, he also warns "after my departure grievous wolves shall enter in among you, not sparing the flock." The N.T. writers warn against false teachings. Peter refers to such as "damnable heresies." It is important that we combine the positive and negative positions and do as Paul states it, "I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God" (Acts 20:27).

QUESTION . . . What is the best method in dealing with error and various forms of deviation from the Scriptures?

ANSWER . . . The experience of those who deal with cultic groups is that the distribution of the right kind of literature is the best way in combating error. Literature removes much of the prejudice and the inevitable argument which usually follows a personal encounter with cultists. Such literature, however, must be clear on all major doctrines of the Bible.