

The Discerner

the voice of... **Religion Analysis Service**

A QUARTERLY EXPOSING
UNBIBLICAL TEACHING & MOVEMENTS

Volume 28, Number 2

April • May • June 2008

Eckankar
Confucianism

Hare Krishna

Freemasons

Jehovah's Witnesses

Humanism

Jainism

Judaism

Neopaganism

MOONIES

Univeralism

Wicca

Islam

Exposed!

MORMONS

BAHA'I FAITH

Buddhism

Scientology

Satanism

In This Edition:

Tribute to Dr. David Larsen 2
By William A. BeVier

Dear Reader — With This Issue 3
By Rev. Laurence J. Sutherland

Is the Roman Catholic Pope
Infallible? 5

Salute the Danish Flag— It's a Symbol
of Western Freedom 23
By Susan MacAllen

Islam: A Religion, or Cult? 26
By Peter Hammond

Quiz: Islam 29



*"Hereby know we the spirit of truth
and the spirit of error" 1 John 4:6*

The Discerner

Volume 28, Number 2
April • May • June 2008

1313 5th St. SE, Suite 126E,
Minneapolis, MN 55414-4504
612-331-3342 / 1-800-562-9153
FAX 612-331-3342

Editorial Committee

Rev. Laurence J. Sutherland
Dr. William A. BeVier

Published Quarterly
Price \$10.00 for 4 issues
Foreign subscriptions extra

Religion Analysis Service Board Members

Dr. Ronald E. McRoberts: President
Ronald B. Anderson: Treasurer
Rev. Laurence J. Sutherland
Editor of "The Discerner"
Rev. Steve Lagoon: Vice President/
Secretary

Religion Analysis Service Board Of Reference

Dr. William A. BeVier
Rev. Ron Carlson
Dr. Norman Geisler
Dr. Roy Knuteson
(Ret.) Dr. David Larsen



TRIBUTE TO DR. DAVID LARSEN

I met Dr. Larsen when I was invited to join the Board of RAS in the 1970s. He was Vice President of the Board at that time. He also was Pastor of the First Evangelical Covenant Church in Minneapolis, MN.

I enjoyed personal fellowship with him until he was called to be Professor of Preaching at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School in Illinois. At which time he became a member of the Board of Reference of RAS.

Durng the fifteen years I was editor of The Discerner, I could always count on him to submit carefully prepared and pertinent articles. He wrote numerous articles for The Discerner as well as for other publications. He also is the author of several books. His newest (2008) is: *Is God a Dispensationalist?* (Ed.). I found him to be a diligent student of the Scriptures and always current on happenings in Christendom.

Currently he is a Professor Emeritus at Trinity, but still active in a writing and speaking ministry. I pray the Lord will continue to use him in the future as He has in the past.

With Christian regards for a faithful servant of the Lord,
William A. BeVier

DEAR READER

The servant of the Lord is often labeled a “prophet of gloom and doom” when he interprets history and the future in the light of the Bible. He is, however, in good company. Biblical prophets such as Elijah, Micaiah, Amos, Isaiah, Jeremiah and Zephaniah spoke tersely and boldly of judgment ahead and the “Day of the Lord”. In church history, men such as Savanarola, Wyclif, Luther, Calvin and Knox preached Christ’s coming to judge the living and the dead. In our own country men such as Jonathan Edwards, Charles Finney, D.L.Moody, and a host of modern evangelists have trumpeted both the themes of salvation through Jesus’ blood and righteousness but also the imminent and coming “terror of the Lord”.

The present spiritual tone of America is very unsettling. Just a few facts indicate this “slippery slope” toward moral decadence:

1. Homosexuality-increasingly socially acceptable but biblically abhorrent
2. Same sex marriages, now validated by some state courts
3. Pornography - emails, x-rated films, magazines, books, and now cell phones
4. Abortion at any stage - 4,000 per month in the USA
5. Promiscuity among our youth, more and more teen pregnancies
6. Sexual violence, rape and assault cases abound
7. Public vulgarization of speech and outright profanity
8. Living together without marriage, ignorance of its sanctity and obligations
9. Pedophilia/child abuse, even among the clergy
10. Debasing marriage arrangements such as “swingers” and polygamy
11. Abdication of parental responsibility in the upbringing of children
12. Chemical and alcoholic addictions demanding more facilities for care
13. Prisons and jails are overfull, recidivism rates remain high
14. Divorce rates climb to 50%, even among church-goers
15. Sex kits replace the Gideon Bible in many hotels

Each of the above indices of moral laxity and depravity has been extensively addressed by godly servants of the Lord. Praise God for men and women who are willing to expose these failures among us. They do a blessed service as they condemn “sin but not the sinner” and encourage us all to repentance and faith in Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of sin.

Do you remember the dramatic oratorio “Elijah”? The words of Elijah still ring in my ears as the lead singer shouts: “Where is the God of Elijah?” God answered this plaintive cry and came down and burned the sacrifice. The 450 prophets of Baal were exterminated, and the wicked house of Ahab came to an end (1.Kings, chapters 18-21).

We at Religion Analysis Service want to be counted among those who “stand in the breach” to counteract this insidious and headlong slippery slide into inevitable judgment.

Laurence J. Sutherland

WITH THIS ISSUE

Just a few weeks ago Pope Benedict XVI arrived in America, presumably to establish good relationships with the Roman Catholic Church, American version, and at the same time to bring his church more in line with traditional Roman Catholic dogma. This would be his opportune time to gain the goodwill of the American church but also to correct the canker sore among the Catholic clergy relating to pedophilia. There is evidence that corrective measures are now being implemented, though not to the complete satisfaction of all concerned.

After two years in his position, we notice that the Pope is serious about reform and about dogma. He wants to bring the whole Catholic Church into harmony with its traditions and dogma following Augustine. One of these dogmas relates to papal infallibility. This dogma has not had universal acceptance by Catholic clergy, and Protestant churches regard it as typical of the arrogance of Rome and its decrees and bulls through the centuries. In his lengthy article on papal Infallibility, Steve Lagoon, one of our esteemed board members, researches this teaching. Whether we regard this dogma with modern applicability or not, it remains a thorn that pricks the relationship of Rome with both mainstream and evangelical Protestant Christianity. It is well that we take heed to the rebound of dogma in the Roman Catholic Church. This article should sharpen our perception as to what this rebound might mean to us.

In our previous issue (January - March 2008) we were brought up to date on some matters relating to Islam. In this issue we continue to review the phenomenal growth of Islam in the world and especially in the Western world. What are the repercussions of such growth to our societies? The example of Denmark might well warn us of what awaits us if Islam becomes a numerical factor of consequence, and when diversity and political correctness influence and determine social mores and traditional national values. Both the articles from Susan MacAllen and Peter Hammond should alert us to portending and pending developments.

What do we know really about Islam? Perhaps the test will stimulate us to research this relatively unknown religion to Americans. Please let me know if you scored 100%.

Laurence J. Sutherland

IS THE ROMAN CATHOLIC POPE INFALLIBLE?

One of the important things that separate Roman Catholics and Protestants is their respective viewpoints on revelation and church authority. Is infallible truth limited to the words of Holy Scripture or does it also include post-biblical pronouncements of the church, particularly those made by the pope. That is, does the pope make infallible pronouncements when speaking *Ex Cathedra* that are binding for the church of Jesus Christ? This is the question I will address in this presentation.

It is important to examine this question because if the Roman Catholic claim to papal infallibility is true, then Protestants are guilty of rejecting God's guidance for the church, as given in the infallible statements. Some Catholics claim that Pope Boniface's papal Bull, *Unam Sanctum* (1302) is an infallible statement. It says, "We therefore declare, say, affirm, and announce that for every human creature to be submissive to the Roman Pontiff it is absolutely necessary for salvation."¹ If that or similar papal statements are true, there are obviously serious consequences for Protestants and evangelicals.

I do not intend to review the biblical case for or against the papacy, for which there are many excellent works available. Rather, I am asking what the consequences are if one assumes the Roman Catholic position is true. Does the doctrine of papal infallibility stand the test of history and logic?

Rome Has Spoken; the Case is Closed.

Protestants agree with Roman Catholics that the true church of Jesus Christ will stand faithful to biblical truth until His return. For instance, Jesus said to Peter, "I will build my church, and the gates of Hades will not overcome it"(Matthew 16:18). This would seem to indicate that no work of Satan would successfully remove true Christianity (or true Christian teaching) from the face of the earth. Jesus also said that the Holy Spirit would faithfully guide the church "into all truth"(John 16:13). Is this not a promise that the church would have the Holy Spirit's help in preserving Christian truth? So in this sense the church is infallible; despite false teachers and schisms the church universal would triumph, faithfully proclaiming God's truth.

Protestants believe that the inspired Scriptures are the only infallible guide for the church. On the other hand, Fiedler and Rabben have

noted that the Catholic view of authority is different and can be best summed up in the famous statement “*Roma locuta est; causa finita est*” which in English is translated, “Rome has spoken; the case is closed.”² In other words, for Protestants the final arbiter of truth is the Bible, while for Roman Catholics, the final arbiter is the Church, especially the hierarchy, and ultimately the Pope himself.³

What exactly constitutes an infallible truth?

Before we can examine the validity of the Roman Catholic teaching concerning infallibility, we must have a clear understanding of the doctrine. We begin with the definition of the first Vatican Council in 1870, given by Pope Pius IX:

“We teach and define that it is a dogma divinely revealed that the Roman Pontiff, when he speaks *ex cathedra*, that is, when in discharge of the office of pastor and doctor of all Christians, by virtue of his supreme apostolic authority, he defines a doctrine regarding faith and morals to be held by the universal church, by the divine assistance promised him in blessed Peter, is possessed of that infallibility with which the divine redeemer willed that His Church should be endowed for defining doctrines regarding faith and morals, and that therefore such definitions of the Roman Pontiff of themselves—and not by virtue of the consent of the Church—are irreformable.”⁴

Infallible versus inspired and revealed

Several things should be observed here. First, Catholics make a distinction between infallible statements on the one hand, and inspiration or revelation on the other hand. That is, Catholics do not claim that infallible statements are inspired or are new revelation as is found in the Bible. For instance, the Catholic Concise Encyclopedia states:

“It [Infallibility] is distinguished from both [biblical inspiration and revelation].”⁵

Also, Vatican I declared:

“For the Holy Spirit has promised the successors of Peter, not that they may disclose new doctrine by *revelation*, but that they may, with his assistance, preserve conscientiously and expound faithfully the revelation transmitted through the apostles, the deposit of faith.”⁶

However, this seems to be a distinction without a difference. When we compare what Catholics consider an infallible statement with Scripture, both statements are believed to have been guided by God, and as such, are without error and authoritative for Christians. So what is the difference?

The Catholic answer seems to be that although God does not allow the church or especially the Pope when speaking *ex cathedra*, to teach falsely, that this does mean that it is inspired. This can be compared to Protestant Systematic theologies that although they may faithfully proclaim biblical truth, are nonetheless not considered inspired.

However, Protestants proclaim that these theologies are only “truth” to the extent that they adhere to “inspired” Scripture. Protestants do not claim infallibility for theologians, or their writings, or councils, or creeds.

Further, if, as Catholics suggest, we know that infallible statements are absolutely free of error, kept from error by the Holy Spirit, does it not follow that these statements are in some sense “inspired”?

Further, Catholics consider Pope Pius IX’s proclamation of the Immaculate Conception in 1854 an infallible statement. It is interesting that the statement itself says, “It has been revealed by God.”⁷

Is it not merely a semantic dodge to say something is infallibly “revealed” by God but is not revelation?

Three types of infallible statements

Catholicism maintains that there are three types of infallibility in the Church:

“The doctrine defines that infallibility is: (1) In the Pope personally and solely as the successor of St. Peter, (2) In an ecumenical Council subject to confirmation by the Pope, (3) In the bishops of the universal church teaching definitively in union with the Pope.”⁸

So something can be considered an infallible teaching even if it is not an infallible declaration of the pope, either because it is a statement from an ecumenical council approved by the pope, or even a teaching with the strong support of the bishops around the world, and who are in union with the pope.

What makes a statement infallible?

Now, we naturally wonder how you can tell what is an infallible statement. We have quoted the definition in Vatican 1 itself above. Boettner provides a good summary of the requirements necessary for a statement to be considered an infallible papal pronouncement by Catholics:

“(1) The Pope . . . is speaking *ex cathedra* . . . speaking in his official capacity as head of the church. (2) The pronouncement must be intended as binding on the whole church . . . (3) The pronouncement must have to do with matters pertaining to ‘faith and morals.’”⁹

Catholic author Philip St. Romain offers a similar definition: “It is only when the Pope officially speaks *ex Cathedra*, as supreme shepherd and teacher of the universal Church, and *to* the universal Church, proclaiming by a definitive act some doctrine of faith or morals—it is only then that the Pope speaks infallibly.”¹⁰

How many infallible statements are there?

Given the Roman Catholic definitions of what constitutes an infallible statement, including the Vatican I definition itself, we wonder why most of the pope’s teachings are not considered infallible, not to mention those of most of the ecumenical councils. For instance, an encyclical is defined as:

“Thus enkyklike [encyclical] means a circular letter. A letter that is meant to ‘go the rounds.’ . . . It applies only to the letters of the bishop of Rome and successor of St. Peter, to his flock, all the Christians all over the world . . . papal letters relating to doctrinal or moral matters; exhortations, warnings or commendation.”¹¹

Hence, encyclicals are statements from the pope acting in his office as supreme teacher and pastor of the church, and are intended for and binding for all the world’s Christians, and pertain to faith and morals. On what basis then are they not considered infallible?

In fact, some encyclicals *are* considered to contain infallible statements. Freemantle states:

“Encyclicals are thus not necessarily *ex cathedra* pronouncements. When they are, their matter must be of *faith* or *morals*; in method they must use the terms, formal or equivalent, *declare*, *define* or *pronounce*, and they must definitely state the ‘sanctions regarding the obligation to believe and the censures incurred.’”

Incidentally, it is not clear why Freemantle and other Catholic writers add that an infallible statement must include the “censure incurred” for rejecting it, since the censure requirement is not contained in the Vatican I definition itself.

Back-door Infallibility

Catholic scholar and author Garry Wills touches on this issue in what he calls “Back-door Infallibility.” He states, “Though he [Pope John Paul II] has not formally defined an infallible new doctrine, he has put a stamp of quasi-infallibility in position after position. He and his doctrinal alter ego, Cardinal Ratzinger [now Pope Benedict XVI], have called the bans on women priests, on contraceptives, on homosexual acts ‘definitive’ or ‘irreformable’ or ‘already infallible.’ To reinforce Paul VI’s pronouncement on women’s ordination, John Paul wrote: ‘Wherefore, in order that all doubt may be removed

regarding a matter of great importance, a matter which pertains to the church's divine constitution itself, in virtue of my ministry of confirming the brethren, I declare that the church has no authority whatsoever to confer priestly ordination on women, and that this judgment is to be definitively held by all the church's faithful."¹²

Wills suggests that Pope John Paul II would have liked to declare his statements on these matters described above as infallible, but did not or could not for political reasons. And so, says Wills, John Paul danced all around the edges of infallibility, desiring his statements to have the power of infallibility, without actually claiming infallibility.

Paul Johnson's appraisal is similar, "In 'Veritatis splendor' (1993) on ethics he [Pope John Paul II] seemed on the point of claiming infallibility for his teaching, but finally did not do so."¹³

This all raises an important point. On the one hand, Catholics are expected to obey, and are bound by infallible statements, even though these statements are not inspired or revealed. We wonder, why should we take statements that are neither inspired nor revealed, over the inspired and revealed words of God in the Bible? Again, Catholics repeatedly claim that the Church, (with the pope at its head) is the God given interpreter of Scriptures. But this would mean that teachings that are neither revealed nor inspired by God are more authoritative than the inspired and revealed words of God in the Bible. This is why Protestants insist on *sola scriptura*, the absolute authority of the Scriptures.

Where to find the infallible statements?

One would naturally expect, given their importance, that there would be a compilation of all the *ex cathedra* papal statements, or at least a complete list of them published? In the same way, one would also expect any other infallible statements such as those formulated by ecumenical councils, to be in some way identified. That way Christians throughout the world could easily access this infallible truth from God.

One is shocked to learn that no such list or compilation exists. Nor can it exist; for no Catholic knows with certainty which statements are "infallible." Hence, Boettner states, "Surely it would be of inestimable value to know which deliverances are *ex cathedra* and which are not, which are infallible and authoritative and which are only private observations and therefore as fallible as those of anyone else. It seems impossible to secure such a list."¹⁴

Of what value is it to have an infallible statement, if no one really knows for sure if it exists?

How many infallible statements?

Catholic scholars do not agree as to how many papal statements are infallible. At this point I will quote at length from Timothy F. Kauffman's excellent article that shows the range of Catholic opinion concerning *ex cathedra* statements:

“How many times has the pope taught *ex cathedra*, or ‘from the chair’ of Peter? How many *ex cathedra* papal statements have there been, and what are they? . . . Different Roman Catholic apologists have asserted very divergent numbers of infallible papal statements. The doctrine of the Immaculate Conception and the doctrine of the Bodily Assumption of Mary were taught infallibly by Popes Pius IX and Pius XII in 1854 and 1950, respectively. Both popes taught that these doctrines were divinely revealed and were therefore part of Christian revelation and to be believed. But are these two the only infallible *ex cathedra* papal statements ever made? . . . It depends on which apologist you ask. Roman apologist Scott Hahn says yes. In his talk on Pope Pius IX's proclamation in 1854, Hahn stated that 1950 was the only other time an *ex cathedra* statement that had ever been made by a pope:

‘Now, we have to realize that the Holy Father has only stated dogmatically and infallibly a definition of a doctrine one other time: in 1950, with the dogma of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin, both her body and soul.’

Hahn has proposed a two-statement canon of *ex cathedra* papal statements. But apologist Tim Staples says there are at least four, and likely very many more. In his audio tape series, ‘*All Generations Shall Call Me Blessed*,’ he berates those who state that popes have only spoken infallibly on two occasions. Staples mentions the two *ex cathedra* statements to which Hahn refers, and then adds at least two more, referring first to pope Boniface VIII's statement *Unam Sanctam* (1302), and second, to St. Leo's letter to Flavian which was examined and approved by the Council of Chalcedon in 451:

‘We have infallible statements from popes all the way back. Pope Boniface VIII made an infallible statement in the 13th century concerning papal authority or papal primacy. In the year 451 at the Council of Chalcedon, Pope Leo I made an infallible declaration that was recognized as such by council Fathers concerning the hypostatic union of Christ.’ . . .

Consider the longer list compiled by Adam S. Miller in his book, *The Final Word*. Miller assures us that he has the right list when he says his booklet contains, ‘...a listing of *ex cathedra* papal pronouncements on matters of doctrine.’ And he joins us in recognizing the significance of the issue when he states that his work contains a listing of ‘what the Catholic Church has defined as those truths formally revealed by God and necessary for belief.’ His proposed canon of *ex cathedra* statements is eleven. But Roman Catholic priest Leslie Rumble would beg to differ. He has an even longer list in his book, *That Catholic Church*. In his opinion, there have been 18 *ex cathedra* papal statements throughout Roman Catholic history”¹⁵

Freemantle states, “

“The encyclicals *Acerbo Nimis* (1905), on the teaching of Christian doctrine, and *Pascendi* (1907) are frequently given as examples of such *ex cathedra* pronouncements.”¹⁶

The reason there is such confusion about what is and is not an infallible statement seems to be because nobody actually knows, popes included. Perhaps we need an infallible statement to tell us what is infallible! Geisler sums up the situation well:

“However, this is not definite as to which pronouncements are infallible. First, there is no infallible statement on just what are the criteria. Second, there is not universal agreement on the criteria. Third, there is no universal agreement on how to apply these or any criteria to all cases.”¹⁷

An Official Interpreter?

Catholic Answers states: “Today there are tens of thousands of competing denominations, each insisting its interpretation of the Bible is the correct one. The resulting divisions have caused untold confusion among millions of sincere but misled Christians. Just open the Yellow Pages of your telephone book and see how many different denominations are listed, each claiming to go by the ‘Bible alone,’ but no two of them agreeing on exactly what the Bible means . . . The conclusion? The ‘Bible alone’ theory must be false.”¹⁸

Catholic Answers goes on to say, “Such an official interpreter [i.e. the Church under the direction of the Pope] is absolutely necessary if we are to understand the Bible properly.”¹⁹

But does the Catholic claim to possessing an infallible interpreter of Scripture really provide an advantage that Protestants do not possess? Actually, it does not, because there still remains the problem of

how Catholics can interpret the teachings of the church. If we need an interpreter to explain the Bible, do we not also need an interpreter to explain the continuing teachings of the Church? Do we not find disputes, even among the highest members of the Catholic Church about the meaning of papal Statements?

As to the Catholic criticism of Protestants because of the multitude of denominations, are there not many orders in the Catholic Church (i.e. the Dominicans, Augustinians, Franciscans, Benedictines, Jesuits, Carmelites, Opus Dei) each with its own distinctive theological emphasis? Is there not also a liberal and conservative split within the Roman Catholic Church?

On the other hand, is it not remarkable that though Protestants are not linked organically into an earthly organization, yet we share in a commitment to the fundamental truths of Scripture such as the teachings of the Trinity, the deity of Christ, the virgin birth, salvation by faith, etc? This indicates that the only “pope” that Christians need is the Holy Spirit.

Popes Do Fall into Heresy

We wonder of what help is it to have an official interpreter who can speak infallibly if such a gift is almost never exercised? If, as many Catholics believe, there have been only two exercises of papal infallibility in 2000 years, an average of one every 1000 years, of what great value is it?

The Case of Pope Honorius

Further, why should Catholics trust papal teaching over inspired Scripture, when, as history shows, popes have fallen into heresy? For instance, consider the case of Pope Honorius (625-638). Coulombe states:

“Honorius . . . did say, however, that there was only one will in Christ. Now, unless he meant something else (and oceans of ink have been poured to prove it so), then here is a plainly heretical statement on his part. . . This action led to his branding as a heretic by Constantinople III (680-681).”²⁰

Wills adds, “He [Pope Honorius] promoted this concept in letters to other bishops as well as to Sergius—with the result that he was later condemned by a council for the heresy of Monothelism (one-willism), a sentence that Pope Leo III ratified. ‘Because of this condemnation, henceforth every new pope before taking office had to acknowledge solemnly—as stated in the *Liber Diurnus*—the true faith, inclusive of condemnation of Honorius.’”²¹

Wills also gives the judgment of Jesuit historian Klaus Schatz: “Father Schatz is clear on this point: ‘It is an undisputed fact that must be maintained against all attempts to water it down that the council and the subsequent popes clearly condemned Honorius as a heretic. In other words, they were absolutely convinced that a pope could fall into heresy.’ In order to say that Honorius did *not* err on an essential of the faith, his defenders have to claim that Leo II *did* err on the same point. papal inerrancy, in either case, disappears”²²

Noted historian J.N.D. Kelly stated that, “His [Pope Leo II] most important letter (7 May 683) was to Constantine, ratifying the council’s decisions with the authority of Peter and anathematizing the Monothelite leaders it had condemned, including Honorius I”²³

Some Catholics maintain that Honorius was not really guilty of promoting heresy, but rather was only guilty of negligence in stamping it out. Yet, as we have shown, the facts are clear that Honorius was a Monothelite. It is true that Pope Leo II said about Honorius that he “by profane treachery permitted its purity to be polluted.”²⁴ But this statement does not deny that Honorius held to heretical doctrine.

Most Catholic apologists argue that Honorius’ actions were not *ex cathedra*, and there is therefore no problem. For instance, Catholic author Bertrand Conway quotes Cardinal Hergenrother: “It cannot be said that he [Pope Honorius] defined error, *which alone would tell against it.*”²⁵

Coulombe argues similarly, “But it is important to remember that in this letter he [Pope Honorius] was neither speaking officially, nor attempting to bind the Church.”²⁶

Catholics should understand in no uncertain terms what this response means, and that is that popes can both believe and teach heresy in their papal role, just so long as they don’t pronounce it infallibly. If this is the case, how does a Catholic know which papal statements (bulls, encyclicals, sermons etc) are true and which are heresy? If Liberius and other popes believed and taught heresy during their papacies (as history clearly shows), then the same can be true of the pope today. This again shows the advantage Protestants have in following inspired revelation from God in the Bible, rather than the fallible, changing, and even heretical teachings of the popes.

Wills points out another problem in Catholic efforts to exonerate Pope Honorius’ capitulation to heresy by distinguishing it from *ex cathedra* pronouncements:

“I said there were two dodges used by papists to deny the changing nature of the papacy. The second one is to ‘define infallibility down,’

so narrowing it that every challengeable papal statement is excluded from it purview.²⁷

In other words, every time you show a problem with a papal statement, the response is, “well that is not an infallible statement.’ But when it is realized that there has only been a handful of infallible statements in all of church history, it seems that the whole doctrine of papal infallibility is an empty promise, and the pope’s teachings are no more authoritative than the pastor of the First Church in your town.

This “defining infallibility down” is also seen in the following statement, “‘It need only be added here that not everything in a Conciliar or papal pronouncement, in which some doctrine is defined, is to be treated as definitive and infallible. For example, in the lengthy Bull of Pius IX defining the Immaculate Conception the strictly definitive and *infallible portion is comprised in a sentence or two*; and the same is true in many cases in regard to conciliar decisions. The merely argumentative and justificatory statements embedded in definitive judgment, however true and authoritative they may be, are not covered by the guarantee of infallibility which attaches to the strictly definitive sentences—unless, indeed, their infallibility has been previously or subsequently established by an independent decision.”²⁸

Talk about the death by a thousand qualifications!

Catholic Answers quotes Richard Knox:

“Has it ever occurred to you how few are the alleged ‘failures of infallibility’? . . . Here have been these popes, fulminating anathema after anathema for centuries—certain in all human probability to contradict themselves or one another over and over again. Instead of which you get this measly crop of two or three alleged failures!”²⁹

If most Catholics are correct in affirming only a few infallible statements, and these are only the few sentences defining the Marian doctrines, it is not that impressive to note a lack of contradiction.

However, Knox seems to suggest that all the anathemas through the centuries are infallible, in which case there is an abundance of examples of contradictions and false teachings. The book *Rome Has Spoken* by Fiedler and Rabben is filled with such examples.³⁰

The Case of Pope Liberius

Coulombe presents the historical facts involving the Arian controversy and Pope Liberius (352-366):

“During his pontificate, the Arian heresy was at its height, having at one point the allegiance of the emperor, Constantius II, and all but five bishops . . . Orthodox bishops, like St. Athanasius, patriarch of Alexandria, were driven from their dioceses . . . The emperor, hell-bent on promoting Arianism, exiled Liberius to Beroea . . . Constantius then appointed the anti-pope, Felix II, to rule in Liberius’s stead. The emperor next convened . . . an ecumenical council at Sirmium . . . This conclave approved several semi-Arian creeds . . . At last, after great pressure, Liberius gave in and signed them, in return for being allowed to return to Rome in 358. Similar pressure led him to excommunicate St. Athanasius for a time.”³¹

J.N.D. Kelly fills in the picture:

“Once again the emperor used bullying tactics to extract a condemnation of Athanasius from all the delegates except three convinced Nicenes, who were promptly exiled. Since Liberius still held out, resisting bribery and then threats, he was brought by force to Milan and then proving unyielding, banished to Beroea in Thrace. Here, as months slipped by and the local bishop worked on him, his morale collapsed and, in painful contrast to his previous resolute stand, he now acquiesced in Athanasius’s excommunication, accepted the ambiguous First Creed of Sirmium (which omitted the Nicene ‘one in being with the Father’), and made abject submission to the emperor. His capitulation is pathetically mirrored in four letters which he wrote from exile in spring 357 to Arianizing bishops, and which suggest that he was ready to pay almost any price to return home.”³²

Wills quotes from the church father and translator of the Latin Vulgate, Jerome:

“Liberius, conquered himself by the ordeal of exile, returned to Rome as if he were a conqueror by endorsing the heretical perversion.”³³

Catholic apologists make the same argument regarding the case of Liberius that they made with Honorius:

“Papal infallibility does not refer to the personal errors or sins of individual popes. The Pope is infallible only when he teaches the whole flock of Christ *ex cathedra* on a question of faith and morals.”³⁴

Conway adds, “It was an act of weakness, indeed, that went counter to his strong attitude shown at Milan two years before, but St. Athanasius himself declared that Liberius’ signature was forced from him under threat of death.”³⁵

We are told that Liberius should be excused because he was under intense pressure, as though his actions were not valid, since they

were done under duress. If that is the case, what about the fact that many of the popes were not freely chosen by the Church, but determined by secular rulers? One example among many:

“The Roman clergy, cowed into submission by imperial violence, elected a more compliant successor [Pope Eugene I 654-657].”³⁶

Likewise Coulombe, “Elected during the exile of St. Martin I, Eugene was forcibly consecrated by order of Emperor Constans II.”³⁷

Vatican I and Freedom

Let it also be noted that there was intense pressure applied to the delegates at Vatican I by Pope Pius I, as Pius bullied the council to proclaim papal Infallibility itself in 1870. If decisions made under duress are not valid, the findings of Vatican I, including the pronouncement of papal Infallibility should be discarded. “The First Vatican Council . . . was among the most tumultuous in history. Great numbers of the bishops believed that the infallibility doctrine was not well founded in the deposit of faith . . . By the time the council proclaimed the doctrine’s final version at St. Peter’s . . . One-third of the bishops had gone home, many in protest.”³⁸

There are numerous histories of Vatican I that show the extremes that Pius IX went to achieve the definition of papal Infallibility. An article available on the TIME website describes an important book by Father August B. Hasler, a Swiss-German scholar at the German Historical Institute in Rome entitled *Pius IX: papal Infallibility and the First Vatican Council* (Anton Hiersemann). Hasler describes some of the pressure tactics used by Pope Pius IX:

“Pius and the bishops supporting him outmaneuvered opponents of infallibility —without ever answering their historical arguments against it—so effectively that the council ‘degenerated into a ritual, mock discussion.’ . . . Pius IX, then 78 and determined to complete his struggle to centralize church control in his office, dominated the council from the start. He decided that the less anyone knew about Trent, the better; so when the director of the Vatican Archives ordered a review of the Trent rules, Pius fired him in a ‘raving scene.’ The Pope’s nuncios to various countries, Hasler reports, were told to cast aspersions on anti-infallibility churchmen. The Vatican suppressed opposition periodicals . . . Missionary bishops [were summoned] one by one to remind them that they were employed and paid by the papacy. The head of the Armenian Antonian order, Archbishop Placidus Casangian came under especially heavy pressure. The Pope personally threatened him with dismissal if he did not back infallibility, had Vatican police search his quarters, and ordered him confined. The archbishop fled instead. Pius, meanwhile, was

putting strong pressure on the other church leaders in private audiences. In one remarkable council speech, he compared opposition bishops to Pontius Pilate condemning Jesus, and pleaded, ‘My children, do not leave me. Cleave to me and follow me. Unite with the representative of Christ.’ . . . Pius denounced opponents of infallibility variously as ‘donkeys,’ ‘betrayers’ and ‘sick in the head.’ Once, in a screaming fit of anger, he put his foot on the head of a kneeling Cardinal, then lifted the man by his ears.”³⁹

My point then, is, why is Liberius’ compromise excused and considered invalid (as described above) because of being under duress, while the Vatican I Council that declared papal infallibility is considered valid despite the incredible pressure and duress placed on the Council by Pope Pius IX?

Further, if the charism of papal infallibility is a guarantee against popes espousing heresy, why did it not protect Pope Liberius? Is there an exception to the effect that it only applies to free decisions of the Pope? This is more of the “Defining Infallibility down” that Wills spoke of. It gets worse! Consider this statement:

“A similar exceptional situation might arise were a Pope to become a public heretic, i.e., were he publicly and officially to teach some doctrine clearly opposed to what has been defined as *de fide* Catholicism. But in this case many theologians hold that no formal sentence of deposition would be required, as, by becoming a public heretic, the Pope would *ipso facto* cease to be Pope. This, however, is a hypothetical case which has never actually occurred.”⁴⁰

This is amazing. Basically it’s the ultimate escape clause. Catholic apologists will leave no stone unturned and use all their skill in sophistry to try to clear every pope of misleading the church into heresy. But if all else fails, they can just say, oh well, yes, Pope X did teach heresy, but at the moment he did, he excommunicated himself and was therefore, no longer the pope. How can this be taken seriously?

Has there been an unbroken succession of popes going back to Saint Peter?

If the Pope is the Bishop of Rome, then how could the popes during the French period be valid? Again, how can it possibly be maintained that the popes that resided in Avignon, France for over 70 years are to be considered the Bishops of Rome?

“It is true that popes have not always reigned from Rome. Between 1309 to 1377, the papacy directed the Church from Avignon, of which the dramatic papal palace there is a reminder. But this absence from Rome was always referred to as ‘the Babylonian Captivity’ . . .

It is true that some popes were never able to get to Rome . . . Urban IV (1261-4), Clement IV (1265-8), and Celestine V (1294) never actually set foot in Rome as pope.”⁴¹

Some Catholics argue that it is acceptable that popes ruled from Avignon because of the precedent, according Rome’s version of history, of Peter moving from Antioch to Rome. If so, however, then the papacy should not be tied to Rome at all, but rather merely to the successor of Peter wherever he may reside.

The Great Schism

One Catholic source states: “The lines of popes can be traced back, in unbroken succession, to Peter himself.”⁴² Is this claim valid? It seems a perfectly legitimate question to wonder who was the Pope at the time when there were two or more claimants to Peter’s chair, something that happened often in church history. And yet, Rome’s answer is not easily discovered.

Catholic apologist Philip St. Romain says, “Q. During those times when there were two or three popes, which one was infallible? This is a rhetorical question usually asked in a spirit of sarcasm. A rhetorical answer might state that only the pope who was the true bishop of Rome rightly enjoyed an assurance of infallibility.”⁴³

To begin with, Romain’s answer unfairly attacks the questioner (*ad hominen*) rather than answering the legitimate question. Second, he doesn’t at all answer the question, but merely restates it.

Though many examples could be given, we will limit our examination to the most notorious one known in history as the Great Schism. Alan Schreck describes it as follows:

“Gregory XI died in 1378, soon after his return to Rome from Avignon. His death brought about an even greater crisis in the Church. The Cardinals gathered in Rome and under pressure from the Roman people, wisely elected an Italian as pope, Urban VI, To their surprise, the mild-mannered Urban began to chastise the cardinals, constantly harping at them to reform their lives and even torturing some who opposed him. The French cardinals, claiming that the original election of Urban was invalid, fled Rome and elected a French ‘anti-pope,’ Clement VII. This began one of the saddest chapters in Catholic Church history. Two, and later, three men claimed to be the true pope, each supported by various nations and kingdoms.

This raised the pressing question of how to resolve this difficulty. None of the competing popes offered to resign, and the cardinals and bishops were divided in their loyalties. Some theologians, such as Frenchman Jean Gerson, chancellor of the University of Paris, had

proposed earlier that the authority of an ecumenical council was greater than that of a pope; and he called for an ecumenical council of bishops to resolve the division. This was finally done. The Council of Constance (1414-18) deposed two popes, persuaded the third to retire, and elected a new pope, Martin V (1417), who was recognized by the whole church . . . Many Christians began to view the ecumenical council as having greater authority than the pope, though this was not true. The Council of Constance was an exception, not the rule, designed to respond to a state of emergency in the Church.”⁴⁴

There are several important points to observe here. Schaaf tells us that “The question of the legitimacy of Urban VI.’s pontificate is still a matter of warm dispute. As neither pope nor council has given a decision on the question, Catholic scholars feel no constraint in discussing it.”⁴⁵

Most Catholic scholars maintain that the true pope was Urban VI (even though, “The same body of cardinals which elected Urban deposed him, and, in their capacity as princes of the Church, unanimously chose Robert as his successor.”⁴⁶) and his successors in the Roman line (Boniface IX, Innocent VII, and Gregory XII). Then, when Gregory resigned (at the urging of the Council of Constance), the council was free to name a successor, and they chose Martin V, whom Roman Catholics nearly universally accepted as the true pope, ending the Great Schism.

There are problems with this seeming solution. Gregory resigned, provided John and Benedict should be set aside.”⁴⁷ However, Benedict never did resign, but claimed his papacy till his death.⁴⁸ Also, the Council of Constance was not called by the alleged true pope at the time, Gregory XII, but rather by the anti-pope John XXIII,⁴⁹ and therefore should not be considered a valid council. For instance, most Roman Catholic scholars reject the ecumenical validity of the Council of Pisa (1409) because it was not called by a legitimate pope.⁵⁰ Further, most of the bishops at the Council of Constance had been excommunicated by Pope Gregory.⁵¹ How then could they elect the next Pope?

Some Catholics answer that Pope Gregory XII eventually gave his sanction and approval to the Council following his abdication,⁵² and therefore, the council was valid.

It was this same Council of Constance that declared that ecumenical councils were superior to popes, and denied papal infallibility.⁵³ Catholic scholars respond that these actions of the Council of Constance in their fourth and fifth sessions occurred before Pope

Gregory sanctioned the council and therefore are not binding. Not so fast!

Gregory XII was “represented by two delegates”⁵⁴ at Constance from the beginning of the council, so it seems strange to suggest the council was not valid. It should be noted that the Council of Constance was not only called by the anti-pope John XXIII, but also by the Holy Roman Emperor Sigismund, which follows the historical precedent of the Emperor Constantine convening the Council of Nicea in 325.

Further, the new pope elected by the council, Martin V, announced “he would maintain all the decrees passed by the council in matters of faith in a conciliar way.”⁵⁵ Martin V later “recognized the council as oecumenical, and declared its decrees binding.”⁵⁶ Martin’s successor, Pope Eugenius IV, “in a bull issued Dec 13, 1443 . . . formally accepted the acts of the Council of Basel, the most explicit of which was the reaffirmation of the acts of the Council of Constance in its 4th and 5th sessions” which declared conciliar superiority and denied papal infallibility. They also declared that a council does not need the sanction of the pope to be ecumenically valid.

The implication of that is the Council of Pisa should then be accepted as valid. But this council deposed Gregory XII in 1409.⁵⁷ This means that Gregory XII was not the true pope following the council of Pisa, but rather Alexander V? And so on!

Conclusion

It is my opinion that the Roman Catholic doctrine of papal infallibility dies the death of a thousand qualifications. Its force is narrowed to such an extent that it is practically meaningless. On average, there is an *ex cathedra* statement once every 1000 years. Worse, no one really knows which statements are infallible. On top of that, Catholics, including leading scholars, are not sure what these papal statements mean.

Most of the statements that popes make are not considered infallible, and many have been heretical. On top of that, there is a long record of popes holding contradictory positions in their teachings. Finally, we are told that papal statements, even *ex cathedra* ones, are not inspired or revealed by God. Yet despite all of this, we are expected to follow the guidance of the pope over the inspired teachings of the Bible. This makes no sense. As so with the great reformers, I take my stand on *Sola Scriptura*, and plead with Roman Catholics to join the reformation!

¹ As cited by Richard P. McBrien, *Catholicism*, Study Edition, Winston Press, Minneapolis MN, 1981, p. 626

² Maureen Fiedler and Linda Rabben, *Rome Has Spoken*, Crossroad publishing Company, The Quixote Center/ Catholics Speak Out, New York, 1998, p. 12

³ If it is objected that Catholics also appeal to the Bible as a final arbiter, I would point out that Catholics regularly claim that since the Church determined the biblical canon, it is pre-eminent even over the Scriptures.

⁴ Vatican 1, as cited by Loraine Boettner, *Roman Catholicism*, The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, Phillipsburg New Jersey, 1962, p. 235

⁵ Infallibility, *The Catholic Concise Encyclopedia*, Robert C. Broderick, M.A., Simon and Schuster Inc, New York, 1957, p. 199

⁶ Pastor Aeternus, *Documents of Vatican Council 1*, John F. Broderick, S.J., The Liturgical Press, Collegeville MN, 1971, p. 62 (Emphasis mine)

⁷ Norman L. Geisler and Ralph E. Mackenzie, *Roman Catholics and Evangelical: Agreements and Differences*, Baker Books, Grand Rapid MI, 1995, p. 304

⁸ Infallibility, *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, Robert C. Broderick, Thomas Nelson Publishers, Nashville, New York, 1976, P. 292

⁹ Loraine Boettner, *Roman Catholicism*, The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, Phillipsburg New Jersey, 1962, pp. 235-236 Church, and to the universal church. Proclaiming by definitive act some doctrine of faith or morals—it is only then that the Pope speaks infallibly.”

¹⁰ Philip St. Romain, *Catholic Answers to Fundamentalists' Questions*, Liguori Publications, Liguori, MO, 1984, p. 20

¹¹ Anne Freemantle, *The Papal Encyclicals In Their Historical Context*, Mentor Books, New York, 1956, pp. 21, 25.

¹² Gary Wills, *Why I Am A Catholic*, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston . New York, 2002, Mariner Edition 2003, p. 252

¹³ Paul Johnson, *The Papacy*, Barnes and Nobles Books, New York, 1997, p. 208

¹⁴ Loraine Boettner, *Roman Catholicism*, The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, Phillipsburg, New Jersey, 1962, p. 236

¹⁵ Timothy F. Kauffman, *Theo-Illogical: Quid Pro Canon*. This excellent article is available at the following web address: <http://www.sxws.com/charis/pope-10.htm>

¹⁶ Anne Freemantle, *The papal Encyclicals In Their Historical Context*, Mentor Books, New York, 1956, p. 28.

¹⁷ Norman L. Geisler and Ralph E. Mackenzie, *Roman Catholics and Evangelical: Agreements and Differences*, Baker Books, Grand Rapid MI, 1995, p. 213

¹⁸ *Pillar Of Fire, Pillar Of Truth, The Catholic Church and God's Plan for You*, Catholic Answers, San Diego, CA, 1997, pp.11-12

¹⁹ *Ibid*, p. 12

²⁰ Charles A. Coulombe, *A History of the Popes*, MJF Books, New York, 2003, pp. 114-115

²¹ Gary Wills, *Why I Am A Catholic*, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston. New York, 2002, Mariner Edition 2003, p. 105

²² *Ibid*, p. 106 (emphasis in original)

²³ J.N.D. Kelly, *Oxford Dictionary of Popes*, Oxford University Press, Oxford UK, 1986, p. 79

²⁴ Charles A. Coulombe, *A History of the Popes*, MJF Books, New York, 2003, p. 126.

²⁵ Rev. Bertrand L. Conway, C.S.P., *The Question Box*, The Paulist Press, New York, 1929, p. 173 (emphasis in original)

²⁶ Charles A. Coulombe, *A History of the Popes*, MJF Books, New York, 2003, p. 115

²⁷ Gary Wills, *Why I Am A Catholic*, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston. New York, 2002, Mariner Edition 2003, p. 286

²⁸ Infallibility, P.J. Toner, *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, Volume 7, Robert Appleton Company, New York, 1910, p. 800

- ²⁹ Catholic Answers website at: http://www.catholic.com/library/papal_infallibility.asp
- ³⁰ Maureen Fiedler and Linda Rabben, *Rome Has Spoken*, Crossroad publishing Company, The Quixote Center/ Catholics Speak Out, New York, 1998
- ³¹ Charles A. Coulombe, *A History of the Popes*, MJF Books, New York, 2003, p. 71
- ³² J.N.D. Kelly, *Oxford Dictionary of Popes*, Oxford University Press, Oxford UK, 1986, p. 31
- ³³ Gary Wills, *Why I Am A Catholic*, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston. New York, 2002, Mariner Edition 2003, p. 106
- ³⁴ Rev. Bertrand L. Conway, C.S.P., *The Question Box*, The Paulist Press, New York, 1929, p. 172
- ³⁵ *Ibid*, p. 172
- ³⁶ Paul Johnson, *The Papacy*, Barnes and Nobles Books, New York, 1997, p. 57
- ³⁷ Charles A. Coulombe, *A History of the Popes*, MJF Books, New York, 2003, p. 123
- ³⁸ Maureen Fiedler and Linda Rabben, *Rome Has Spoken*, Crossroad publishing Company, The Quixote Center/ Catholics Speak Out, New York, 1998, pp. 19-20
- ³⁹ *Was Vatican I Rigged?* at the following web address:
<http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,912037,00.html?iid=chix-sphere>
- ⁴⁰ Infallibility, P.J. Toner, *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, Volume 7, Robert Appleton Company, New York, 1910, p. 799
- ⁴¹ Paul Johnson, *The Papacy*, Barnes and Nobles Books, New York, 1997, p. 8
- ⁴² *Pillar Of Fire, Pillar Of Truth, The Catholic Church and God's Plan for You*, Catholic Answers, San Diego, CA, 1997, p. 2
- ⁴³ Philip St. Romain, *Catholic Answers to Fundamentalists' Questions*, Liguori Publications, Liguori, MO, 1984, p. 21
- ⁴⁴ Alan Schreck, *The Compact History of the Catholic Church*, Servant Books, Ann Arbor, MI, 1987, pp. 56-57
- ⁴⁵ Philip Schaaf, *History of the Christian Church*, Volume VI, The Middle Ages, WM. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, MI, 1910, Reprinted July 1980, p. 124
- ⁴⁶ *Ibid*, p. 126
- ⁴⁷ *Ibid*, p. 159
- ⁴⁸ *Ibid*, p. 160
- ⁴⁹ *Ibid*, p. 145, 148
- ⁵⁰ *Ibid*, p. 144. See also, *Nelson's Dictionary of Christianity*, George Thomas Kurian, Editor, Nelson, Nashville, TN, p. 552
- ⁵¹ Philip Schaaf, *History of the Christian Church*, Volume VI, The Middle Ages, WM. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, MI, 1910, Reprinted July 1980, p. 130
- ⁵² *Ibid*, p. 159, 165
- ⁵³ *Ibid*, p. 157
- ⁵⁴ *Ibid*, p. 149
- ⁵⁵ *Ibid*, p. 165
- ⁵⁶ *Ibid*, p. 166
- ⁵⁷ *Nelson's Dictionary of Christianity*, George Thomas Kurian, Editor, Nelson, Nashville, TN, p. 552

SALUTE THE DANISH FLAG— IT'S A SYMBOL OF WESTERN FREEDOM

By Susan MacAllen

In 1978-80, I was living and studying in Denmark. But in 1978—even in Copenhagen—one didn't see Muslim immigrants.

The Danish population embraced visitors, celebrated the exotic, went out of its way to protect each of its citizens. It was proud of its new brand of socialist liberalism—one in development since the conservatives had lost power in 1929—a system where no worker had to struggle to survive, where one ultimately could count upon the state as in, perhaps, no other western nation at the time.

The rest of Europe saw the Scandinavians as free-thinking, progressive and infinitely generous in their welfare policies. Denmark was also most generous in its immigration policies—it offered the best welcome in Europe to the new immigrant: generous welfare payments for first arrival plus additional perks in transportation, housing and education. It was determined to set a world example for inclusiveness and multiculturalism.

How could it have predicted that one day in 2005 a series of political cartoons in a newspaper would spark violence that would leave a dozen dead in the streets—all because its commitment to multiculturalism would come back to bite?

By the 1990's the growing urban Muslim population was obvious—and its unwillingness to integrate into Danish society was obvious. Years of immigrants had settled into Muslim-exclusive enclaves. As the Muslim leadership became more vocal about what they considered the decadence of Denmark's liberal way of life, the Dane—once so welcoming—began to feel slighted. Many Danes had begun to see Islam as incompatible with the long-standing values: belief in personal liberty and free speech, in equality for women, in tolerance for other ethnic groups, and a deep pride in Danish heritage and history.

The New York Post in 2002 ran an article by Daniel Pipes and Lars Hedegaard, in which they forecasted accurately that the growing immigrant problem in Denmark would explode. In the article they reported:

“Muslim immigrants constitute 5 percent of the population but consume upwards of 40 percent of the welfare spending... Muslims are only 4 percent of Denmark's 5.4 million people but make up a majority of the country's convicted rapists, an especially combustible issue given that practically all the female victims are non-Muslim. Similar, though

lesser, disproportions are found in other crimes. Over time, as Muslim immigrants increase in numbers, they wish less to mix with the indigenous population.”

“A recent survey finds that only 5 percent of young Muslim immigrants would readily marry a Dane. Forced marriages—promising a newborn daughter in Denmark to a male cousin in the home country, then compelling her to marry him, sometimes on pain of death—are one problem.”

“Muslin leaders openly declare their goal of introducing Islamic law once Denmark’s Muslim population grows large enough—a not-that-remote prospect. If present trends persist, one sociologist estimates, every third inhabitant of Denmark in 40 years will be Muslim.”

It is easy to understand why a growing number of Danes would feel that Muslim immigrants show little respect for Danish values and laws. An example is the phenomenon common to other European countries and the U.S.: some Muslims in Denmark who opted to leave the Muslim faith have been murdered in the name of Islam, while other hide in fear for their lives. Jews are also threatened and harassed openly by Muslim leaders in Denmark, a country where once Christians citizens worked to smuggle out nearly all of their 7,000 Jews by night to Sweden—before the Nazis could invade. I think of my Danish friend Elsa, who, as a teenager, had dreaded crossing the street to the bakery every morning under the eyes of occupying Nazi soldiers—and I wonder what she would say today.

In 2001, Denmark elected the most conservative government in some 70 years—one that had some decidedly non-generous ideas about liberal unfettered immigration. Today Denmark has the strictest immigration policies in Europe. (Its effort to protect itself has been met with accusations of “racism” by liberal media across Europe—even as other governments struggle to right the social problems wrought by years of too-lax immigration.)

If you wish to become Danish, you must attend three years of language classes. You must pass a test on Denmark’s history, culture and a Danish language test. You must live in Denmark for 7 years before applying for citizenship. You must demonstrate an intent to work, and have a job waiting. If you wish to bring a spouse into Denmark, you must both be over 24 years of age, and you won’t find it so easy anymore to move your friends and family to Denmark with you. You will not be allowed to build a mosque in Copenhagen. Although your children have a choice of some 30 Arabic culture and language schools in Denmark, they will be strongly encouraged to assimilate to Danish society in ways that past immigrants weren’t.

In 2006, the Danish minister of employment, Claus Hjort Frederiksen, spoke publicly of the burden of Muslim immigrants on the Danish welfare system, and it was horrifying: the government’s welfare committee

had calculated that if immigration from Third World countries were blocked, 75 percent of the cuts needed to sustain the huge welfare system in coming decades would be unnecessary. In other words, the welfare system as it existed was being exploited by immigrants to the point of eventually bankrupting the government. “We are simply forced to adopt a new policy on immigration. The calculations of the welfare committee are terrifying and show how unsuccessful the integration of immigrants has been up to now,” he said.

A large thorn in the side of Denmark’s imams is the Minister of Immigration and Integration, Rikke Hvilshoj. She makes no bones about the new policy toward immigration, “The number of foreigners coming to the country makes a difference,” Hvilshoj says. “There is an inverse correlation between how many come here and how well we can receive the foreigners that come.” And on Muslim immigrants needing to demonstrate a willingness to blend in, “In my view, Denmark should be a country with room for different cultures and religions. Some values, however, are more important than others. We refuse to question democracy, equal rights, and freedom of speech.”

Hvilshoj has paid a price for her show of backbone. Perhaps to test her resolve, the leading radical imam in Denmark, Ahmed Abdel Abu Laban, demanded that the government pay blood money to the family of a Muslim who was murdered in a suburb of Copenhagen, stating that the family’s thirst for revenge could be thwarted by money. When Hvilshoj dismissed his demand, he argued that in Muslim culture the payment of retribution money was common, to which Hvilshoj replied that what is done in a Muslim country is not necessarily what is done in Denmark. The Muslim reply came soon after: her house was torched while she, her husband and children slept. All managed to escape unharmed, but she and her family were moved to a secret location and she and other ministers were assigned bodyguards for the first time—in a country where such murderous violence was once so scarce.

Her government has slid to the right, and her borders have tightened. Many believe that what happens in the next decade will determine whether Denmark survives as a bastion of good living, humane thinking and social responsibility, or whether it becomes a nation at civil war with supporters of Sharia law.

And meanwhile, Americans and Canadians clamor for stricter immigration policies, and demand an end to state welfare programs that allow many immigrants to live on the public dole. As we in America look at the enclaves of Muslim amongst us, and see those who enter our shores too easily, dare live on our taxes, yet refuse to embrace our culture, respect our traditions, participate in our legal system, obey our laws, speak our language, appreciate our history...we would do well to look to Denmark, and say a prayer for her future and our own.

ISLAM: A RELIGION, OR CULT?

By Peter Hammond

Rev. Peter Hammond is the Founder and Director of Frontline Fellowship, the Founder and Chairman of Africa Christian Action, the Director of the Christian Action Network and Chairman of the Reformation Society. He is the author of Faith Under fire in Sudan, Halocaust in Rwanda, In the Killing Fields of Mozambique, The Great Commission Manual, The Biblical Worldview Manual, Putting Feet To Your Faith, The Greatest Century of Missions, Biblical Principles For Africa, The Discipleship Handbook, Slavery, Terrorism and Islam - The historical Roots and Contemporary Threat and The Greatest Century of Reformation. He is also the Editor of both Frontline Fellowship News and The Christian Action Magazine. He is also a Contributing-editor of Joy.

Peter has a strong commitment to Christian education, having helped to promote Christian education and home schooling in South Africa for over 15 years. He and his wife Lenora home school their four children and help provide Christian school textbooks through their Christian Liberty Books ministry. Through his Textbooks For Teachers program, Peter has been providing thousands of Christian school text books to community Christian schools in Zambia and Sudan. He is involved in mobilizing support of Christians suffering in Zimbabwe, and in providing tons of relief aid for the victims of communism in Zimbabwe.

He is a missionary member of Livingstone Fellowship. He is also a minister of the Episcopal Church of Sudan and Chairman of the Reformation Society.

Islam is not a religion nor is it a cult. It is a complete system.

Islam has religious, legal, political, economic and military components. The religious component is a beard for all the other components.

Islamization occurs when there are sufficient Muslims in a country to agitate for their so-called 'religious rights.'

When politically correct and culturally diverse societies agree to 'the reasonable' Muslim demands for their 'religious rights,' they also get the other components under the table. Here's how it works (percentages source CIA: The World Fact Book (2007)).

As long as the Muslim population remains around 1% of any given country they will be regarded as a peace-loving minority and not as a threat to anyone. In fact, they may be featured in articles and films, stereotyped for their colorful uniqueness:

United States -- Muslim 1.0% Australia -- Muslim 1.5% Canada -- Muslim 1.9% China -- Muslim 1%-2% Italy -- Muslim 1.5% Norway -- Muslim 1.8%

At 2% and 3% they begin to proselytize from other ethnic minorities and disaffected groups with major recruiting from the jails and among street gangs:

Denmark -- Muslim 2% Germany -- Muslim 3.7% United Kingdom -- Muslim 2.7% Spain -- Muslim 4% Thailand -- Muslim 4.6%

From 5% on they exercise an inordinate influence in proportion to their percentage of the population.

They will push for the introduction of halal (clean by Islamic standards) food, thereby securing food preparation jobs for Muslims. They will increase pressure on supermarket chains to feature it on their shelves -- along with threats for failure to comply. (United States).

France -- Muslim 8% Philippines -- Muslim 5% Sweden -- Muslim 5% Switzerland -- Muslim 4.3% The Netherlands -- Muslim 5.5% Trinidad &Tobago -- Muslim 5.8%

At this point, they will work to get the ruling government to allow them to rule themselves under Sharia, the Islamic Law. The ultimate goal of Islam is not to convert the world but to establish Sharia law over the entire world.

When Muslims reach 10% of the population, they will increase lawlessness as a means of complaint about their conditions (Paris -- car-burnings). Any non-Muslim action that offends Islam will result in uprisings and threats (Amsterdam -- Mohammed cartoons).

Guyana -- Muslim 10% India -- Muslim 13.4% Israel -- Muslim 16% Kenya -- Muslim 10% Russia -- Muslim 10-15%

After reaching 20% expect hair-trigger rioting, jihad militia formations, sporadic killings and church and synagogue burning:

Ethiopia -- Muslim 32.8%

At 40% you will find widespread massacres, chronic terror attacks and ongoing militia warfare:

Bosnia -- Muslim 40% Chad -- Muslim 53.1% Lebanon -- Muslim 59.7%

From 60% you may expect unfettered persecution of non-believers and other religions, sporadic ethnic cleansing (genocide), use of Sharia Law as a weapon and Jizya, the tax placed on infidels:

Albania -- Muslim 70% Malaysia -- Muslim 60.4% Qatar -- Muslim 77.5% Sudan -- Muslim 70%

After 80% expect State run ethnic cleansing and genocide:

Bangladesh -- Muslim 83% Egypt -- Muslim 90% Gaza -- Muslim 98.7% Indonesia -- Muslim 86.1% Iran -- Muslim 98% Iraq -- Muslim 97% Jordan -- Muslim 92% Morocco -- Muslim 98.7% Pakistan -- Muslim 97% Palestine -- Muslim 99% Syria -- Muslim 90% Tajikistan -- Muslim 90% Turkey -- Muslim 99.8% United Arab Emirates -- Muslim 96%

100% will usher in the peace of 'Dar-es-Salaam' -- the Islamic House of Peace -- there's supposed to be peace because everybody is a Muslim:

Afghanistan -- Muslim 100%; Saudi Arabia -- Muslim 100% Somalia -- Muslim 100% Yemen -- Muslim 99.9%

Of course, that's not the case. To satisfy their blood lust, Muslims then start killing each other for a variety of reasons.

'Before I was nine I had learned the basic canon of Arab life. It was me against my brother; me and my brother against our father; my family against my cousins and the clan; the clan against the tribe; and the tribe against the world and all of us against the infidel. -- Leon Uris, 'The Haj'

It is good to remember that in many, many countries, such as France, the Muslim populations are centered around ghettos based on their ethnicity. Muslims do not integrate into the community at large. Therefore, they exercise more power than their national average would indicate.

Adapted from Dr. Peter Hammond's book: *Slavery, Terrorism and Islam: The Historical Roots and Contemporary Threat*.

QUIZ: Islam

1. The word “Islam” means
 - a. faithfulness
 - b. submission
 - c. love
 - d. freedom
2. Which happened first?
 - a. Crusades
 - b. Muslims conquer Mecca and Medina in Arabia
 - c. Establishment of the Ottoman Empire
 - d. Battle of Tours in Spain
3. Which country has the greatest population of Muslims?
 - a. Iraq
 - b. Iran
 - c. Saudi Arabia
 - d. Indonesia
4. A Muslim religious or legal decree is called
 - a. burkha
 - b. hegira
 - c. fatwa
 - d. hajj
5. Which position is highest in Muslim religious rank?
 - a. Caliph
 - b. Imam
 - c. Sheik
 - d. Mullah
6. The most populous of the religious sects in Iran are the
 - a. Kurds
 - b. Sunnis
 - c. Bahaiis
 - d. Shiites
7. Which of the following biblical personages is especially esteemed by Muslims?
 - a. David
 - b. Abraham
 - c. Mephibosheth
 - d. Joseph

8. The ethnic origins of most Muslims in the USA are
 - a. South Asians
 - b. African Americans
 - c. White Americans
 - d. Arabs
9. Muslim schools are called
 - a. madrasses
 - b. synagogues
 - c. ashrams
 - d. ecoles
10. The number of times that every Muslim should pray each day are
 - a. three
 - b. five
 - c. seven
 - d. nine

Answers:
1. (b); 2. (b); 3. (d); 4. (c); 5. (a); 6. (d); 7. (b); 8. (a); 9. (a); 10. (b)

SUBSCRIBERS

If your mailing label reads JUN 2008 and is Vol. 28, No. 2, your subscription expires with this issue. Please renew your subscription soon. Renewals cost \$10.00 per year in the US. Foreign subscriptions cost extra to cover the additional postage.

Come visit Religion Analysis Service on the world wide web!

Our URL is: <http://www.ras.org>

Our e-mail address is: info@ras.org

RELIGION ANALYSIS SERVICE, INC.

1313 5th St. SE, Suite 126E,
Minneapolis, MN 55414-4504

Address Service Requested

**Important- If your mailing label
reads JUN 2008, your subscrip-
tion has expired with this issue.
Please renew now!**

Non Profit Org.
U.S. Postage
Paid
Minneapolis, MN
Permit No. 795