

Integrity

4051 S. Lincoln Road
Mt. Pleasant, Michigan 48858

Nonprofit Organization
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
Ann Arbor, MI 48106
Permit No. 189

ADDRESS CORRECTION REQUESTED

INTEGRITY, a journal published bimonthly by an independent nonprofit corporation, is intended to be a ministry of reconciliation which utilizes the varied talents of a large community of believers. These believers, united in faith but divergent in opinions, seek to accurately reveal God to both the church and the world so that all may become one as He is one. Accordingly, it should not be assumed that the views expressed by individual authors necessarily represent the opinions of either the editors or the Board as a whole.

conform to the theory. "Popper put the essential point in a marvelous aphorism: 'The wrong view of science betrays itself in the craving to be right'" (p. 147). From Darwin on, contends Johnson, the guardians of evolutionary theory have protected themselves from objective refutability. "Evolutionary science became the search for confirming evidence, and the explaining away of negative evidence" (p. 150). So it is not evolution as a scientific conclusion that objectors have to contend with, but evolution as an anti-religious faith, one which fears any rivals to its "philosophical program of scientific naturalism." But, ironically, "whenever science is enlisted in some other cause—religious, political, or racialistic—the result is always that the scientists themselves become fanatics" (p. 154).

Phillip E. Johnson has taken a bold step in the face of a powerful and closed-minded scientific and social Establishment, one supported by an equally powerful and sophisticatedly constructed myth of the origins of all life, especially

including mankind. After reading this book, one should stand amazed at how completely the popular imagination has been captured by the images of crouching prehistoric "predecessors" of man and references to the continuum of the progress of life from some yet-unexplained primordial spark to the wonders of our present world; and yet, all of this elaborate image-making is based on an intellectual construction for which the physical evidence is at best inconclusive. Johnson's book may not go far enough for the most dedicated creation-science adherents, but it certainly provides comfort for those who have long wanted to puncture the unwarranted philosophical and anti-theistic extensions and presumptions of naturalistic evolutionists.

Dr. Elton D. Higgs, professor at University of Michigan, Dearborn for more than 25 years, is an expert in Medieval literature. As a member of the Board, he has dedicated time and skills to the *Integrity* ministry for more than ten years.

March/April
Vol. 23, No. 2

Integrity

Editorial: The Call For Unity

Evidence of Wisdom

Hoy Ledbetter

Moral Truth Always Liberates—Always

John W. Loftus

1992 ACU Lectureship

J. Bruce Kilmer

Intercepted Correspondence

Book Review: Darwin On Trial

Phillip E. Johnson

Reviewed by: Elton D. Higgs

March/April 1992
Vol. 23, No. 2

Editors

Diane G.H. Kilmer
J. Bruce Kilmer

Layout Editor

Natalie Randall

Integrity Address

4051 S. Lincoln Road
Mt. Pleasant, MI 48858

Board of Directors

Sidney R. Bonvallet
Wayne A. Bonvallet
Brant Lee Doty
Howard L. Ganong, Jr.
Elton D. Higgs
Laquita M. Higgs
Joseph F. Jones
Diane G.H. Kilmer
J. Bruce Kilmer
Curtis Lloyd
Curtis D. McClane
Foy Palmer
Henrietta C. Palmer
William Palmer
Amos Ponder
Karl W. Randall
Natalie Randall
Jan Van Horn
John Van Horn

Editorial Advisor

Hoy Ledbetter

Subscriptions

are by written request.
There is no subscription
charge, but we depend on
your contributions, which are
tax deductible.

Manuscripts

written exclusively for
INTEGRITY are
welcomed.

Back Issues

Available from
1269 Pickwick Place
Flint, MI 48507

The Call For Unity

I remember the first time I ever read Thomas Campbell's principles of unity in his *Declaration and Address*. They were required reading for Dr. Bill Humble's Restoration History class at Abilene Christian University. I was a young idealist, disenchanted with the flaws and divisions of a legalistic church, but very much committed to Jesus Christ. Campbell's *Declaration*, over 150 years old at the time, reflected the influence of reformers before him, but I felt like I was reading fresh news.

Campbell's writings developed the theme of "in essentials, unity; in opinions, liberty; in all things, love." He saw that the Church was naturally made up of people at different stages of spiritual growth and understanding. Therefore, Campbell declared, a very minimum of qualifications is necessary to consider one another "brethren." Christians, he believed, are people who understand their lost condition, accept the fact that only Jesus Christ can save them, and have professed faith in Jesus and obedience to him. No other requirements, Campbell maintained, should be conditions of fellowship or communion.

Campbell was totally committed to the conscientious study of Scripture, but he himself had observed and experienced discrimination by church members over differences of opinion. He called such divisiveness horrid evil, antichristian, unnatural, for "it destroys the visible unity of the body of Christ; as if he were divided against himself, excluding and excommunicating a part of himself." Campbell wrote that Christians were expected to "love each other as brethren, even as Christ has loved them." He emphasized Christ's prayer for unity among his believers, "so that the world may know that You have sent me and have loved them as You have loved me" (John 17:23b).

That Thomas Campbell became "eager to maintain the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace" (Ephesians 4:3) was clearly seen by those of us who read about his life for Restoration History class. Campbell accepted Christ's appeal to be ecumenical in thought and practice. Sometime during that history class, I decided to pursue unity rather than perpetuate exclusiveness. Since that commitment, the Lord continues to surprise me with experiences which enlarge my vision of who is family.

Diane G. H. Kilmer

Evidence of Wisdom

HOY LEDBETTER

"I am Sir Oracle, and when I ope my lips let no dog bark!" Thus Shakespeare, in *The Merchant of Venice*, prescribes words for a man who wants to have a reputation for wisdom. Of course, since arrogant people do not wish to appear arrogant, nobody would ever really make a statement like that—except indirectly, through other claims made and behavior exhibited.

It is to such a pretension to wisdom that James replies in the third chapter of his epistle: "Who among you is wise and understanding? Let him show by his good behavior his deeds in gentleness of wisdom. But if you have bitter jealousy and selfish ambition in your heart, do not be arrogant and so lie against the truth. This wisdom is not that which comes down from above, but is earthly, natural, demonic. For where jealousy and selfish ambition exist, there is disorder and every evil thing. But the wisdom from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, reasonable, full of mercy and good fruits, unwavering, without hypocrisy. And the seed whose fruit is righteousness is sown in peace by those who make peace" (Jas. 3:13-18).

The "wise and understanding" person in this passage apparently is one who claims to have special inspiration from God and to be an expert in faith and church. Since the vocabulary of the present-day church is somewhat different, the one James calls "wise" we would probably refer to as "Spirit-filled," and we might replace his word "understanding" with "sound," a term that is often used among partisans to denote those who are faithful to their accepted interpretations of Scripture.

But even though those so-called Spirit-filled and sound brethren viewed themselves as champions of the truth, as heralds of the whole gospel, and claimed to be on the hot line to God, James was not impressed. He would, of course,

readily admit that they were under inspiration, but he questioned that it was the right inspiration; and they needed to submit some proof that it was. The right inspiration would build up God's community by producing good deeds in an atmosphere of "mild and gentle friendliness." Any teacher whose inspiration did not lead to that would be unmasked as a false teacher with counterfeit credentials, even if he did claim to be Spirit-filled.

Signs of Pretension

On the other hand, there are some positive evils that always betray empty pretenders. One of these James calls "bitter jealousy," which suggests a fierce desire to promote one's own opinion or party to the exclusion of all others. It is the contentious spirit that contrasts with the mild and gentle friendliness of the genuine Christian. The person who is given to this vice may see himself as jealous for the truth, but his fanaticism and quarrelsomeness have nothing to do with truth. He is, in fact, an unspiritual controversialist who will regard those who differ with him as dangerous, will refuse to be reconciled to them, and will maintain a hostile attitude toward everyone who disagrees with him.

The second mark of the heretic is "selfish ambition," a term which originally denoted the day laborer, the man who would do his work and be paid for it at the end of the day. From that definition it jumped to the meaning of one who worked for hire, then one who worked *only* for hire, that is, only for what he could get out of it, and not for the good he might do for others. And finally it was used in reference to one who would volunteer for public service, not because he was really devoted to the public interest, but because it provided him an oppor-

tunity to advance himself. So the word shows up in the New Testament in the sense of selfish ambition.

This term has many occasions to serve in the vocabulary of the church today, for notwithstanding the constant protests we make against selfish ambition, we never seem to be able to get rid of it. It is an appropriate designation for the ever-present empire builder who develops a Christian image to cover up his secret desire to be rich, or powerful, or popular, or, possibly, just the most influential preacher in the country. The victim of this vice is often said to have received a call, but if so, what he has heard is not the voice of the Lord, but the yearnings of his own flesh. Selfish ambition is a term of broad scope; it may characterize any person who seeks to get his own way without considering what builds up his brothers and sisters and who, in order to do so, may even insist that he has a special anointing of the Holy Spirit and therefore should not be opposed.

All lying is certainly sinful, but James stresses that bragging about our spirituality when our behavior is anything but spiritual is a special insult to the truth. He says "if you have bitter jealousy and selfish ambition in your heart, do not be arrogant and so lie against the truth." No matter how much divine prompting you may claim, you are not teaching the truth but asserting yourself, and since your conduct is inconsistent with the truth you claim to have and herald, you are lying against it.

Earthly Wisdom

In a tone that may make our soft-spoken generation uncomfortable, he goes on to say, in essence, "You may be inspired all right, but not by the Holy Spirit. Your inspiration is earthly and never really carries you above the material plane. It is natural rather than spiritual, for it always settles on the sensual. It is demonic, and we all know where the demons get their inspiration."

To this bold statement James adds one more word of denunciation. He says that "where jealousy and selfish ambition exist, there is disorder and every evil thing." They leave in their wake a big mess of broken relationships,

divided churches, disillusioned saints, and lingering resentment.

This is such an unattractive picture that we may hesitate to acknowledge that the church can harbor such people. But there can be no doubt that James is talking about something that *has* happened in some churches and *can* happen in all of them. We must take nothing for granted. Satan still seeks whom he may devour, and we must always be ready to resist him. Sectarianism is a deadly poison, and we may not find the antidote easy to take, but it is necessary. And that is what James turns to next, when he gives us a list of qualities which will be evident among those who really are in touch with God.

Wisdom from God

The first of these, which is given top billing, is "pure." Purity requires that our motives and methods be characterized by integrity, that what people see is what is really there. It demands that our praise of God not be mixed with tooting our own horn. It compels us to preserve a clear distinction between the gospel and our own opinions; to avoid any act of service that is done to be seen by men; and to maintain a fellowship in which we respect God's choice of our brothers and sisters, without setting up our own conditions of acceptance. As a moral term, purity stands opposed to the bickering and contentiousness which some people carry on in the name of Jesus. It means that we always tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, with no deception practiced to give us an advantage over anybody else. If we are to keep secrets from each other, it must always be with the unmixed intention of not hurting the other person, and with a constant recognition of how easily even that noble purpose can be perverted.

Next, this inspiration is "peaceable." Since peace in the Bible basically refers to right relationships, the spirit that is ready for peace is always trying to bring people together, rather than separating them. It is conciliatory, not resentful. This quality is especially important in a growing fellowship, for whenever people reach a new understanding of truth, or when they first begin to put into practice what they

have discovered, there are bound to be tensions. And in times of tension it is easy to express firm convictions in a belligerent manner. That is when it is especially important for us to disagree without being disagreeable, which is what the peaceable person always does.

The next quality is "gentle," which in this verse comes from a Greek word which literally means "yielding," and that is a rendering which would serve well in our translations. It denotes the quality of one who is willing to give in to others, even when technically he does not have to. It suggests a mildness of disposition that does not insist on the letter of the law or stand on personal rights, but is willing to yield a point if that is best for the other person. It is a "merciful consideration" which knows how to forgive. Scholars like to refer to Matthew Arnold's happy rendering of the word in 2 Corinthians 10:1, which refers to the "sweet reasonableness" of Christ.

Now if our "sweetly reasonable" Lord can be mild and forgiving to his enemies, although he could make severe demands upon them, surely we can find in him the strength to go at least that far with our own dear brethren. But unfortunately the opposite is often the case, when we are so obsessed with defending our own power and dignity, with standing on our rights, and proving that we are not somebody who can be pushed around. The Christian gift of yielding is the answer to our defensiveness, our unforgiving attitude, our Satanic jealousy for authority, and our power struggles which so often leave the body in splinters if not in splinters.

True spirituality, James says, is also "reasonable." Within its context this word seems to indicate not only one who is ready to submit to the truth when he discovers it, but also one who is willing to listen to others, even those who disagree with him, rather than always being on the attack. It is quite literally "Yielding to persuasion," a necessary ingredient of obedience, but not in the sense of one who has no firm convictions and is therefore swayed in whatever direction the latest wind blows, but one who will be moved by reasonable argument. This virtue is directly op-

posed to the unbending attitude of the partisan who has total resistance to the facts when they get in the way of his opinions.

This wisdom is also "full of mercy and good fruits." In the first chapter of Romans there is a tragic picture of man at his worst in his departure from God, and one of his great wrongs that shows how far he has fallen is that he is "without mercy." Because God is merciful and always works for the benefit of others, those who follow him must also be full of mercy and beneficial acts. Blessed are the merciful, even in small matters, for they shall obtain mercy.

Unwavering Wisdom

Another commendable aspect of the Spirit-filled life is that it is "unwavering." We ought to give special stress to this one because it is easy to overlook the fact that people who are always wrestling with their own uncertainty are a serious threat to the unity of the church. Those who cannot quite trust their convictions have a profound psychological need to have them confirmed by everybody else in their group believing exactly the same thing. Such people are very uncomfortable with any real diversity and will demand, in one way or another but usually as an exaggerated loyalty to the truth, that the whole church adopt their viewpoint; and unless they are restrained, they will protect their wavering convictions by removing even loyal dissenters from the church. They may also insist that the church services be conducted according to their agenda, and even if they do give lip service to the edification of other members, they will complain that they just cannot get through the week unless certain things happen which support their faith, and thus they force the body to either give in to them or to endure their demoralizing murmuring. Either way, people who waver can be extremely destructive.

Finally, the heavenly wisdom is "without hypocrisy." The fact that Jesus denounced hypocrisy with extraordinary frequency has not kept his people free from it. Do you remember what happened to Peter at Antioch? After he had accepted the principle that the Gentiles could be saved by faith without the works of the law and circumcision, he backed it up by

eating with the Gentiles when he first arrived in Antioch. But when certain conservative brethren came from Jerusalem, he began to withdraw from the Gentiles and hold himself aloof, because he was afraid of the party of the circumcision.

Paul portrayed Peter's posture as pure pretension, and credited it with starting an epidemic, because "the rest of the Jews joined him in hypocrisy, with the result that even Barnabas was carried away by their hypocrisy" (Ga. 2:13). This holding aloof from the Gentiles was nothing but fear in action. It resulted from no religious impulse. It represented no real conviction. It only laid on the Gentiles a condition of communion that even Peter himself did not believe in. But had it continued, it would have destroyed the fellowship between Jews and

Gentiles which had been purchased with the very blood of Christ. Now we may not have the opportunity to do quite that much damage, but we can do enough; and we need to remember that there is no feigning of feeling in true inspiration.

James closes out this passage by bringing us back to his characteristic stress on righteousness, for we live to achieve the righteousness of God, which we cannot do unless we follow the rules for maintaining community.

Hoy Ledbetter, founding editor of *Integrity*, has served churches in the Stone-Campbell movement during all his years of ministry. He presently serves First Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) in Albany, Georgia.

Moral Truth Always Liberates—Always

JOHN W. LOFTUS

Perry Cotham's recent essay (Nov./Dec. 1991) was well written and informative regarding censorship and the Constitution. My major concern with it is that when pornography is defined as art by the NEA, an organization that should know, then other kinds of pornographic material will have legitimacy as well—the floodgates of filth will open. Already we have seen strip joints defend themselves by claiming that their activity has artistic merit.

Cotham wrote, "one person's art is another person's poison." Does he mean to say there is no truth in art? Is he saying that morally decent art can be poison to non-Christians in the same sense that immorally indecent art is poison to Christians? I beg to differ. As a Christian, I happen to think that morality, decency and

truth are never poison to *anyone* regardless of one's socio-religio-political persuasion. Moral truth is never oppressive, if it's the truth of God. Moral truth never hurts us, because it represents God's love to his creation. Real moral truth can only heal us, bind us up, call us to repentance, remind us of our condition, challenge us to love the unlovely, and so on. This kind of truth does not destroy what is beautiful, good, or precious. Truth is not destructive at all. As a Christian I simply do not want to be poisoned, nor do I want to live in a society where poison ruins people's lives.

What we are really witnessing is a clash of values, and I see no reason why a Christian can't stand up and say: "These are my values, and I think they are right for everyone because

they not only have a foundation in God, but also because we have seen them work in the Western world by giving us freedom without chaos for more than a thousand years."

Cotham is correct that there are other evils in our society that are worse than pornography. But this fact cannot be used as an argument against those who choose to fight lesser evils because of their proximity to the evil itself. These people are still justified in fighting the evil before them.

What I really disagree with in Cotham's essay is his defense of the NEA funding of indecent art. His essay is thoughtful and articulate on many points. But for him to say that we shouldn't attach conditions to public funded art or else we run the risk of serving a dominant ideological regime, perhaps one like the Nazi's, is certainly counterproductive, and an unnecessary use of inflammatory rhetoric.

Cotham's Argument

There are at least four reasons Cotham's argument is incorrect.

(1) Hitler banned pornography because he claimed that it contributes to the destruction of Aryan families. Hitler banned pornography since he desired the Aryan race to dominate the world. By banning it, he was protecting Aryan families from being broken up, which would minimize his chances to succeed in his ideological quest for world domination. What we need to realize is that it's entirely reasonable to agree with Hitler that pornography destroys families, without ascribing to his ideological, racial and militaristic goals. Jascha Heifetz is quoted as saying: "No matter what side of an argument you're on, you always find some people on your side that you wish were on the other side."

Christians fight pornography in order to help the families of *all people of all races*. It's true that there are groups such as NOW, and AC-TUP, who think that the bourgeois family unit is the source of almost all our societal ills, and that it must be destroyed. But why should we allow it to be destroyed in favor of a homosexual-feminist-atheistic-humanistic society? Why should we capitulate to them when they

have declared war on my family and yours? Theirs is the ideological regime we should avoid.

(2) Gary Wills, himself no conservative, has argued that "one of the great mistakes of liberals in recent decades has been the ceding of moral concern to rightwingers. Just because one opposes censorship, one need not be seen as agreeing with pornographers." Why? Because "it is a distortion to turn 'You can express any views' into 'I don't care what views you express.'" (*TIME* "In Praise of Censure," July 31, 1989). Christian faith demands that we do care. To do less is to abdicate our role as salt in society. Why is it that Christians are the only ones expected to keep silent about their values, while the homosexual, New Age, atheistic, anti-human environmentalist and abortion lobbies never stop pushing their agendas?

(3) At the end of his essay, Cotham states that if we are offended by something we can "vote with our dollars." Now who does he think is funding the NEA anyway? Don't we have a voice in saying where our tax dollars should go? Sure we do, and Cotham knows it. But he can't have it both ways. So long as our money goes toward defining what art is, then we must speak up. If we ignore the problem another decade, as Cotham might want, our country may be filled with the same level of pornography as found in England, France, Germany or Japan.

(4) The Western experience of freedom itself is a moral value given to us by the Judeo-Christian ethical world-view. What people will allow others to freely do in any society depends upon their system of values. Whether the issue is human rights, abortion, welfare policy, censorship, pornography, criminal punishment, prostitution, racial preferential hiring, bigamy, cannibalism, homosexuality, and so on, a society will only grant others liberty to do what their values will tolerate. To tolerate everything brings utter moral chaos, and invites a police state to establish order.

Perhaps we should examine the kind of freedom other countries, which have not been touched by the gospel, have experienced. Let's compare these societies with ours and ask

what it is that makes us different. The gospel always liberates. It does so by its system of ethics, along with regenerated people committed to see those ethics dominate their culture. True Christianity creates a truly free culture.

Christianity Within History

It can be argued that Christianity gave us the First Amendment in the first place. Other religious world-views see no real distinction between God and Caesar or the church and the state. But this distinction is based in the Creator/creature difference of Judeo-Christian faith. Unlike pantheism, New Age Occultism, atheism, or even Muslim sects, Christianity gave us this freedom. What might happen if we abandon or neglect this heritage? What kind of society would the homosexual lobby create, for instance, if we let them? What kind of rights and privileges are they willing to grant to Christian people?

Before someone brings up the mistakes in Christian history, he should be reminded that they should always be judged by the particular historical time period in question, not by a hindsight moral consensus developed later in history. Voltaire has said: "Every man is the creature of the age in which he lives; very few are able to raise themselves above the ideas of the time." This being the case, Christianity has always been an improvement upon the social-historical period which preceded it. Christiani-

ty has a better record than communistic dialectical materialism, or Muslim jihads, Arab terrorists, or Chinese warlords.

No one is calling for forced adherence to specifically Christian doctrines, only for outward obedience to limited public ethical standards of behavior. The goal here is not to save people by demanding such obedience, but to contain their evil intentions and produce a peaceful and civilized society.

To limit our role in shaping the ethics of our society in the name of freedom, as Cotham has argued, will actually undercut true freedom. Why? Because moral truth always liberates—always. It's true that on some issues many Christians may not have most of the truth—certainly not all of it. This much is granted. But unlike Cotham, I'd rather err on the side of most Christians who at least have a sure standard for behavior, than trust the shifting standards. It's also true that we should develop a healthy humility for what we proclaim, and be willing to question the veracity of much of what we believe. But when we have solid convictions on certain issues, then we need to proclaim them to the same degree we have confidence they represent moral truth.

John W. Loftus holds M.A. and M.Div. degrees from Lincoln Christian Seminary and the Th.M. degree from Trinity Evangelical Divinity School. He presently serves as senior minister to the Angola Christian Church in Angola, Indiana.

Diane and I returned to Abilene last February for the first time since I graduated in 1971, we found all three aspects at the ACU Lectureship. The lectures were inspiring and uplifting. In the

big tent, along with what seemed like every Church of Christ mission, publication, camp, nursing home, school, and good work of any kind, we put up a table display for *Integrity*. At that promotional spot we met many old friends, and made many new ones.

During the Lectureship in 1970, I remember hearing Carl Ketcherside speak at the local Christian Church because his views regarding unity were considered too controversial for the Lectureship. Now some 20 years later, *Integrity* had a table display in the Big Tent and the editors were warmly greeted by numerous ACU faculty and staff. Leroy Garret's *Restoration Review*, *Integrity*, and other non-mainstream publications were mentioned in lectures, not in a derogatory manner, but in the context of encouraging all of us who are part of the Stone-Campbell movement to keep talking to each other.

Douglas Foster, the new co-director of ACU's Center for Restoration Studies, gave the Restoration History lectures. In one lecture, Foster explained how he had read several Church of Christ publications dating over the past ten years. He then rated these publications on a scale of 1 to 90 on how he thought 18 issues were treated in the articles. The issues included such things as versions of the Bible; hand clapping in worship; marriage, divorce and remarriage; elderships; women's role in the church; and the discipling movement. The higher the score a publication received meant the more closed or conservative were the positions the publication took on these issues. The lower the score meant the more open or liberal were the positions the publication took on these issues.

Of the publications reviewed, *Restoration Review* received the lowest score, 30, and Ira Rice's *Contending For the Faith* received the highest score, 88. Incidentally, although Dr. Foster did not review *Integrity*, he stated in one of his lectures that he thought that *Integrity* would be close to *Restoration Review*. We thought this was pretty good company to be in!

Dr. Foster reminded us that within Christendom, all of the publications he reviewed and most of the different views within the Church

of Christ are within what is generally accepted as conservative evangelical Christianity. We all believe the basics of, as the early Restoration leaders would have put it, "the essentials." With so much in common, we should keep talking to one another. If we do not, then we are likely to break into even smaller, ineffective groups. We have so much to offer each other, if we will only accept each other with our differences.

Other signs of change, growth, and hope were evident. While in Abilene, we attended Sunday morning worship at the Minter Lane Church of Christ. Over the past year they had experimented with Sunday meeting innovations, settling upon a refreshing format that we experienced while there. Members meet at 9 a.m. for a half hour of worship in song, prayer and Scripture. (The morning we were there Jesus' Great Commission from Matthew was read in German, Chinese, English, and an African language.) Next came the sermon, given by Dr. Tony Ash. The next half hour was spent in "focused fellowship," when members could either spend time in prayer alone or with an elder, or visit with others over coffee. After fellowship time, the peak of the morning meeting was reached when the next half hour was devoted to partaking of the Lord's Supper together. Sunday school classes meet on Sunday evening. The time spent in fellowship before the Lord's Supper and the extended time taken for the Lord's Supper was especially meaningful to me.

Two lectures particularly stood out in importance because of their positive content which we hope to see bear fruit. Jim Woodruff lectured in Moody Coliseum on "The Believer's Freedom." Throughout his talk, Woodruff promoted the striving for unity among believers. He entreated his listeners to keep their differences in the background and allow our common salvation in Christ to step to the foreground of our relationships. Woodruff's book, *The Church in Transition*, emphasizes love and unity in the family of God based on Jesus Christ rather than traditions. Although Woodruff's lecture seemed inoffensive and quite palatable to me, two preachers were overheard at a local

restaurant afterward, bemoaning Woodruff's attitude as "too soft."

The second memorable lecture I wanted to mention was by Carroll Osburn, a Greek scholar who teaches at ACU. His assignments for the week were "The Difficult Texts in I Corinthians Reconsidered." The texts included: "Let A Man Judge Himself" (I Cor. 11:28), "That Which Is Perfect" (I Cor. 13:10), and "Let The Women Keep Silent" (I Cor. 14:34-35). When he gave the third talk of his series on the I Cor. 14 passage, every seat was filled in the large lecture hall, people were sitting in the aisles, standing in the back, and chairs were set on the stage. This indication of interest in the topic was encouraging, but Dr. Osburn's conclusion was even more encouraging. He said that to be true to the Greek text, you could not interpret I Cor. 14:34-35 to mean that all women for all time had to be silent in the church. Because Paul had just written in chapter 11 that women were praying and prophesying in the church, he could not be saying in chapter 14 that women were silent in all the churches. What Paul was saying, according to Dr. Osburn, was that just as the tongue speakers who were causing confusion, and just as the prophets who were causing a ruckus should be still, so should the women who were interrupting by piping up, be still. Both the lecture on unity and the lecture on freedom in Christ for women were encouraging signs of hope for the future for Restoration churches of the a cappella tradition.

One book I noticed that seemed to be selling well in the Big Tent was "I Permit Not A Woman..." "To Remain Shackled," whose author, Robert Rowland, I got to meet later that week. Rowland documents specific instances that represent the many inconsistencies in the Church of Christ regarding what we say women can and cannot do. We shared a great conversation and Rowland took the July/August issue of *Integrity* with him. Later, he called excitedly from Oregon to say that he'd just finished my article "Women in God's Plan" and marveled at how his book supported and expanded on the article's contents! You can order

Rowland's book from Lighthouse Publishing Company, 525 N.W. 57th Street, Newport, Oregon 97365 for \$9.95 plus \$1.55 postage.

Two more authors I met who have served the church faithfully with their writing were Olan Hicks and his wife, Barbara, and Cecil Hook and his wife, Lea. Hicks has published encouraging books on unity, divorce and remarriage, and other topics. His latest book *How To Cooperate With God In Your Life* can be ordered from Gospel Enterprises, P.O. Box 1253, Searcy, AR 72143. Hook wrote *Free In Christ* and other books that readers have found quite liberating. You can order any of his books by writing to Cecil and Lea Hook, 1350 Huisache, New Braunfels, TX 78130.

Cecil Hook mentioned to me during one of our conversations that we were free at the ACU Lectureship to display *Integrity* and his book *Free In Christ* because of people like Leroy Garrett and Carl Ketcherside. Both Garrett and Ketcherside took criticism for years for advocating the very ideas I saw being advocated at the 1992 Lectureship: open discussion, acceptance, unity in diversity, unity in essentials, and encouragement for people to "keep talking to one another." During his inaugural on the first day of Lectureship week, the new president of Abilene Christian University, Royce Money, proclaimed: "As a Christian university, ACU is not for sale! Not to the right or to the left. Not to sectarian spirits who set themselves up as standards of orthodoxy or to any spirits who would have us sell our religious birthright."

Our visit to Abilene gave us a renewed vision for the Church of Christ, and for the role of *Integrity* in the dialogue and search which must continue if Restoration churches are going to be viable and effective 20 years from now!

Bruce Kilmer is co-editor of *Integrity*. He grew up in the a capella Church of Christ, graduated from ACU, and has served as an elder in the instrumental Church of Christ/Christian Church. Currently Bruce and his family live in Mt. Pleasant, Michigan, where he works for the Michigan Supreme Court.

Intercepted Correspondence

The following "Intercepted Correspondence" is a continuing feature begun in the January/February 1988 issue of *Integrity*. These letters are *Integrity's* version of C.S. Lewis' *Screwtape Letters* and Os Guinness' *Gravedigger Files* and are written by two different *Integrity* board members.

To refresh your memory and inform new readers, our imaginary setting has Bruce

attending Word Perfect computer classes, where he accidentally begins intercepting subversive communication between two devils on his computer screen. The *Integrity* board decides that we must inform Christians everywhere of the destructively evil plots of the nefarious teacher Apollyon and his young student Ichabod by publishing the letters for as long as they can be intercepted.

My dear nefarious Nephew,

Your longer-than-usual diatribe extolling the subversive efforts we may expend to effect musical mayhem contains some genuinely diabolical methods and motivations. I am faxing it for distribution to all our newer imps and demons, in the hope that they, too, may turn what should be one of the Enemy's most effective tools in worship into demonic disaster. Music is potentially, at one and the same time, one of our greatest assets or a catastrophic liability to our cause. In the Enemy's mode, music has power to turn even a case-hardened heart and soul into a guilt-stricken penitent. I can only encourage you to continue your exploitation of C. Sharp's spiritual myopia. When pride overwhelms humble spirituality, when frivolity dilutes religious intensity, and when showmanship dominates spiritual projection, we can claim a "fellow-traveler," if not a dedicated disciple.

Encourage the weaker followers to take advantage of beautiful, comfortable warm, sunny days. They are made to order for picnicking, fishing, golf, family reunions and outings, and all sorts of pleasant outdoor activities. We can lure the Enemy's lukewarm adherents away from the "religious herd" in a stuffy building to the attraction of great and beautiful open setting (where the Set-Maker is always forgotten, of course), using all sorts of pretexts: "We only

get so many days like this for outdoor activities; better use this one. . . ;" "My kids are growing up so fast I want to enjoy them before I lose them. . . ;" "After all, we've been to church three Sundays in a row; the Lord owes us this one. . . ;" "The preacher just seems to be singling me out for some choice, harsh criticism; I don't need any more just now. . . ." You've heard all these, and many more. But old as they are, they still work.

And "preacher-bashing" is quite the thing currently, being very productive where other approaches fail. If the preacher doesn't "preach the Bible," he's drawn and quartered by a sizeable segment of the knowledgeable auditors. If he does, he's "stuck in a rut with the same old stuff." If his sermons are primarily addressed to contemporary social, moral, economic, environmental or political issues, he's a "liberal;" if they are not, he's "blind to the needs of the community/city/state/nation/world." If he raises his voice, he's a rabble-rouser; if he doesn't, he really isn't concerned. If he's truly humble and sincere, he's hiding something, or compensating for some grave error in his past. If he's assertive, he is opinionated. If he takes a stand, he's dogmatic; if he doesn't, he's chicken-hearted. You can add to this list *ad nauseum*. And, properly and discriminatingly utilized, the consequences can be most gratifying.

With a man like Brother Whitesoul, you must be very discriminating, however. He has shown a consistently strong will in serving the Enemy, and an equally strong power of resistance to our numerous assaults. The real "straight arrows" have always been harder to bring down. If you can't trip them up on pride or false humility, you have to throw various other hooks at them until one of them lodges. Then fight them like fish: keep a tight line and never give 'em any slack!

Just one last little comment regarding those of whom you speak—the ones working overtime to buy what they "must have." Here's a game we're really winning, far and wide. It's the old simple process of dulling the human sense of discrimination between *wants* and *needs*. "I need . . ." has become an integral (almost *innate*) factor in the ordinary child's speech, coming right after "Momma" and "Daddy." Placed in an opulent, materialistic society and coupled with an overwhelmingly permissive philosophy of parenthood, this deceitful ploy has been successful beyond our most optimistic expectations. The concept, conceived at and promulgated after the IntraHellic Demonic Council of 1945, was a masterful combination of precise planning and fortunate timing. You are playing largely upon this theme at Broad Way. Don't let it rest.

There are still some diehards addicted to the enemy's vague and unsatisfying "Seek first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness" line. Let it be one of your prime priorities to tackle this bunch!

Keep up the bad work.

Yours for confounding consternation,

Uncle Apollyon

My Dear Image Of Iniquity,

How pleasant a catalogue of excuses you sent me! I have added several of them to my list of "Desperate Dodges" with which to help half-hearted believers find excuses for switching off

their consciences and deceiving themselves. "Don't go on that mission to Nineva," I tell them; "That's a drag. You could have a whale of a time if you just took a cruise or something." Or else, "You know, that dish Delilah really goes for you. Once in a while you've got to loosen up and really let your hair down. Nobody's going to begrudge you a little relief from jawboning with the Philistines around here." Or how about this: "Who's going to know if you take this job with old Balak? Even if he is a bit sharp against God's people sometimes, he pays really well, and it's only a temporary job anyway. If you just try to keep the Lord's will in mind as you go, you might prove that godliness and gain don't always have to be separate. Besides, wouldn't you feel like an ass if you passed up the opportunity?"

Well, enough tidbits from my Rationalizer's Notebook. Are you as encouraged as I am about the "sidestepped issues" of current thinking? We've already seen how AIDS does double duty in this regard; either "enlightened" people ignore the contribution that freely chosen vice makes to the spread of AIDS and pretend, as I read in one newspaper, that it strikes as arbitrarily as the common cold; or else "righteous" people dismiss any responsibility for combatting the disease by pretending that the number of innocent victims is negligible and that the guilty ones deserve no attention or compassion.

Another of my favorite sidestepping exercises is the attempted separation of private vices and public life. What does it matter if a person cheated on his/her spouse, or lived a life of open fornication, or robbed a bank semi-legally from the inside? What does that have to do with his/her fitness for public office? After all, don't we want somebody who's lively and sharp-dealing to look out for our interests? As one commentator put it, "Hardly anybody who claims to be a 'boy scout' really is; and even if he were, I couldn't really trust somebody who hasn't been down in the dirt with the rest of us." Thank Lucifer that even true virtue is regarded with such contempt and suspicion. If people ever started to understand what Goodness really is, instead of being afraid or scornful of

it, we'd be in trouble. We rely on the reflex judgment that if something is dull, it's probably because it's supposed to be good for you.

I'm glad to report that this assumption seems to be behind the worship services lately. If dullness is a good dish, then people attending recent services have certainly been well-fed (or is it fed up?) We seem to be under the influence of a song leader and a couple of elders who want to be careful to preserve the congregation's dignity, and presumably the Lord's, as well. Consequently, the songs have been uniformly shallow in meaning and slow in tempo. ("We don't want to do anything unexpected or upset-

ting.") This assures that those who aren't looking for meaning have plenty of time to let their minds idle, and that those who are spiritually hungry have ample opportunity to do a slow burn, or else lapse into catatonic frustration. Brother Whitesoul does his best to uplift people with the sermon, but by that time, everybody but the "preacher-bashers" that you talked about have tuned out. It makes me tired to think about it, so I'm going to sign off.

In the active furtherance of apathy,

Ichabod

Book Review

Darwin On Trial

by Phillip E. Johnson

Regnery Gateway/195 pages

Reviewed by ELTON D. HIGGS

Although Phillip Johnson makes it clear at the outset of *Darwin on Trial* that he is "not concerned in this book with addressing any conflicts between the Biblical accounts (of creation) and the scientific evidence" (p. 14), he nevertheless brings into sharp focus the broader conflict between the anti-religious naturalism of dogmatic evolutionism and any system of faith which posits a supernatural power behind the universe. Three major points in this conflict become clear as Johnson develops his analysis and his argument: (1) Darwin and his followers have from the beginning until now accepted as an article of faith that the outlines of the process of evolution are irrefutably derived from the inherent interrelatedness and "classifiability" of forms of life as they now exist. Uncertainties and gaps in the fossil record are

therefore no deterrent to accepting fully the big picture that the theory of evolution presents. (2) Because the "fact" of evolution is a key tenet of naturalistic orthodoxy in the scientific community, it has been protected from the standards of verifiability applied to other areas of scientific endeavor. Biologists have suppressed negative evidence about evolution within their own professional ranks, and scientific philosophers and educators have created a mythology that occupies the same ground as the Judeo-Christian account of the origins of the world and of humankind. (3) By applying a double standard for the acceptance of ideas, supporters of the dogma of naturalistic evolution have worked (with notable success) for the rejection of religious faith as a means of interpreting the world, while at the same time in-

sisting on their own assumptions as unquestionable fact. Ironically, "the very persons who insist upon keeping religion and science separate are eager to use their science as a basis for pronouncements about religion" (p. 8)

In developing these three major points, Johnson starts with a brief overview of the control exerted by the scientific "Establishment" of Darwinian evolutionists. As a lawyer (and a professor of law at U.C.-Berkeley), Johnson sifts through the evidence presented to verify the certainty of evolution and challenges everyone to subject the assertions of evolutionists to fresh scrutiny, without bias as to the outcome. He argues that his credentials are appropriate for undertaking to answer this question.

Because what people believe about evolution and Darwinism depends very heavily on the kind of logic they employ and the kind of assumptions they make. Being a scientist is not necessarily an advantage when dealing with a very broad topic like evolution, which cuts across many scientific disciplines and also involves issues of philosophy (p. 13).

Questioning the Logic

In the next several chapters, Johnson examines the logic and the assumptions of evolutionary claims. The first and most basic of the logical fallacies that he focuses on is the tautology that springs from assuming that the kinships between observable classifications in current life forms can be explained only by their being traceable to a common physical origin. Once it is firmly accepted that the complexity of species and the interrelatedness between species inherently prove the existence of a progressive succession of previous simpler forms, all that remains is to fill in the specific shape of a process that is already taken for granted. As Johnson puts it, "If we define 'evolution' simply as 'whatever produces classification,' then evolution is a fact in the same sense that classification is a fact. This is . . . [a] tautology, however, and as such it has no genuine explanatory value" (p. 66). From this point of view, further research consists merely of look-

ing for material to demonstrate the pattern that has already been "proven" logically. As Johnson says, "there is an important difference between going to the empirical evidence to test a doubtful theory against some plausible alternative, and going to the evidence to look for confirmation of the only theory that one is willing to tolerate" (p. 28).

Johnson goes on to detail some of the areas in which evidence contraindicative to the truth of evolution is ignored or passed off as irrelevant. Darwin's theory depends on the accumulation of an incredible number of tiny steps of change on the way to evolutionarily significant transformations between species; this idea constitutes a kind of "dogmatic gradualism," to use Johnson's phrase, which is basic to the theory of evolution. When statisticians object that the chances of such a process eventually producing life as we now know it are practically nil, the evolutionists merely beg the question by saying that such theoretical considerations are irrelevant, since it is obvious that evolution *has* taken place. In a similar way, the lack of strong corroboration in the fossil record for macromutations (*between* species, in contrast to micromutations—*within* species) has always been passed off by evolutionists as unimportant, since they consider the logical foundations of evolutionary theory to be already conclusive enough. Darwin himself gave the excuse that one should not expect the fossil record to present the whole picture, since the part of it we have access to has survived only by chance. Yet, observes Johnson, "the fossil record today on the whole looks very much as it did in 1959, despite the fact that an enormous amount of fossil hunting has gone on in the intervening years" (p. 50). Moreover, the fossils that have been found in the last 130 years support a picture of stability as the norm for life forms over the years, rather than change (p. 51). Some Darwinists have tried to postulate various forms of "saltationism," or leaps of change in life forms, to explain the fossil record as we know it. To all of this Johnson wryly concludes: "If Darwinism enjoys the status of an *a priori* truth, then the problem presented by the fossil record is how Darwinist evolution always happened in such a manner as to escape detection" (p. 53).

Johnson describes other difficulties in the system of Darwinian evolution which are turned aside or even turned into advantages: (1) the fact that the record of the extinction of species indicates their abrupt, rather than their gradual cessation; (2) the indiscriminate application of the term "evolution" to both micromutation (within species) and macromutation (between species), along with the assumption that an accumulation of micromutations is bound to add up eventually to a macromutation (a change from one species to another); (3) glossing over anomalies residing in the preservation of characteristics in some species that seem to endanger survival rather than to promote it (such as the peacock's "gaudy fan, which is obviously an encumbrance when a peacock wants to escape a predator" [p. 30]). Darwinists say that such "mistakes" in the results of evolution are proof that life evolved by chance and not by the design of a Creator; (4) failure to give a reasonable and persuasive account of the unimaginable process by which inorganic matter became organic matter which was capable of reproducing itself. This latter problem has become the source of some rather fantastic theories about the origin of life on earth, including the one proposed by Francis Crick, of DNA fame, that postulates the planting of organic "seeds" on earth by an indeterminate life-source from outer space (p. 108). Such efforts to create a story to explain the unknown bring evolutionists, says Johnson, into the same arena of thought occupied by religion, and therein lies the true ground of the conflict between the doctrines of evolution and theism.

A Matter of Faith

Early in the book, Johnson observes that "Evolutionists increasingly talk like creationists in that they point to a fact but cannot provide an explanation of the means" (p. 10). It is this adoption of the methods and attitudes of religion while protesting that they are being rigidly scientific that Johnson finds the most dishonest and insidious characteristic of the evolutionary establishment. He shows how strikingly similar to a religion are the actions to propagate the tenets of naturalistic evolution:

The story of human descent from apes is not merely a scientific hypothesis; it is the secular equivalent of the story of Adam and Eve, and a matter of immense cultural importance. Propagating the story requires illustrations, museum exhibits, and television reenactments. It also requires a priesthood, in the form of thousands of researchers, teachers, and artists who provide realistic and imaginative detail and carry the story out to the general public (p. 83).

Johnson goes on to point out that the most basic assertions of the Darwinists are items of faith, not scientifically established fact. "Darwinists *know* that the mutation-selection mechanism can produce wings, eyes, and brains not because the mechanism can be *observed* to do anything of the kind, but because *their guiding philosophy assures them* that no other power is available to do the job. The absence from the cosmos of any Creator is therefore the essential starting point for Darwinism" (p. 131). It is this underlying "religious" commitment to atheism in orthodox Darwinism that explains the hostility of its adherents to any hint that the "fact" of evolution is still open to question, especially in public educational institutions. The naturalistic evolutionary Establishment vigorously insists that "naturalistic evolution belongs in the category of knowledge, not belief, and so resistance to it stems from ignorance, which education rightly aims to eliminate" (p. 141). Thus it is seen that the rigidity of evolutionary doctrine rests squarely on "philosophical beliefs that are not subject to scientific test and refutation" (p. 144).

Science and Pseudo Science

It is the implications of this last point that Johnson takes up in his last chapter, "Science and Pseudoscience." He invokes the philosopher Karl Popper's distinction between these two categories: real scientists are willing to make risky assertions, based on their understanding of the facts, with the possibility of being proved wrong by additional facts; pseudoscientists (including such social scientists as Karl Marx and his followers) begin with a "self-evident" theory and work to make the fact