

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

The
DISCERNER

AN
INTERDENOMINATIONAL
HERESY-EXPOSING
QUARTERLY

Vol. X

No. 1

2. POPE JOHN PAUL II AND HIS
EXTENSIVE TRAVELING
6. THE PROPER POSITION ON SEPARATION
10. A TRIBUTE TO DR. WILLIAM McCARRELL
11. CREATION IN SCHOOLS
14. BOOK REVIEW SECULAR HUMANISM: THE
MOST DANGEROUS RELIGION IN AMERICA—
HOMER DUNCAN
15. MOONEY'S FLOWERS WORTH \$20 MILLION
16. PERTINENT QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

January—March 1980

The DISCERNER

Published Quarterly

Price \$2.00 for 4 issues; \$5.00 for 12 issues;

.50 cents a copy, for foreign

subscriptions add 20 cents a copy.

Copyright 1980 by Religion Analysis Service, Inc.

2708 E. Lake St., Suite 231

Minneapolis, Minnesota 55406

Printed in the United States

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

John E. Dahlin, *Chairman*

Mr. Harold Dainsberg

Rev. David L. Larsen

POPE JOHN PAUL II AND HIS EXTENSIVE TRAVELING

By Prof. John E. Dahlin, Editor

(An evaluation of the appearance of the Pope in the United States and elsewhere)

During his papal office of only a little more than one year, Pope John Paul II, has traveled more extensively than any of his predecessors in this brief period. This is an abrupt departure from the traditional position of the Roman Popes in the past. The only exception was the time of Pope Paul who took a few trips outside Italy during a longer period of time. The new Pope is a non-Roman, but that in itself is not the main reason for breaking the general tradition of the papacy in history. During the past year Pope John Paul II has visited Mexico, Poland, Ireland and the United States. In late November he traveled to Turkey visiting some important cities there. It was obvious that he would be enthusiastically received in the Catholic areas visited. In our country, however, where the Protestants are in the majority, he was very well received, not only by President Carter, but a number of Protestant leaders have given laudatory statements publically about his journey to our land. Great multitudes came out to see him wherever he appeared while

he was here. The trip was a public relations achievement of unprecedented proportions. The most commonly expressed feeling of those who saw and heard him was, "You cannot help but like him."

THE REASON FOR THE POPE'S TRAVELS

No Pope during recent decades has been as outgoing a person as the present one. He loves people and mingles with them without manifesting any aloofness due to his high office. During the time of strained relations with the Communist government of Poland, as a high ecclesiastical leader of that land, he acquired many skills and a remarkable gift of diplomacy. He has what many have called a real "Charisma." And, along with other brilliant qualities, it brought more recognition to him than that given to his predecessors. It was clear to careful observers that Pope John Paul II sought to extend his influence as widely as possible, particularly during the present world crisis. No doubt his effort has been a plus with respect to the establishment of better human relation-

ships in this precarious period of history. Indeed this was one reason for his decision not to live in isolation at the Vatican as the tradition has been in the past.

Moreover, the Pope realizes that there are many elements of dissenters within the Catholic Church who advocate some major changes in the ecclesiastical system. In other words, there is considerable ferment within the Church. First, there is a considerable amount of dissent within the clergy with regard to the inflexible position of the Church on celibacy for the priests. This has created a problem for the papacy. Then, there is the ongoing exodus of many priests from the service to the Catholic Church. And, their seminaries have seen the number declining rapidly in recent years among the men in training for the priesthood. This constitutes a threat to the expansion of Catholicism. According to the statistics in one recent year, the Catholic Church gained only 50,000 members. Even some of the aggressive cults have done better with reference to numbers gained during the same year. This is a very small gain for the Church which has 49,000,000 baptized members in the U.S. Furthermore, there is an addition, the problem of the expansion of the liberation theology particularly in the Latin American countries. These liberal groups (often revolutionary) urge the Church to take side with the poor and oppressed, hence giving support to the liberation movement of the activists. The Pope faced this problem in his recent visit

to Mexico. Here in America the Pope felt the impact of feminism and the vocal demand that women who qualified should be allowed to attain priesthood. (This has never been possible within Roman Catholicism). Finally, the expanding demands of the youth were also manifested during the visit of Pope John Paul II. To the youth he made the appeal to turn away from a worldly life and temptations, and trust in revelation not in rebellion.

When addressing the General Assembly of the United Nations, the Pope appealed to governments to manifest a greater compassion for the needy and down-trodden. Obviously, he was seeking to influence the prosperous nations to bridge the gap existing between the *have* and the *have not* nations. He appealed also to the oppressed people to rejoice in God's love and that the Lord had not forgotten them. These various efforts of the Pope were clear indications of his skill in meeting difficult issues during his visit.

THE PAPAL DILEMMA

Figurately considered, the Pope must walk the tight rope as it were in dealing with growing dissent as well as retaining an effective relationship with the Catholic establishment, especially at a time when the liberals call for changes within the system. This the hierarchy does not approve, and the Pope realizes that it would be extremely unwise for him to oppose the majority of the Bishops, who for the most part are conservatives. Therefore, in their

presence he came down hard on certain practices. He lectured against contraceptives, abortion, and divorce. And, he publically rejected the demand of a considerable group of Catholic women in attaining priesthood. He did this by pointing out that the Lord chose only males for leadership. In addition, the Pope struck out against homosexuality and lesbianism. (This writer commends him for his outright rejection of these expanding trends in our misguided society).

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH REMAINS BASICALLY UNCHANGED

The present ruler of Roman Catholicism made it completely clear that the historic doctrinal position of the Church must remain intact. We find no willingness on his part to consider any alteration on fundamentals and practices of the Church. Even the ecumenical-minded head of the ALC, Dr. David W. Preus, said, "I was distressed about the Pope in his inflexible position." And, he said further, "The papal ecumenicity was ambiguous." He had reference to the theological dialog hoped for with reference to the release of the clergy from the vows of celibacy and the ordination of women. And, the ALC leader also felt that the Pope closed the door to a realistic position on population control (in overpopulated areas) by means of using present-day methods for this purpose. He continued his comment by saying, "The Pope spent his final day in raising stop signs."

And, Dr. Preus finally added, "I found myself alternatively stirred, ambivalent and distressed over the course of the papal visit." No doubt he echoed the feeling of many ecumenists in the land. In contrast, certain naive Protestants were carried away by the popularity of the papal visit, and they continue to believe the Catholic Church will initiate basic changes in its system. This is illogical thinking in the light of the many pronouncements of Pope John Paul II. It is only at the fringe area where change may occur, as e.g., the de-emphasizing of Latin at the services, and allowing a modernization of the garments worn by the nuns. And, in dealing with Protestants the Roman Church has softened its position by calling them "separated brethren" and not "heretics" as in the past. The fact is Roman Catholicism continues in its historic position. If it allowed a weakening of the authority at the top, and in the hierarchy, it could not carry on effectively in its world-wide activities. I shall now proceed to point out the inflexibility of the Roman Church in the following areas:

On the matter of the apostolic succession, the Church insists that Peter was the first Pope and the vice-gerent of Christ on earth. This is being followed to the very letter. The present Pope is in that long line of succession and it is preserved. This makes the Pope the authoritative head of the Church on earth and the only true shepherd of God's flock. And, when the Pope speaks "Ex-

Cathedra" he is infallible. This doctrine was proclaimed in the year 1870. In addition, Catholic doctrine is maintained that salvation is in and through the Church with the Seven Sacraments being vital to salvation. Allied to this is the belief that the Lord's Supper (mass) the Eucharist becomes the real body and the real wine the real blood of Christ. This is known theologically as trans-substantiation. It implies that the sacrifice of Christ is being continually offered, hence a disbelief in the finished work at calvary. Moreover, the Virgin Mary is adored and called the Queen of Heaven, Mother of God, Refuge of Sinners, Mariology is fixed within the Catholic system. In fact, the veneration of Mary has increased and not diminished. Purgatory, which is not mentioned in the Bible, is believed to be the place where the departed go at death for a longer or shorter period until released. No change is forthcoming in that teaching. And, justification by faith (as Luther held) is rejected. Faith and works are both necessary to salvation. It is being maintained within the Catholic system. The Books of the Apocrypha are held to be equal to the Bible. But the fact of the matter is neither Christ or any of the New Testament writers ever quote from these spurious books, indicating that they were not regarded as God's revelation. And, to the surprise of many, the Catholic Church maintains that *tradition* is equally as valid as revelation or Scripture. This the great Catholic Councils established long ago. Finally, it

should be remembered that the Catholic Church exercises its power of excommunication, or using the threat of it, to whip obstinate individuals into the line. This power was used to silence Father Coughlin who had the largest radio audience in the country forty years ago. The ecclesiastical head of the Catholic Church in the Detroit, Michigan area refused to allow him to continue as he was not an acceptable spokesman for the church. (This once prominent radio man, mainly forgotten, died recently at an advanced age). Nothing perhaps is feared more within Catholicism than being excommunicated.

These positions, which I have mentioned, are not all, but they are the major teachings of the Catholic Church which remain intact. After all, they constitute the fundamental doctrines of that system. When people insist that the Catholic Church has changed, that is, substantially, they are either ignorant or guilty of wishful thinking. In the non-doctrinal area there is some relaxation of certain practices, of course. Professors are exchanged with Protestants in higher educational institutions, and at times marriage ceremonies are jointly performed by the clergymen of both groups. These are not fundamental changes, however. It is even possible that these relatively new arrangements may lead to additional relaxation in some areas. It might be proper here to point out that in the United States, where the Catholic Church has minority status, many of its activities are

restrained, and are not followed to the extent in countries which are nearly totally Roman Catholic.

This article is factual, and not anti-Catholic. There is much misinformation in these matters at a time when great changes are taking place in numerous areas. Roman Catholics must enjoy here the same liberties as the Protestants and other religious groups. In our land constitutional freedom of religion is provided. This must be preserved or we will all lose our

liberties. I am simply trying to convey to the readers that we need not be swept away from making proper evaluations at a time when popular waves of enthusiasm are seen, particularly as a result of the recent papal visit. The fact is that fundamental changes are not taking place within Roman Catholicism. Our object should be to seek to lead many of the good people in that system to salvation and the understanding of the grace of God through Jesus Christ.

THE PROPER POSITION ON SEPARATION

By Prof. John E. Dahlin

A great deal has been said and written on the matter of separation during recent decades. As Editor of *The Discerner* I have followed this development both with interest and concern for many years. On no other current subject, perhaps, are the positions taken as divergent or irreconcilable. During the past decade we have included a few articles on the subject of separation, in which the matter has been broadly treated by competent writers. It seems that in this article the matter might well be discussed in somewhat more detail as the subject deserves further analysis. Many seem to lose their balance and swing into some extreme position in the matter of separation. This is precisely what has happened among quite a number of people during recent years. In my observation there are at present four distinct categories

within which people are identified on the matter of separation in the sphere of Protestant Christianity.

THE ECUMENICAL-MINDED GROUP

The first group which has emerged represents the large liberal wing which advocates an all-out ecumenicity wherein no separation is practiced. This includes, of course, The World Council of Churches, and The National Council of Churches. These large organizations have established no barriers or restrictions in their inclusive program. All groups are welcome in the present church union, where the ecumenical spirit dominates those in control of the system. This inclusive arrangement presents a broad spectrum, including the Unitarians at the left, and a variety of groups between until it reaches into some of the

more evangelical organizations. And, several of the cults also are included and are members in this broad, external church union. It is a hodgepodge of religious groups which have united in a major consolidation program.

These ecumenists build their concept erroneously, I believe, on the statement in the prayer of Christ, recorded in John, chapter 17. They hold up especially verse 21, which reads "That all may be one, as thou, Father are in me, and I in thee, that the world may believe that thou hast sent me." This statement is wrenched out of its proper context and applied in a way which was never intended by our Lord. Let me illustrate:

The famous Dr. E. Stanley Jones promoted a few decades ago the idea of the formation of an all-inclusive church union, to be known as The *United Church of Christ*. Had his pattern of church union been adopted, it would have followed that over every local church would be posted these words in bold-faced letters, *The United Church of Christ*, and below which would be the denominational label of the local church in parenthesis. This latter identification would imply that the local church was simply the agency of The United Church of Christ. The program advocated by Dr. Jones was not adopted. Rather, there emerged a different body, namely the World Council of Churches, and in America also the National Council of Churches. The famous missionary of India believed the program, if adopted, would cause the world to listen to the message of a

United Church. He deplored the excessive fragmentation in Christianity. Unfortunately he failed to see the illogical procedure which he advocated. How could men build a spiritual union with Unitarians, apostates, infidels and liberals of every hue and color and bring them together with the more evangelical organizations? Paul raised the question, "What part hath he that believeth with infidels? And what agreement hath the temple of God with idols?" (2 Cor. 6:15, 16).

In the light of Christ's prayer mentioned, what is the explanation with regard to the unity for which He prayed? There is not the slightest indication that our Lord had reference to some kind of external, ecclesiastical federation of organized religious denominations. He referred to God's redeemed people, that is, people who were His through faith and regeneration. There is no justification at all of expanding the words of Christ to mean what was never intended. Certainly He did not seek a system such as the one developed in our generation. Bible-believing people have no problem to feel a oneness with fellow-believers. This pleasant relationship I have enjoyed for more than one-half a century. Christ limited His prayer to those who were born from above and had spiritual life. He did not embrace the idea of an external world church union.

THE DISTINCT SEPARATISTS

To the far right in the broad spectrum of Christians of our time are the people known as strict separatists, who insist on a total come-out-ism, not only from the

well known liberals, but they also include separation from others who appear tainted with the concept of compromise or toleration. This group, to the far right, is known as people following a *second degree of separation*. To illustrate: I remember a well known Bible teacher who said to a group of ministers that he would withdraw from any ministerial association who even tolerated one single member that did not take a unequivocal stand on the Biblical doctrine. Another outstanding separatist refused to write an article for a conservative magazine because he noticed one person on the board of reference of that publication, who was not a pure separatist at every point. It is obvious that people within this rightist group do not support Campus Crusade, Youth for Christ, Congress on Evangelism, and the popular present-day Evangelistic Crusades. This group does not lack Scriptural passages, which they feel support fully their position. Here are a few of their passages cited: Eph. 5:11 "Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness." And also, 2 Cor. 6:17, "Come ye out from among them and be ye separate, saith the Lord." In 1 Tim. 6:3,5 Paul writes, "If any teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness . . . from such withdraw."

In the context of Paul's instructions to the churches, where he deals with existing spiritual conditions, one may question whether

the present-day separatists have given the right exegesis of such passages and that they must be applied in the manner that these distinct separatists practice. Indeed, the verses quoted are impressive, but they may not necessarily demand a drastic self-imposed separation from every group where certain weaknesses may be present. In Paul's Letters to the Church of Corinth, the apostle displayed a remarkable wisdom in dealing with difficult situations prevailing there. Oversimplification of passages are not always the way Scripture passages should be applied.

The pure separatists are easily identified, and their position need to be given thoughtful consideration by all of us.

THE MODERATE ELEMENT

In our analysis of the various groups with respect to their position on separation, a third category appears quite distinct. Several decades ago a considerable number of churches broke away from the old-line denominations because of the expanding liberalism in the parent bodies. The moderates also found it necessary to organize in opposition to the arrogance and the dominance of the liberals. This led to the establishment of several new organizations in the land and distinct denominations became a reality. And, many colleges and seminaries were placed in operation. New publications were provided to represent those who were opposed to liberalism. At the beginning period the groups were

positive and inclined toward taking a firm position. In later years some of the same groups have taken a less vigorous attitude on the matter of separation. This has led many people to name them as the new evangelicals, and sometimes they have been called the neo-evangelicals. Obviously there are considerable variations among the several million who belong in this category. Some are remaining separatistic in their concepts, at least to a certain extent, others are ecumenical and non-separatists. All in all, the third wing is not monolithic. Despite this broad spectrum reflecting the various positions held within the moderate group, there are some general characteristics by which the entire group may be identified. First, the moderate element is not particularly separatistic in its position. To illustrate: some of the periodicals print articles from time to time by non-fundamental writers along with others. No fixed line is being pursued in this regard. Moreover, the moderates support the cooperative evangelistic crusades (which are non-separatistic) in the large cities across the nation, and they serve on the committees of the sponsors. And, in addition, one usually finds the moderates steer away from a policy of come-out-ism in the evangelistic outreach. Involvement has become a key expression among them. To put it plainly, most of the moderates accept the social implication of the Gospel, and this position seems to become increasingly important to them. Helping the needy; in every way

possible is an accepted responsibility and humanitarian activities, such as the program of World Vision. It should be mentioned that in general the moderates present the Gospel of Christ. This becomes a sort of dual program as it were. And, the moderates seek to find a way to engage in some kind of dialog with those of a liberal persuasion. On the theological front, the moderates do not object to various positions on the subject of eschatology. On the matter of the Verbal-Plenary Inspiration of the Scriptures they do not always take a unequivocal stand in supporting that position. Often during public gatherings, and convocations, one finds that nationally popular personalities are invited to speak. They are on the rostrum even though some of them have not taken a firm stand for the evangelical faith. All of these matters, which I have discussed, provide some distinct ear-marks of the moderate elements in the category so designated in this article. This evaluation is made after many years of careful observation of those who may be classified as the moderates.

THE RESTRAINED SEPARATISTS

There is a fourth category, even if it cannot be identified as easily as the others which have been discussed. Actually this group consists of true separatists, but they refrain from being involved in a continuous controversy with other evangelicals who may have reached some different conclusions on

the position on separation. This fourth separatistic group usually stays out of the many, broad activities which are popular today. But, on the other hand, they do not feel it is necessary to be excessively drastic and harsh toward some of the brethren who honestly differ, and who do not see eye to eye with them on the matter of separation. Let me illustrate: In writing the introduction to my book, *Glimpses and Reflections of a Ministry*, Dr. John F. Walvoord had this statement: "The views expressed are shared by many who believe on the one hand, that they can have no part in modern liberalism, and should remain separate from apostasy, and on the other hand do not want to be needlessly controversial or divisive. To those who tend to go beyond the Scriptural instruction on separation, this book should serve as a useful, mature statement

of where evangelicals should take their proper position in these difficult days of rapid theological change." Personally, I feel Dr. Walvoord expresses the proper position in these difficult days, when the tendencies are to gravitate either to the far right or to the left on the matter of separation. This distinction is being exemplified by a considerable number of Bible-believing Christians of today. They represent a complete unwillingness to compromise on fundamental positions, and yet they do not feel inclined to fuel the fire of controversy with those brethren who have some honest differences with them on certain positions with respect to separation. This, then, is an overview on an important matter that confronts all of us. I sincerely hope the discussion will be helpful to the readers.

A TRIBUTE TO DR. WILLIAM McCARRELL

This long time leader of fundamentalism departed on August 25th at the age of 93. We were not aware of this when the previous issue of *The Discerner* was printed. He was a member of the Board of Reference of Religion Analysis Service for many years. Some years ago he wrote an outstanding article on liberalism for our magazine. Dr. McCarrell will be remembered longest for his 45 years pastorate at the Cicero Bible Church on the west side of Chicago. He also established the Fisherman's Club, and through its continued soul-winning work many were saved, including booze-runners, gangsters and gamblers. Dr. McCarrell also was one of the leaders in organizing The Independent Fundamental Churches of America, a very fine national organization of Bible-believing people. He preached until he was 91 when he suffered a stroke. During his ministry of nearly 70 years he touched thousands of lives. Indeed, he was an outstanding man of God during the greater part of this century. He will be missed by all conservative groups of our country.

John E. Dahlin

CREATION IN SCHOOLS

By Duane T. Gish, Ph.D., associate director of the
Institute for Creation Research, San Diego, California

The Institute for Creation Research does not attempt to *force* public school systems to give equal time to the creation theory of origins. It is the position of ICR that the best approach to the teaching of origins in the public schools is to *persuade* local and state boards of education and other educational authorities that good science, good education, academic freedom and religious freedom demand that the scientific evidence for both models of origins, special creation and evolution, be taught in the public schools. The present system of teaching only evolution indoctrinates our children in a naturalistic, mechanistic, humanistic philosophy in violation of the separation of church and state. Furthermore, this system denies the student the right to make his own decision concerning the credibility of these two models of origins based on an analysis of all available evidence and the interpretation of that evidence by each model of origins.

ICR not only does not recommend legal and/or legislative action to force this but believes that such action, at least in most states, is ill-advised at this time. If all efforts at persuasion eventually fail, then perhaps the only recourse left will be legislative or court proceedings. Members of the ICR staff of scientists have, on occasion, testified as individuals before legislative committees at the in-

stitution of those supporting legislation to require the teaching of both models, but no such legislation has ever been instigated or officially supported by ICR.

Even if educational authorities adopt the two-model approach as official policy and adopt appropriate educational materials to implement that policy, there will always be those teachers opposed to using this material who will scorn the creation alternative. Nevertheless, the majority of teachers will make a conscientious effort to teach the material objectively; in fact, many teachers themselves will become convinced that the creation model is superior to the evolution model when they are exposed to all the evidence. At the very least, all students will have the material available in their textbooks and many will accept the creation model in spite of opposition from their teachers.

The ICR has been accused of using "dubious arguments on the improbability or nonexistence of mechanisms and events postulated by evolutionists." Our arguments are certainly not dubious. It can be shown without the slightest doubt that if the best-known laws of science are accepted, and if well-established physical processes and principles are considered, a mechanistic, naturalistic, evolutionary origin of the universe and of life is a physical impossibility.

Concerning the Second Law of

Thermodynamics, the closed system versus open system does not even enter the picture when considering the origin of the universe. All evolutionists consider the universe to be an isolated system (nothing enters the universe from the outside and nothing acts on the universe from outside itself). They believe further that the universe began in a disordered state (as the result, perhaps, of the explosion of a primordial cosmic egg, the origin of which defies explanation) and that it transformed itself from this primitive chaos to the present cosmos, a highly ordered and complex universe. The Second Law of Thermodynamics says that *no* isolated natural system can begin in a state of disorder and end up in an ordered and complex state. This law states that the order within an isolated system can only decrease, *never* increase. The theory of the evolution of the universe clearly violates this law.

Even in open systems, in which case energy can enter from some outside source, there is a universal tendency toward disorder, decay and deterioration. In only those systems possessing appropriate energy conversion machines (photosynthesis in green plants, power tools in automobile factories) and an appropriate control mechanism (the incredibly complex genetic system in green plants and the human-controlled assembly line in an automobile factory) is it possible for order and complexity to arise at the expense of an outside energy source.

Without such systems, for exam-

ple, the ultraviolet light from the sun is terrible destructive. The hypothetical primitive earth would have been open to energy from the sun and that source would have supplied more than enough energy, but there could have existed no energy conversion machines or control systems. The idea that the indescribably complex system known as life could have spontaneously originated under these circumstances violates just about everything we know in science and is a nature myth invented by man to explain his origin apart from God. ICR believes our students in public schools are entitled to know this.

Concerning the probability arguments, the numbers fed into the equations are certainly not a problem. Creation scientists use the numbers supplied by evolutionists themselves, along with assumptions of evolution theory, and show that the postulated evolutionary events have a nil probability.

For example, Julian Huxley calculated the probability of something as complex as a horse evolving from a single-celled organism by mutation only without natural selection. According to his calculations, the probability was one chance out of one thousand raised to the million power (this latter number is equal to the number one followed by three million zeroes, a number so large that if trillions times trillions times trillions times trillions times trillions of universes were packed solid with electrons, the number of electrons they could contain would

not even approach that number!). But, says Huxley, natural selection was able to overcome these impossible odds!

Creationists merely point out that no natural process could overcome odds of that kind. Natural selection was evidently Huxley's god. They further point out that the odds against an evolutionary origin of life, where natural selection could not operate, are almost infinitely greater. Surely students with even average intelligence can understand such arguments. Evolutionists believe evolution in spite of the evidence, not because of the evidence.

The fossil record is also highly contradictory to evolution theory but is remarkably in agreement with the creation model. Our students need to know, for example, that evolutionist David Kitts of the University of Oklahoma has stated that although evolution requires intermediate forms between species, the fossil record doesn't supply them; and that the famous British anatomist Lord Zuckerman (an evolutionist) has said that if man has evolved from an ape-like creature, he did so without leaving a trace of the steps of the transformation in the fossil record. I repeat, evolutionists believe in evolution in spite of the evidence. The creation scientist arguments are not designed to challenge the ingenuity of evolutionists (and they are indeed ingenious!), but are designed to show first that evolution could not have occurred (based on proven laws and principles of science) and, secondly, that indeed it has not oc-

curred (based on the fossil record).

What is our goal in getting creation taught in public schools? It is put an end to an indoctrination or brainwashing designed to convince students that they are nothing more than a mechanistic product of a mindless universe, and to let them know that a Creator-God does exist. Millions will logically conclude that this Creator-God must also be their Lord and Master and that perhaps, after all, the Bible is more than a collection of myths. Here at ICR we have received many written and spoken testimonies of conversions to Christ following exposure to our debates, lectures and literature; and many Christians have testified that their attitudes toward the Bible were changed as a result of our ministry.

We agree heartily that the best way of keeping the world's philosophy out of our Christian youth is to educate them in Christian schools. But what about the millions of Christian youth who do not and perhaps cannot attend Christian schools? What about the millions of unsaved youth in public schools? Shall we permit our tax money in this pluralistic democratic society to be used to indoctrinate these students in a humanistic and essentially atheistic philosophy and view of our universe? Shall we continue to permit our Constitutional guarantees of academic and religious freedoms to be flouted? Shall we continue to finance such a system with our tax dollars while making no attempt to free it of these humanistic biases? We have

the truth on our side. The students in our public schools must be exposed to that truth. For Christians to insist on less is unconscionable.

The ICR staff of seven scientists publishes a monthly journal entitled *Acts & Facts* which is free to

anyone requesting it. Write the Institute for Creation Research, 2716 Madison Avenue, San Diego, California 92116.

Used with permission of *The Baptist Bulletin*, Nov. 1979.

BOOK REVIEW
SECULAR HUMANISM: THE MOST
DANGEROUS RELIGION IN AMERICA—
HOMER DUNCAN

Christian Focus, Lubbock, Texas, 78 pages, paper, \$1.50

By Rev. Ewald Eisele

The author of this enlightening but disturbing 78 page paperback, Homer Duncan, needs no introduction to conservative and fundamental circles. His pen has been effective in attacking the enemies of the Truth before this and in this volume he continues his assault with vigor.

He is dealing here with something that isn't usually considered to be a religion and in the early pages he defends that designation by calling on, and quoting on page 14, John W. Whitehead and John Colan, as saying in the *Texas Tech Law Review*, "The Supreme Court has recognized this new religion as 'the religion of secularism'."

The title page sounds this solemn warning, "It is unbelievable but true, the American taxpayers are paying for their own destruction." But there is also a solemn purpose for this 14 chapter book stated on page 7, "The purpose of this booklet is not only to inform, but to challenge to action. It is never too late to act when you are moving in the will of God." Then page after page he exposes and ex-

pounds on what he rightly has labeled Dangerous. He begins by defining it as the secular religion that deifies man and dethrones God. Its avowed aim, he writes, is to replace theism with humanism.

After dealing with the tenets of Secularism Humanism Mr. Duncan associates it first to the theory of evolution and then to communism. In both of those two chapters the relation between these ideologies are not considered as a future danger but as a present reality with which Christians today are going to have to cope.

The chapter, "Humanism and the Church of The Lord Jesus Christ" should be read over and over again by everyone professing faith in Jesus Christ. This is followed by a lengthy quote from *The Church At The End of The Twentieth Century*, by Francis Schaeffer in which Dr. Schaeffer brings a devastating attack on present day liberalism—which Mr. Duncan elsewhere declares to be nothing less than Secular Humanism in all its subtleness.

Americans are aware, and accept the fact, that most of the time

religious cults are very subtle in their approach and attack. But the danger of Secular Humanism lies not only in its subtleness but in the fact that the majority of the educators of the land are sold out to its tenets and are committed to spreading its poisons through our public schools and colleges.

There is no doubt that here is a small but very important document. Not only should every Christian read it, but it should also be read by every American who is

concerned with the direction in which our nation is moving.

Having presented his case, Mr. Duncan doesn't leave the reader without a solution to the problem. The final chapter, "What We Can Do And Must Do" presents a down-to-earth plan of action. It is not a plan for the clergy, nor for the legislator, but for the grass-roots American who is concerned with the future of the greatest nation on the face of the earth.

MOONEY'S FLOWERS WORTH \$20 MILLION

Officials of Rev. Sun Myung Moon's Unification Church have revealed financial records indicating the group collected \$20 million in 1978 in street solicitations. The information was made public to refute charges by Allen Tate Wood, a former leader of the U.C. who has defected and is now a "deprogrammer."

In an interview with the New York Post, and in testimony in the Manhattan Supreme Court, where the U.C. is seeking tax exemptions on its real-estate buildings, Tate had alleged that the group makes as much as \$219 million a year

through solicitations.

The Post noted that neither figure cited by Wood or one provided by the U.C. could be independently verified. But the \$20 million cited by the U.C. for 1978 represents a substantial increase over the \$8 million it claimed for 1975, the last year for which figures had been made public.

Katie Lowrey, U.C.'s director of public affairs, said, "There are more people soliciting now, but inflation also goes into that. People who four years ago gave \$1 for a flower now give \$2."

From "Eternity" November issue.

YOUR FRIENDS WILL APPRECIATE THE DISCERNER

At the beginning of the New Year we suggest that you send in gift subscriptions for your friends. They will benefit by the information provided by our magazine for the readers. 4 issues for \$2.00; 12 issues for \$5.00.

RELIGION ANALYSIS SERVICE, INC.
2708 E. Lake Street
Suite 231
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55406

Address Correction Requested

PERTINENT QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

John E. Dahlin, Editor

QUESTION . . . What is meant by a second degree separation which is referred to by certain writers?

ANSWER . . . By a second degree of separation is meant more than a detachment from the liberals on Biblical doctrine. To this is added a separation from those within the Christian sphere who are tolerant on some issues, and who fail to take a decisive position in situations where the Scriptural teaching points to separation. This is regarded by many as a second degree of separation.

QUESTION . . . Has the conservative position on separation eroded since the time, several decades ago, when a major break occurred between fundamentalists and liberals?

ANSWER . . . From observation of developments in this country and elsewhere it is apparent that the separatistic position has weakened during the past generation. At the present time it appears that only a minority advocate a complete separation from those practices which are not in accord with the Biblical teachings on many vital issues involving the Christians in our time.