

salvation through the devil, and deceptive propaganda. This booklet can be obtained from the Faith, Prayer and Tract League, 1016 11th, NW, Grand Rapids, Mich. SAMUEL TEN BRINK  
Bluffton Christian Reformed Church  
Muskegon, Mich.

### COOPERATIVE EVANGELISM

Some months ago Christianity published an article in opposition to "separation." Now it publishes another that avoids meeting the criticism that was made of the first one. In defense of having unbelievers sponsor evangelistic endeavors, Mr. Ferm (Apr. 14 issue) quotes Finney as saying, "My duty is to belong to the church, even if the devil should belong to it." Does this mean that it would be a sin to leave a church if the devil controls it? At any rate, Mr. Ferm's argument, during the course of which he asserts, "If it is compromise, then Finney compromised," requires for its validity the unexpressed premise that Finney could not have compromised. Personally I do not hold such an exalted opinion of Finney. Nor do I think that Jesus' preaching in the temple is comparable with being sponsored by unbelievers. Jesus did not have the sponsorship of the Pharisees.

The writer also appeals to Wesley, and rebukes some misinformed person who cited Wesley as a separationist. But now may we ask, is Mr. Ferm a member of the Anglican or Episcopal church? If separation is a sin, then all the Methodists are great sinners, and should return to their parent body. And all the rest of us, with them, should return to the Roman Catholic church. It is instructive to see that articles against separation, that is, against the purity of the Church, are ordinarily quiet as to the Protestant Reformation. Their arguments proceed on the tacit assumption that there are no apostate churches from which obedience to God requires separation. But such synagogues of Satan do indeed exist.

GORDON H. CLARK  
Indianapolis, Ind.

The article . . . is but further evidence of the bankruptcy of thought and unbiblical approach used by those enamored of the current ecumenical evangelism, in a futile effort to vindicate it. To toss casually and indifferently aside "the few proof texts, such as II Cor. 6:14" advanced against the ecumenical program, and the substitution of example on the part of past evangelists, indicates the truthfulness of the fundamentalist charge that such programs are of men and not of God, since God makes known his will

only through his Word. The "proof-texts" are not few . . . , but even if they were but few would still be proof-texts.

KENNETH R. KINNEY  
First Baptist Church  
Johnson City, N. Y.

While it is not always wise to be continuously making war with apostates, it is deadly ever to make peace with them . . . The chasm between redemptive Christianity and non-redemptive religion . . . is not bridgeable.

New York City WILLIAM WARD AYER

Much on historical precedent; almost nothing for a scriptural basis. Thus, an extremely lopsided article.

H. CROSBY ENGLIZIAN  
Oldham Baptist Church  
Oldham, S. Dak.

### ON LOGICAL POSITIVISM

The March 17 issue carried a "Review of Current Thought" by Philip Edgcumbe Hughes of London which was a strange mixture of Scripture paraphrase, dogmatic arrogance, book reviews and confused thinking about contemporary British philosophy. . . .

From this article one would receive the impression that logical positivism was the current trend of philosophy in Britain and that *Language, Truth and Logic* by A. J. Ayer was its Bible. This is certainly a gross error. Mr. Hughes in the first paragraph identifies "contemporary linguistic philosophy" with logical positivism. This is a mistake all too common today. . . .

The book review of E. L. Mascall's *Words and Images* is very interesting and rewarding reading . . . Mr. Hughes has rightly pointed out the Achilles heel of the book from the perspective of an evangelical Christian apologetic. However, I want to defend Dr. Mascall for not appealing to the doctrine of creation: he is not writing theology. Dr. Mascall feels that philosophical questions deserve philosophic answers. On the other hand, if Mr. Hughes had wished to criticize the book he should have concentrated on philosophic issues, for instance, the several Thomist assumptions in the book . . . .

Mr. Hughes . . . asserts that logical positivism would have to sacrifice logic to the verification principle. As a matter of history this did not happen; as a matter of logic it was not at all necessary. . . .

I won't say much about the arrogant and dogmatic condemnations of the logical positivists. . . . Philosophic doctrines are not sinful; they are wrong. Mr.

Hughes may be quite correct in his analysis of man as sinner. My only contention is that honest philosophic questions and arguments deserve honest sympathy and honest answers. Since it seems that Mr. Hughes cannot refute the positivists, he has used ad hominem arguments. . . .  
Indiana University ROBERT L. PERKINS  
Bloomington, Ind.

It is good of Mr. Perkins to take notice of my brief Review of Current Religious Thought; but how he managed to receive the impression from what I wrote that logical positivism is "the current trend of philosophy in Britain" and Professor Ayer's *Language, Truth and Logic* "its Bible" is a mystery that I have not succeeded in solving. Such a view would indeed be, as Mr. Perkins affirms, "a gross error." The error, however, resides in his impression rather than in my article, for I neither wrote nor implied any such thing. Mr. Perkins also completely fails to meet my point about the incompatibility of the concept of logic with the verification principle of the logical positivists. As for Dr. Mascall's Thomistic predilections, I am of course well aware of these, but lack of space precluded an examination of this aspect of his thought.

To suggest, as Mr. Perkins does, that Mascall eschews theology in his book shows the former's reading of the book to be suspect, for Dr. Mascall does no such thing; nor is it correct to state that he makes no appeal to the doctrine of creation—on the contrary, he speaks of "that unique but universal characteristic of finite beings which manifests their dependence upon the creative activity of a transcendent cause, the God of Christian theology." My complaint was that Dr. Mascall has failed to indicate in a consistent manner the crucial relevance of this doctrine in any debate on epistemology from the Christian side. I believe that Mr. Perkins is fundamentally wrong in supposing that "philosophical questions deserve philosophical answers," when the person giving the answers is a *Christian*. Can he really believe that the fact of man's creaturehood and fallenness has no bearing on philosophy and must be dismissed as irrelevant theology? In making a distinction between what is sinful and what is wrong I presume Mr. Perkins will be prepared to grant that wrongness is not unconnected with the root of sinfulness. I am consoled that he should have found my review of Dr. Mascall's book "very interesting and rewarding reading," for that means the major portion of my article.

London PHILIP EDGCUMBE HUGHES