

FAITH & ACTION

In Three Volumes

the Collected Articles of

R.J. RUSHDOONY

from the Chalcedon Report, *1965–2004*

Chalcedon / Ross House Books
Vallecito, California

FAITH & ACTION

VOLUME 2 • GOVERNMENT, EDUCATION & SOCIETY

FAITH & ACTION

Volume 1



FAITH & ACTION

VOLUME 1 • AUTHORITY, HUMANISM & MORALITY

the Collected Articles of

R.J. RUSHDOONY

from the CHALCEDON REPORT, *1965–2004*

ROSS HOUSE BOOKS

CHALCEDON / ROSS HOUSE BOOKS
VALLECITO, CALIFORNIA

Copyright 2019
Mark R. Rushdoony

Chalcedon/Ross House Books
PO Box 158
Vallecito, CA 95251

www.ChalcedonStore.com

All rights reserved.

No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means — electronic, mechanical, photocopy, recording, or otherwise — except for brief quotations for the purpose of review or comment, without the prior written permission of the publisher.

Library of Congress Control Number: 2018943528
ISBN: 978-1-879998-83-4

OTHER SELECT TITLES BY ROUSAS JOHN RUSHDOONY

THE INSTITUTES OF BIBLICAL LAW

The Institutes of Biblical Law, Volume 1

The Institutes of Biblical Law, Volume 2: Law & Society

The Institutes of Biblical Law, Volume 3: The Intent of the Law

COMMENTARIES ON THE PENTATEUCH

Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy

Systematic Theology in Two Volumes

Sovereignty

Salvation and Godly Rule

Larceny in the Heart

Tithing & Dominion

By What Standard?

The One and the Many

Law & Liberty

Revolt Against Maturity

The Cure of Souls

In His Service

The Messianic Character of American Education

The Philosophy of the Christian Curriculum

Intellectual Schizophrenia

The Biblical Philosophy of History

Foundations of Social Order

The American Indian

This Independent Republic

The Nature of the American System

Politics of Guilt and Pity

A Word in Season series

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The James Vernier Family
Dr. Russell & Karen Boates
Heath Ford
Thomas & Marguerite Wingfield
Ruth M. Jacobs
Elmer L. & Naomi H. Stoltzfus
Ford & Andrea Schwartz
Dr. & Mrs. Richard Vest, Jr.
Steve Shifflett
J. & Joan Dyer
Keith & Antha Harnish
Steven & Sue Schlagel
Dean & Mary Helen Waddell
Mr. Darrell Ross
J. David Allen
The George Sechrist Family
Michael & Denise Snyder
Stephen Cope
Jerry & Linda Postell
Mr. & Mrs. Gerald Christian Nordskog
Mark & Kathy Dion
Paul R. Zimmerman
Michael G. Griggs
Joseph & Jessica Graham
Mr. & Mrs. Eric E. Brown
Timothy P. Murray
Eleuthere & Joan Poumakis
Steve & Bev Swartz,
Alice Springs, Australia
David Robert Mason
Dr. Nick & Janie Edwards
Dr. John E. and Lynda J. Ramsey
Harry J. Krieg, Jr.
Robert E. Scherer
Michael & Marian Bowman
Roger & Jenny Strackbein
Virginia C. Schlueter
Steven & Darlene Christenson
Robert B. Halliday III & Patricia M. Halliday
The John Saunders III Family
E. James DeMattos
Ruth Sawall
John and Tracy LaBreche
Maurice & Marlene Page and Family
John R. Rimel & Debra L. Rimel
Jean L. Herre
The Grater Family
David J. Brewer
T. M. Childs
Mr. & Mrs. Roberto Corral
Felipe Sabino de Araújo Neto

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 1

Introduction xv

Sovereignty & Authority

1 The Sovereignty of God 3
2 The Name of Power 5
3 Incarnation and History: "He Whose Right It Is" 7
4 The Doctrine of God and Infallibility 11
5 Is God Now Shrivelled and Grown Old? 14
6 Power Alignments 16
7 "Let My People Go!" 18
8 Authority and Anarchy 20
9 Authority 24
10 Death of God Thinking 30
11 Authority 35
12 Myth of Consent 39
13 Infallibility 42
14 The New Sovereign or God 47
15 The Principle of Change 49
16 Religion and the State 51
17 Who Is the Lord?: Conflict With Caesar 53
18 Freedom Under God 56
19 Peace and Freedom 58
20 Postmillennialism Versus Evolution 62

The Church

21 What Is the Church? 67
22 The Life of the Church: 1 Timothy 5:1–2 69
23 Trivializing the Church 72
24 Trivializing the Faith 74
25 The Church 76
26 Passive "Christianity" 78
27 The Demand for Perfection in the Church 80
28 Unconstructive Religion 82
29 Copycat Churchianity 84
30 Is Caesar Our Lord? 86
31 What Is Civil Religion? 88
32 The False Doctrine of the Holy Spirit 90
33 Indulgences 93
34 Judgment and Atonement 97
35 Inflation 100
36 Irrelevant Church Members 102
37 Irrelevance of Churchmen 104
38 Government and the Diaconate 107
39 The Unknown John Calvin 111
40 The Messenger of Light 116
41 Failure and Recovery 119
42 "Awake, Thou That Sleepest" 124
43 The Process God 126
44 The Church: What Is It? 129
45 Modernism Old and New, Part 1 132
46 Modernism Old and New, Part 2 135
47 Evangelicalism 137
48 Early Church Buildings 139
49 Architecture 142
50 In Paper We Trust? 147
51 The Received Text 151
52 Good Preaching 154
53 Do You Want "Sweetness and Light?" 155
54 Dumb Dogs, That Cannot Bark 157
55 Biblical Relevance 159
56 True Preaching 163
57 The Trinity and Man 165
58 The Major Media 168
59 The Pastor and His Duties 170

60 Precisionism 172
61 "This Is the Victory" 174
62 Psychobabble in State and Business 176
63 "Showing the Lord's Death" 178

Humanism

64 Civilization's Civil War 183
65 Humanism in the Church 186
66 The Death of an Age and Its Faith 190
67 Peace as a Right? 195
68 The Humanistic Heresy of Rights 197
69 Syncretism 200
70 Pragmatism 204
71 Pelagianism 207
72 Locating Our Problem 212
73 Inhumanism 217
74 The Age of Confiscation 219
75 Bureaucracy 222
76 Socialism 225
77 Planning 229
78 Confiscation 233
79 Evolution, or Providence? 237
80 Education and Rights 240
81 Holy Poverty? 247
82 God's Law and Our World 250
83 Theology and Recovery 254
84 Conspiracies 257
85 More on Conspiracy Thinking 261
86 Still More on Conspiracy Thinking 265
87 Original Sin 269
88 The Right to Rape and Murder? 272
89 Accidental Man 274
90 "The Crucifixion of the Guilty" 279
91 The Arrogance of Evil 281
92 The "Right to Privacy" and the "Right" to Sin 283
93 The War Against Chastity 285
94 False Atonements 287
95 Doctrine of Selective Depravity, Part 1 290
96 Doctrine of Selective Depravity, Part 2 293
97 Doctrine of Selective Depravity, Part 3 296

98 Selective Obedience 299
99 Consequences of Selective Obedience 302
100 Depravity or Natural Goodness? 305
101 The Establishment. 308
102 The Iks 313
103 Anarchism. 318
104 Moralism 323
105 Politics and Theology 326
106 Law Versus Self-Interest 330
107 Humanistic Doctrines of Sin. 333
108 Medical Model or Moral Model? 335
109 Sin and Virtue. 338
110 Liberation Theology 341
111 Twentieth-Century Plans of Salvation. 344
112 The Failures of Humanistic Salvation 346
113 Peace and Security? 348
114 Drop-Outs and Drop-Ins 353
115 Perfection Versus Maturity 358
116 Sabbath or Revolution. 360
117 Utopia 362
118 Sterile Protest and Productive Work 367
119 Disposable Man or Dominion Man? 372
120 Our Man-Centered Folly 375
121 Humanism and Change 378
122 March to a Dumping Ground 381
123 Suicidal Humanism. 384
124 The Marxist Separation of Church and State 387
125 Subversion of Words 389
126 The Menace of Arianism. 393
127 Gnosticism Today 396
128 Pilgrimage. 398
129 Rational Reforms 401
130 Myth of Consent and Locke 404
131 Locke's Promises. 407
132 Critical Analysis 410
133 Diderot: The Gardener and the Worm 413
134 Reason and Politics. 416
135 Women 419
136 Existentialism 422
137 Our False Premises 425
138 Everyday Romanticism 428

139 From Ape Man to Christian Man 431
140 Psychopaths. 433
141 Nihilism 435
142 Genius. 440
143 Post-Christian Era. 446
144 Disposable Man 451
145 Providence. 454
146 Locale of Meaning 457
147 Wolves. 459
148 The New Idolatry 461
149 The Myth of Neutrality 463
150 Experience 466
151 Total Meaning 469
152 Science and Magic. 471
153 Innocent III. 473
154 Children's Crusade 476
155 Crusading 479
156 Doing Nothing 482
157 Dream of Total Justice 485
158 Anti-Christianity on the Rise 488
159 Loss of the Past 490
160 History 493
161 Justice and Authority 496
162 Depending on Evil. 499
163 Hostility to Christianity 502
164 The Disastrous War 505
165 Exaggeration and Denial. 510
166 Humanism and Education 512
167 Blind Faith 517

Morality

168 Abominations 521
169 The Smiling Face of Evil 523
170 Moral Force 525
171 Relativism 531
172 Kwan-Yin Versus Christ 534
173 Epistemological Self-Consciousness 537
174 Moral Disarmament 541
175 Abortion 546
176 Moral Paralysis 552

Van Til & Logic

177 The Van Til I Knew: An Interview With R.J. Rushdoony 559
178 Dr. Cornelius Van Til 575
179 A Letter on Logic and Idolatry 577
180 Van Til's Christian-Theistic Ethics 578

INTRODUCTION

by Mark R. Rushdoony

In 2015 the Chalcedon Foundation celebrated its fiftieth anniversary, with 2016 representing another milestone, the centennial of the birth of my father and Chalcedon founder Rousas John Rushdoony (1916–2001). An important part of our work has been keeping his material readily available, including publishing many accumulated manuscripts for the first time.

These volumes represent a valuable and historically important resource. They are a complete collection of essays my father wrote for the *Chalcedon Report* between 1965 and 2003 (after his passing in 2001 we published, for a time, the text of some talks he had given). Most of these essays have been unavailable for many years.

On October 1, 1965, my father published a one-page newsletter he circulated to a small group of individuals who had pledged to support the newly created Chalcedon Foundation. That publication would become the *Chalcedon Report* and represented the flagship of both Chalcedon and the larger Christian Reconstruction movement.

My father had a varied ministry by 1965. After seminary and newly ordained in the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A. in 1944, he had hoped to find a small rural church that would afford him time to read and study, as his hope even then was to write. No such opportunity presented itself, but he was attracted to a vacant mission church in Owyhee, Nevada, a tiny reservation town on the Idaho border about 100 miles north of Elko. It served the Shoshone and Paiute Indian tribes on the Duck Valley Reservation. He was often snowed in for months at a time. He was also confronted with a culture hostile to the faith though in desperate need of it. He would pastor there for eight and a half years before pastoring two churches in Santa Cruz, California (the second, of which he was the founding pastor, was part of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church).

Santa Cruz at the time was largely a retirement community. Much of its population was, therefore, alone and elderly. Hospital visitations and funerals were a regular part of his weekly schedule. He found the dying were often very receptive to the sovereignty of God and His predestination. They, of all people, wanted to believe there was meaning in both life and death, because the alternative left them hopeless.

While a pastor in Santa Cruz, he was a manuscript reader and editor for Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company. He was given a copy of Morris and Witcomb's *The Genesis Flood*, already rejected by a large Christian publisher, and was able to successfully lobby for its publication. His own first book, *By What Standard? An Analysis of the Philosophy of Cornelius Van Til* (1958), as well as most of his early books, was published by Presbyterian and Reformed. After the study on Van Til, his early focus was on education. He had been researching government education since the early 1950s and published *Intellectual Schizophrenia* in 1961 and *The Messianic Character of American Education* in 1963. These books, and his lectures throughout the country on the subject, generated much of the impetus behind the resurgent Christian day school movement of the 1960s as well as the later resistance to increased efforts to control all private education, including the homeschool movement.

In 1962 he stepped down from the Santa Cruz pastorate and took a job as a researcher with the Volker Fund and later its spin-off, The Center for American Studies. This was a very well-endowed group that represented the confused mixture of those then struggling to organize a push-back to the liberal agenda, a group whose loose cohesiveness and ideological ambiguity emerged under the vague banner of "the conservative movement."

My father immediately ran into opposition as being "too Christian" for a "conservative" response that might hope to gain a hearing. Interestingly enough, the manuscript that was passed around the center's staff as being objectionable was *This Independent Republic*, a historical work. Eventually, my father was let go with a two-year writing grant, during which time the manuscript of *The One and the Many* was produced, though published a few years later.

It came as no surprise to my father that his Christian perspective and theology ran into opposition. He had already faced such reactions within the church since his seminary days. The incident did underscore the need for some independence where he could speak and write without constant internal conflict. Even the Orthodox Presbyterian Church found him too controversial. One minister would later suggest he be brought up

on charges of violating Romans 13 for saying the Federal Reserve was an immoral institution.

Since he had once hoped for a country pastorate he had often sought to start a study center or college, again to allow for his own study and that of others. He had searched for a facility and funding source since his days as a pastor in Santa Cruz. His search had taken him throughout California, back to Nevada, and to Arizona, though nothing materialized.

Even while on the Indian Reservation my father did a significant amount of traveling to speak to various conferences. Often his topic was the challenge of bringing the Christian faith to the Indians. In 1965 his grant was running out when a small group in Los Angeles told him they would finance his move there and pledge monthly support if he would agree to give lectures and Bible studies. It was a low ebb for many conservatives who were thoroughly discouraged by the landslide repudiation of "Mr. Conservative" Barry Goldwater in the 1964 presidential election. Moreover, the 1965 Watts riots took place just weeks before our move. My father's early supporters were disillusioned conservatives whom he tried to steer away from a belief in either politics as the answer or conspiracy thinking and towards a religious understanding that they were witnessing the after-effects of the decline of Christian faith and ethics in the culture. His answer was to return to both. Now his focus was the challenge of bringing the Christian faith back to Western culture.

In the late summer of 1965, with particularly generous help from Philip Virtue, a businessman, and Walter Knott, the founder of Knott's Berry Farm, a popular Southern California amusement park, our family moved from Northern California to a rental home in Woodland Hills in the San Fernando Valley. The legal organization of Chalcedon was already underway.

Chalcedon's purpose was a daunting one. The idea of a worldview organization was at the time unheard of. My father was told no one would give to an organization based on an idea, and was specifically told he should focus on opposing communism because that was an issue to which "conservatives" would give money. He was also told he was too old at forty-nine to be undertaking a vision so bold as the rethinking and reordering of the culture. Yet that had already been the direction of his thinking and writing for many years, and Chalcedon and that small group of benefactors allowed him to do what he had sought to do after seminary. Now he could read and study in depth, but now he was also in a position to travel, teach, and write full time as well.

My father began a series of classes at various Southern California locations. He conducted three lessons on Sunday, at first in Santa Ana, Westwood, and Pasadena. Other classes met during the week.

Those who signed up received a monthly newsletter. The first was written on October 1, 1965. In it, he compared his supporters to the patrons of the Renaissance art:

> For centuries, the church had been the major patron of arts and letters, and a Christian culture had flourished. Emperors and kings very early began to subsidize contemporary thinking with this view. There were clearly religious and philosophical trends pointing towards humanism and statism, but it was the heavy, steady, and long promotion of these things by subsidy that was responsible for the rapid spread and victory of those forces. Europe has been steadily conquered by a rapacious and brutal statism; the Renaissance was a period of showy art, but, behind that façade, it was an era of brutal terror, an era that brought monstrous men to power, some of whom made the Borgias look pale by comparison.
>
> Our age is seeing a similar development. The major and minor foundations have been extensively captured by the forces of humanism and statism, and a new age of terror is developing all around us. Scholarship, arts, and literature are being subsidized to serve the purposes of humanism and statism, and our schools and colleges have been largely captured by these forces, as have been most publishers and periodicals.
>
> This movement has been a long time in developing: it cannot be defeated overnight. It cannot be defeated by short-sighted people who want victory today or tomorrow, and are unwilling to support long-term battle. The future must be won, and shall be won, by a renewal to support and development of our historic Christian liberty, by an emphasis on the fact: the *basic government* is the self-government of the Christian man, and by a recognition that an informed faith is the mainspring of victory. History has *never* been dominated by majorities, but only by dedicated minorities who stand unconditionally on their faith.
>
> What you are doing in your support of me, is to sponsor a countermeasure to the prevailing trend, to promote by your support, interest, *and* study, a Christian Renaissance, to declare by these measures your belief that the answer to humanism and its statism is Christian faith and liberty. Our choice today is between two claimants to the throne of godhood and universal government: the state, which claims to be our shepherd, keeper, and savior, and the Holy Trinity, our only God and Savior. You have made your choice by both faith and action.

In the second newsletter, dated October 31, 1965, another analogy was used:

> The various phases of this vast attempt to turn the world from God's creation to the scientific planners' recreation can be documented in detail. It has been done by the volume. The answer, however, is not in facts and knowledge but in a restoration of Christian faith.

> Because God is God, and because He will not allow Himself to be dethroned, the scientific planners are doomed. This judgement is a certainty because God cannot allow sin to go unpunished. All sin is either atoned for, or punished. The question is whether we will be among those judged, or among those, the saved remnant, who shall undertake even now *the task of reconstruction*.

This is the first time he used the term "reconstruction." "Christian Reconstruction" came to describe my father's view of the responsibility of Christian citizenship in the Kingdom of God. It would prove to be the "big idea" for which Chalcedon stood.

After those two October issues, the issues came out monthly. They were simply designated "Newsletter [number]" until April, 1969, when the name *Chalcedon Report* was first used. My parents had always referred to the Newsletter as "the report" because one of its early purposes was to serve as a report to Chalcedon supporters of my father's activities. These early reports consisted of a postscript at the end of an essay describing my father's travels, speaking events, books read, chapters written, and the like. (These comments have been eliminated in these essays, as have accompanying announcements.) But my father was basically an essayist, so the *Chalcedon Report* became increasingly a vehicle for a series of original essays over the next thirty-eight years. The mimeographs yielded to a typeset, professionally-printed, folded, 17″ × 11″ *Chalcedon Report* No. 92 in April, 1973. Multiple enclosures by various contributors in a number 10 envelope had become unwieldy by November, 1987, so the magazine format was begun.

The essays in these volumes represent more than a collection of my father's writings in a particular forum, however, because they represent the source material that began a real paradigm change in the church by the conclusion of the twentieth century. In these essays my father laid an axe to the root of many ideas which had immobilized the church. In a time of social, political, and economic decay the church had influence over millions, yet with little impact on the culture. The causes of the church's ineffectiveness were many and most can be traced to a lack of obedience to God. When my father spoke on a Biblical view of money, debt, education, psychology, medicine, tithing, charity, diet, inflation, or a host of other issues, he was regularly denounced as an unspiritual legalist. The church was happier with general platitudes about "love," "grace, not law," "following Jesus," and "the leading of the Spirit."

The church's reaction to my father highlighted a disturbing reality of the twentieth century church—it had no objective standard of ethics. Its morality was pietistic, vague, and undefined. It could not command the

culture because it had no ethic that could command the church. It saw my father's emphasis on obedience to God's law as a dangerous innovation.

Very early in his Los Angeles lectures, my father began a long series on Biblical law. In his seminary days, he had promised himself that he would speak out after he had studied the subject in depth and was ready. Those lectures were later published in his seminal *The Institutes of Biblical Law*, Volume I. That book's publication in 1973 represents the birth of the modern theonomy movement.

Theonomy means "God's law," and represents the belief that the laws of God are and always have been God's instruction in righteousness. The Protestant Reformation clarified the orthodox position that justification was by grace received through faith, but the issue of sanctification, the believer's growth in faith, was left unsettled. Simply put, my father's position was that God's law is the standard for man's behavior, that disobedience is rebellion and represents an impediment to personal, familial, cultural, or national blessing.

The extent to which the *unbeliever* disobeys God is readily apparent, but my father spoke more to the evil of *God's people* flagrantly advocating their right to "continue in sin" so that "grace might abound" (Rom. 6:1). The antinomian (anti-God's law) position of the modern church has placed it where it cannot be blessed, because it has embraced a blasphemous theology which denies the righteousness of God while claiming His mercy. It wants a Jesus who is Lord of eternal salvation, but not of their own life. It has, all too often, presented the faith as a man-centered benefits package with no other demands on sinners than a one-time confession.

These essays develop these ideas, their origin and consequences at some length. There is a great deal of history in these essays as well, because the development of modern thought in and out of the church is little known.

The repeated theme is that of the need for Christian Reconstruction. That message was why Chalcedon began and was my father's desire for the church. It was also part of his faith. As a postmillennial, he believed in the victory of the gospel in time and history. His dismal analysis of the present was, therefore, always tempered by a certainty in the triumph of the Kingdom of God. You will find repeated calls in these essays to the absolute certainty of the victory of Christ of which we can be a part.

You will find these essays that now go back, in some cases, over fifty years to be entirely relevant. Many things he stated of the moral direction of the country probably struck many as the time as being perhaps overstated. His early calls for the removal of Christian children from government schools was seen by many churchmen as, at best, a bit "kookish"

and, at worst, unpatriotic. The recent prominence of the homosexual movement proves my father was prescient about the moral direction of our culture. Nevertheless, he never feared such elements, despite their viciousness toward him or their power base. He saw them as he saw all rebels against God as the ultimate losers in a world in which Christ's victory was certain.

Many of these essays were read by very powerful individuals, in both state and national capitals. My father's "big picture" idea of Christian Reconstruction, though, was never about a top-down political movement, but one that began at the individual level of self-government and extended to family, vocation, and from there to even larger manifestations. It was, then, always dependent on the necessity of conversion through the power of the Holy Spirit. Its position has never been to depreciate personal regeneration and the need for justification by grace received through faith, but to offer direction for the believer in their sanctification by means of a self-conscious obedience to God's law. Christian Reconstruction is the calling of all who seek to live in terms of their calling as citizens of the Kingdom of God.

Faith and Action represents the second attempt to collect my father's *Chalcedon Report* essays. In 1991 *Roots of Reconstruction* included a comprehensive collection of his work through August of 1985. These three volumes represent the complete collection of essays. A separate three-volume set published in 2017, *An Informed Faith*, included all his Position Papers; and a smaller volume, *Faith and Wellness*, included his thirteen ground-breaking Medical Reports, still the only attempt at approaching the need for Christian Reconstruction in the area of medicine.

On my father's death, I saw it as my personal calling to continue to make the work of my father available. The publication of this work represents a milestone in that effort, one which the staff of Chalcedon and I take great delight in, not as a memorial to my father, but in recognition that he had a great deal of godly wisdom for the church in our day and beyond. We believe his greatest impact is yet future, because the Kingdom of God and His Christ is growing and the gates of hell shall not prevail against its advance.

Mark Rousas Rushdoony
Vallecito, California
January 10, 2019

SOVEREIGNTY & AUTHORITY

1

THE SOVEREIGNTY OF GOD

Chalcedon Report No. 420, July 2000

The very word *God* implies and requires *sovereignty*. This is why the word *gods* implies a contradiction: because the so-called *gods* imply by that title *sovereignty*, which they do not possess, they can only be seen as partially gods, i.e., one god controlled sea voyages; another, sexual matters; still another, warfare; and so on and on. Polytheism has many partially ruling spirits, but no God.

The word *God* implies ultimacy and the power to create, as Scripture often declares: "Of old thou hast laid the foundation of the earth: and the heavens are the work of thy hands" (Ps. 102:25). Jesus Christ, as God incarnate, tells His people, "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world" (Matt. 25:34). Because God is the only Maker of heaven and earth (Gen. 1:1), it follows that His Word alone can govern all things in every sphere. Because He alone has made us and can save us, His Word alone can govern us. Because He alone is God, His law alone can truly rule us.

Today, however, a church deep into heresy sees Christ as our Savior from sin, but not as our Lord and Lawgiver. This is to deny Christ's deity and sovereignty. We have forgotten that, in the early church, to be a Christian was, among other things, to be under a higher Lord and a higher law.

Today, however, I hear preachers deny the sovereignty of God and who see this as an alien doctrine. In effect, they affirm that other powers rule creation, and Jesus has jurisdiction over a corner of it. This is heresy, not Christianity. When terms such as lord, lordship, sovereignty, dominion, and the like are absent from preaching, so too is the Christ of the Bible, however much named.

The sovereignty of God means that the holy Trinity and the infallible

Word govern us in every sphere of life. *Salvation* is not God's only sphere of operation.

When Christians think in terms of God's sovereignty and rule by His law-word, they acknowledge the lordship of Jesus Christ.

In some circles, the word *sovereignty* is taboo, which in effect means that Christ is also. He is only present where He is truly known as Himself, not as a sentimentalized creature of the church's imagination.

In Matthew 25:31ff., we are told of Christ's coming in His glory to judge all nations. We are then told of those who have professed to know Him reacting with horror at being called the *cursed* ones because of only a verbal profession of allegiance instead of strong obedience to His total Word. The King's word applies in every sphere of life and thought. He will hold us to it. God is our sovereign because He alone is God.

2

THE NAME OF POWER

Chalcedon Report No. 332, March 1993

In Micah 4:5, we have a remarkable prediction: "For all people will walk every one in the name of his god, and we will walk in the name of the Lord our God for ever and ever." To "walk in the name" means to walk in the power and authority of the person or authority named. The old expression, "Open, in the name of the king," or, "in the name of the law," reflects this. The name or authority we can rightly claim determines our own power. This is why we pray "in Jesus's name," i.e., in His person and authority.

E. W. Hengstenberg long ago saw the meaning of Micah 4:5. He wrote, "The lot of every people corresponds to the nature of their god." If your god is yourself, or mankind, your authority will be a limited and poor one.

The growing impotence of too many churches is due to the fact that the nature of their god does not resemble that of the Biblical God. Their god is limited, sentimental, and incapable of judgment or true redemption. Their god is small, weak, and ineffectual. He can give advice but no government and deliverance.

To "walk in the name of the Lord our God" means to walk in faithfulness to His every word. We cannot limit Him by our modern notions of what a "nice" God would do!

It is interesting to note that, in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes, that tyrant forbad the Jews ever to mention the name of God: he feared the invocation in word and action of the name of power. When his rule was overthrown, the Hasmoneans repealed the decree, but the rabbis insisted that the sacred name remain unuttered. Thus, what the Syrian tyrant could not accomplish, the religious leaders did!

To invoke the name of God, the triune God, is to invoke His presence,

His law, and His power. From its Anglo-Saxon origin our English word *name* has always included the meaning "to call or to invoke." When the apostles healed the sick, they did so "in the name of Jesus Christ." This was an invocation of Christ's power by those who were ordained to serve Him and did so faithfully.

Let us look again at Hengstenberg's statement, "The lot of every people corresponds to the nature of their god." Because so many false gods govern men in the churches and out of them, we are surrounded by a world of cruel impotence. Wimps are dangerous because they are weak, cowardly, and devious. Thus, we no longer see, as was once common when two boys disagreed, a fair fight between the two of them. Instead, the goal is to gang up on the other when he is alone and you have "friends" to help you. On all sides, we have the viciousness of cowards and wimps. They are their own gods, and their lives reflect that limited and evil nature.

Those who worship and obey the living and triune God are the ones who confront the evils of the world in Christ's name and are "more than conquerors through him," their Lord (Rom. 8:37). The church cannot overcome the world, nor can we, but Christ can and will, with us or without us. We will continue a weak and wimpish people as long as our god is other than the living and true God, in whose name, power, and authority we conquer.

3

INCARNATION AND HISTORY: "HE WHOSE RIGHT IT IS"

Delivered by R. J. Rushdoony to a Chalcedon Guild Dinner
December 8, 1974

The first proclamations of the coming of Jesus Christ go back to the very beginnings of history, to the birth of time. In the Garden of Eden, as sentence is passed on mankind, the promise is given of restoration through the seed of the woman, who shalt "bruise," or literally, *crush* the serpent's head (Gen. 3:15). The coming of the promised Son is the institution of victory.

Later, the dying Jacob prophesied concerning the coming of the Son. Again, there is the note of militancy and victory. The Son is to come through the tribe of Judah, and Judah's military power is particularly noted. The great Victor of all history is to be born of a warrior's blood. "Judah is a lion's whelp," Jacob declared, one who goes up, or grows up, on prey (Gen. 49:9).

But Judah is only a custodian of power, a symbol of dominion, who holds his sway until the Great One comes, He whose right is it. "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the gathering of the people be" (Gen. 49:10). Power must be husbanded for the man of power, Shiloh. The Jewish Targums paraphrase "until Shiloh comes," with "until the time when the King Messiah comes to whom it belongeth." The sceptre of power and dominion belong to the Christ, and the source of law is the ultimate lawgiver, the Christ. *Shiloh* is a name of the Messiah, and it can mean, "To whom it belongs," or, "he whose [right] it is."

The meaning of the name *Judah* is, "God shall be praised." Jacob began his prophecy, "Judah, thou art he whom thy brethren shall praise." In Genesis 29:35, we read that Leah "conceived again, and bare a son: and

she said, Now will I praise the Lord: therefore she called his name Judah." The hand of Judah, Jacob went on to declare, "shall be on the neck of thine enemies," and his brothers would acknowledge his authority and power. As E. W. Hengstenberg declared, Judah would be his brothers' "forechampion in the warfare against the world, and God has endowed him with conquering power against the enemies of His kingdom." But the meaning of Judah is Shiloh, and in Shiloh dominion will be realized. As Solomon declared, "Yea, all kings shall fall down before him: all nations shall serve him" (Ps. 72:11). David was equally emphatic: "All the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the Lord: and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before thee" (Ps. 22:27). Again, "All nations whom thou hast made shall come and worship before thee, O Lord; and shall glorify thy name" (Ps. 86:9).

The Messiah is the one to whom all dominion, power, and authority belong: He is Shiloh, He whose right it is. The sceptre of dominion is His, and He is the lawgiver and the source of all law. His coming will mark the beginning of a battle unto victory against all who arrogate dominion unto themselves.

According to Numbers 24:17, a sceptre, the sceptre of world and universal dominion, rises out of Israel in the person of the Messiah. He shall arise to wage war against and to destroy all the sons of tumult (or Sheth, Num. 24:17). The tumult of the nations shall give way to the reign of the Prince of Peace, Jesus Christ.

Unto Him shall be "the gathering" or *obedience* of the peoples (Gen. 49:10). Jesus Christ has a title to and an absolute claim on the obedience of all peoples, and He shall establish this right by overturning all things that deny, neglect, or oppose Him. The name Shiloh, He whose right it is, is echoed in Ezekiel 21:27, wherein God declares, concerning the ancient world, "I will overturn, overturn, overturn it: and it shall be no more, until he come whose right it is; and I will give it him." The whole of the Old Testament era is a great shaking of the nations, a shattering of the conspiracies of men against God, to prepare the way for the coming of the Lord. Now that He has come, the great and final shaking is under way. Its meaning, St. Paul declared, is "the removing of those things that are shaken, as of things that are made, that those things which cannot be shaken may remain" (Heb. 12:27).

Therefore, when Christ, the great overturner, was born, the world in the person of King Herod struck at Him, striving to kill Him, knowing that Christ alive meant the defeat and death of the fallen world order. Earth and hell joined, in the events of His birth, temptation, trial, and crucifixion, in a grand design to overturn God's plan, to shake God's eternal decree, and to establish their own pretended right.

The issue was joined: *Who is Shiloh? The whole point of the fall was that man said, I am Shiloh, I am he whose right it is.* This is and must be a democratic universe, one in which every man has the right to be his own god, choosing or determining what constitutes good and evil for himself. There is no paradise of man possible apart from this faith. On this premise, fallen man operates, and on this premise he claims autonomy, declaring his independence from God and man, from all morality not made by man, and from all claims of authority over him. And the result, from the days of the judges to the present, is the same, whenever and wherever God the Sovereign King is denied: "In those days there was no king in Israel: every man did that which was right in his own eyes" (Judg. 21:25).

So, too, the modern state declares itself to be Shiloh, he whose right it is. The modern state acknowledges no law beyond itself, no lawgiver save itself, no savior beyond man, and no binding power beyond time and history. It sometimes disguises its hatred by a show of tolerance for Christianity, but that toleration is itself a form of declaring that Biblical faith is irrelevant. If the claims of Scripture and the God of Scripture are true, then there is no way in which men and institutions can sidestep the absolute requirement of total submission to Jesus Christ as Lord. Their option is only Christ or judgment: there is no life apart from Him, nor any order possible in contempt of Him.

For the state to attempt, as twentieth-century states do, to establish an order apart from Christ is to say that God is not the Lord, and that the universe is open to other claims of deity and sovereignty.

At the first Christmas, the battle was joined, church (the priests), state (Herod), and fallen humanity against the Christ child. At the crucifixion, the battle continued, with priests, Sanhedrin, and Rome united in striving to destroy the King. In virtually every capitol in the world today, the battle continues, as new sanhedrins, called parliaments, congresses, national assemblies, and like names, seek to set aside and suppress the claims of Christ as absolute Lord and only Savior. The new Herods and Pilates seek sanctimoniously to wash their hands of Him, and then to go about their own great business of creating a paradise on earth without God, and the only result is hell on earth.

Gil Elliot, in his *Twentieth Century Book of the Dead* (1972), tells us that in the twentieth century, the era of the triumph of humanism, between eighty and 150 million people have died in war and revolution, and their related violences, famines, slave labor camps, and the like. His statistics err on the side of conservatism; at some points, very able historians would even double the figures. Nor does he include other forms of mass murders, such as abortions. What Elliot does point out, however, is that every attempt

to call some other era more bloody is untenable: "every attempt to do so shows the twentieth century to be incomparably the more violent period." (This, of course, does not deter humanistic scholars from viewing with horror the sins of Christian rulers in the past, while seeing all the events of the present as a prelude to paradise. But, as Solzhenitsyn observes, in *The Gulag Archipelago*, "pride grows in the human heart like lard on a pig.")

To the question, *who is Shiloh?*, the twentieth century rarely answers, *Jesus Christ*. Even among those who profess to call Him Savior, too few will also acknowledge Him to be the Lord. But, if He is not our Lord, He is not our Savior. Jesus Christ is not an insurance agent, writing out an insurance policy on us, and then making no further claim on us, as long as our policy is paid up with modest sums from time to time. He is Shiloh, He whose right it is, and He will not surrender His sovereignty unto any other.

Because Jesus Christ is Shiloh, our world is under judgment for refusing to acknowledge Him as Lord and Savior. These troubled times should not distress or trouble us: they are evidences that Shiloh is at work, shaking the things which can be shaken, so that the unshakeable may alone remain. He will overturn, overturn our humanistic world, shatter its pride, autonomy, and complacency, and He shall reign in both judgment and in peace. It is He and not the world who is our peace. In the troubled world of His birth, the glorious song of the heavenly host was "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men" (Luke 2:14). The meaning of this peace, our Savior-King declares, is Himself. "For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition" between God and man (Eph. 2:14). By means of His grace and law-word, all things are to be brought into and under His peace. His strong and calming word to us is this: "Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you: not as the world giveth, give I unto you. Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid" (John 14:27).

4

THE DOCTRINE OF GOD AND INFALLIBILITY

Chalcedon Report No. 401, December 1998

Scripture tells me that God, being God, is incapable of lying (Num. 23:19). Jesus Christ more explicitly defines Himself as the way, the truth, and the life (John 14:6). There is no access to the Godhead except through Him. Scripture is explicit about identifying Jesus Christ with the Godhead, and God as *the truth*.

This doctrine of God is thus very important in the doctrine of Scripture. God cannot lie. He is also immutable, unchangeable. He is the same, yesterday, today, and forever. "For I am the Lord, I change not" (Mal. 3:6). Change means that things outside ourselves affect and govern our being. As creatures, we are dependent on a world of other peoples and a vast creation made by God. God has no such need for others nor a need for anything outside himself. In fact, God expresses His displeasure with all double-minded men (James 1:6–7).

There can be nothing prior to the one and eternal God, so that there is nothing that can contribute to His being. He is forever one God in three persons, and forever one, yet in three persons. God, who cannot lie, is thus forever *truth*, and all that He is and does is truth. *God therefore can speak only an infallible word*. In all other religions except those which have borrowed from or are imitative of the Bible, there is no doctrine of inerrancy nor infallibility. Biblical religion, on the other hand, mandates it. The God who speaks in and through the Bible speaks a necessarily infallible word. God is internally and eternally God, all wise and all perfect in all His being. His perfection is also a *moral* perfection, whereas, in some religions, this moral perfection is lacking, or is replaced by cleverness. Some native religions saw in their supreme being no moral excellence, but a constant cleverness that was a delight, rather than a moral strength.

Unless a religion arises after Christianity and is imitative of it, it has no doctrine of inerrancy nor infallibility because the question is essentially alien to it. On the other hand, in Christianity, the doctrine of infallibility is an inescapable implication of its doctrines of God and revelation.

When we turn to the Bible, as against two works written as imitations thereof, the differences are many. Believers in the *Koran* and in the *Book of Mormon* are as convinced of the truth and historicity of those works as Christians are of the Bible. They are given as true and historical. Much criticism has been leveled against both works, and we have no intention here of reporting on the history of this criticism.

Both the *Koran* and the *Book of Mormon* purport to be in continuity with the Bible, so they begin by making a claim to a final place in the history of revelation. The final truth in the history of revelation is in them, or will come through them. Islam left room for a great prophet yet to come, a king or warrior-king or Mahdi, and Mormonism believes in a continuing revelation through the hands of the twelve apostles who rule the church. Thus, the finality of revelation is denied even as an arena of authoritative rule is set forth. The finality of the enscriptured Word is replaced with the finality of some men. In this step, a dramatic change in the faith has taken place, and a shift in authority. In the place of the infallible word, we have the binding authority of a group of men. The new revelations undermine the Biblical one.

Orthodox theology thus speaks of the Bible's "verbal inspiration," "plenary inspiration," and so on. The Scriptures are the very words of God, the oracles of God. Van Til thus wrote, "... we may thus call this view of God and his relation to the world the *covenantal* view. As such it is exhaustively personal. There is no area in which man can find himself confronted with impersonal fact or law. All so-called impersonal laws and all so-called uninterpreted facts are what they are because they are expressive of the revelation of God's will and purpose" (C. Van Til, *The Doctrine of Scripture* [n.p.: The Den Dulk Foundation, 1967], p. 37). This should tell us why the language of covenantalism is Reformed and Van Tillian. It is alien to antinomianism and holds to the personal and covenantal law of the triune God.

Basic to Biblical faith, to the Reformed faith, is the belief in the sovereignty of God. The term *lord* is applied to God in both Old and New Testaments and is in the Septuagint routinely rendered as *lord*, God, or sovereign. Calvinism has done justice to the doctrine of God's sovereignty and therefore has been most ready to champion inerrancy, because basic to that view of Scripture is God's lordship or sovereignty.

Where men reject God's sovereignty, they accept and exalt man's

sovereignty, and man's reason then prevails over faith and God's sovereignty. Rationalism then too prevails over presuppositionalism, and theology is supplanted with humanistic calculations. We have, then, the world of the contemporary church, with God locked out by supposedly sovereign man.

The infallible God of Scripture can speak only an infallible word, and this He has done. No other word is possible from such a God. Humanism in its every form will require a god who cannot speak, or who speaks with a confused tongue. The God of Scripture is not such a God. He is *the Lord*, the Sovereign King over all creation. His word is the creating word, the infallible and inerrant word. In affirming the word of God as infallible, we affirm our faith that the God of Scripture is He who He says He is, and that we believe His every word, and that by His grace, hope to live in terms of His every word.

5

IS GOD NOW SHRIVELLED AND GROWN OLD?

Chalcedon Report No. 163, March 1979

Blasphemy often loves to present itself as a new and higher truth and, therefore, the true way. Certainly this is true of many today who tell us that God, who declares, "I am the Lord, I change not" (Malachi 3:6), has indeed changed. Apparently, with age and a new "dispensation" of declining powers, their god now confines himself to purely "spiritual" concerns. Once, in his younger and cruder days, he may have spoken about weights and measures, diet, money, sanitation, politics, economics, education, and more, but, now that man and science have supposedly caught up with him in these spheres, and passed him, this god is silent, and he deals only with spiritual matters as befits an aged and declining person. The laws of this old and shrivelled god are now primitive and obsolete, and man can now do, we are assured, a much better job in all these areas.

This is the plain meaning of dispensationalism and antinomianism. It limits God. It declares that God is now not sovereign and therefore has no word for every area of life and thought. These people in effect believe in an aged and old god who is for old or retreating people whose only thought is to leave the world, not to exercise dominion under God over it as their necessary service.

The recent conflicts with state and federal agencies over Christian schools have brought forth a coast-to-coast chorus of protests from these champions of retreat and flight. The schooling of our children, they declare, is not a Christian concern but a secular and humanistic one. The concerns of our faith are to be purely spiritual and ecclesiastical, they declare.

This very clearly denies God's sovereignty. It implies and declares that most of the world is *secular*, which the dictionary defines as "pertaining

to this world or the present life, worldly as contrasted with religious or spiritual." If this be true, then it is a serious error for the church to regulate sex and marriage and to condemn adultery, because our Lord makes it clear that sex and marriage are for this life only (Mark 12:25). One of the most influential dispensationalists perhaps holds to this view, because he is currently adulterous and yet widely honored. Nonetheless, God does ordain and regulate sex and marriage strictly, because His law and government are total, not merely spiritual and ecclesiastical.

God's sovereignty, law, power, authority, and government cannot be limited. He is Lord and Savior of all things, their total Creator and Governor. Hence, in every area of life and thought, we must be under His law-word and jurisdiction. There is no sphere of life, nor any area of activity, which is outside God's jurisdiction. Man can never step outside of God's government and law to create a purely humanistic area of government and law wherein man is sovereign. At no point in man's life or in all creation can we say, "Here God's government and sovereignty stop, or abate, and here man's word, sovereignty, and government take over." All such thinking, however spiritual it professes to be, is a radical compromise with humanism. It is an assertion of the tempter's principle that man is somehow, somewhere, and in some way entitled to be his own god, knowing, or determining for himself, what constitutes good and evil (Gen. 3:5). Such a view is original sin, whether in the mouth of Satan or in the mouth of a spiritual pastor. God is alone the Lord, in all things, over all things, and everywhere.

6

POWER ALIGNMENTS

Chalcedon Report No. 182, October 1980

An urgently important fact, too seldom appreciated by reformers, is that power aligns itself with power, not weakness. Attempts, thus, to counteract a prevailing power by creating another power therefore aggravate existing problems instead of alleviating them. A more powerful evil confronts the reformer, who then seeks remedy in the creation of still another power bloc, only to see a union of powers now facing him.

The same is true in personal relationships. Peer group pressures govern most people. The reforming politician, once elected to office (and power), becomes usually less sensitive to the will of those who elected him, and more sensitive to the will of those around and above him.

Thus, big civil government, big labor, and big business (and big agriculture as well), may often be in conflict, but they are more often working together to the detriment of smaller groups and persons. Subsidies go to a great extent to power blocs. If a big businessman is independent of this union of powers, he is more than an outsider; he is a threat, and he may find himself before a congressional committee before long.

When Adam Smith wrote against mercantilism and in favor of the free market, he was opposing an economy and social order in which all major powers were linked together in the state, to the detriment of freedom and the people. So distrustful was he of the association of power blocs, that he opposed even an association of manufacturers or businessmen.

Since those years, we have seen the rise of neo-mercantilism, and the steady accumulation of power in the state. Statist controls and laws have promoted and fostered the growth of corporate trusts and large unions whose existence rests extensively on subsidies and legal immunities. The same has been true of banking. Not only so, but big education, being statist, is a part of the power circle. Even major private universities are

recipients of large federal grants and subsidies. These power blocs become a working directorate to govern and control society.

Moreover, power in a society will collect around the central source of power and control in a society. If men believe that the chief power in life is the state, i.e., if they believe that the state is god walking on earth, they will draw near to that power. The more their own power grows, the more they will seek to be close to, and in a good relationship with, the power center, the god of that system. If that god is the state, then all social forces will seek to work with and through the state. Society becomes statist, and the goal of man becomes the gaining of grace and power from the state.

However, if man's religion, instead of being humanistic, is Biblical, then his power center will be neither man nor the state. If the Lord be his God, then the sun and center of man's life will be the Lord God. Man and his society will then gravitate around God and His Word. Man's law will then be, not statist, but Biblical. Power will be defined accordingly in terms of righteousness or justice, not the manipulation of the state.

Man, having been created in God's image, has an inescapable urge to order. Faced with chaos or power, he will, as Adolf A. Berle noted in *Power*, choose power. However, because man is fallen, and his decisions governed by his fallen nature, his definition of power is likewise evil. The more clear his departure from God, the more clearly is his idea of order evil, and actually a form of organized disorder. The Soviet Union, Red China, and other like regimes are examples of this. Corrupt power seeks to corrupt every institution and agency it can touch. Statism thus seeks the control and corruption of every segment of society as a necessity.

The promise of Scripture is power from on high (Joel 2:28–29; Luke 24:49; etc.), power from the triune God. This gift of power is not to an institution but to the covenant people. It comes from the person of God to persons. It creates an alliance of power for the sake of the Kingdom of God, and God's righteousness or justice (Matt. 6:33). Men who are aliens to this power seek power in collectivity and institutions, and in this way make themselves, whether of high or low degree, into mass men.

Power aligns itself with power; so too does weakness: it seeks the protection of power. We will seek to align ourselves with the power in our lives and faith. Will it be God or the state?

7

"LET MY PEOPLE GO!"

Chalcedon Report No. 168, August 1979

An ancient antichrist, Pharaoh, ordered the murder of all the sons of old Israel, seeking thereby the destruction of God's covenant people and his own triumph. He was a tyrant, and the original meaning of tyrant is one who rules without God. The tyrants and antichrists are very much with us now: they rule in the state house and White House, in the courts, and on the school boards, but more subtly than old Pharaoh. But again the goal is the destruction of God's covenant children, this time by forcing them into humanistic schools, or by imposing humanistic, statist controls over schools and children which belong to the Lord.

And again the word of the Lord comes through His faithful servants to the tyrants of our time: "Thus saith the LORD God of Israel, Let my people go"! (Exod. 5:1). It is never easy to serve the Lord, but it is much harder not to, for those who refuse to obey His voice are under the plagues of Egypt. "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues" (Rev. 18:4).

Because we are not our own, but have been bought with the price of Christ's blood (1 Cor. 6:19f.), the choice as to whether or not we will work out a bargain or compromise with the Pharaohs and Caesars of this world is not our own. We are God's property, and we cannot dispose of ourselves, our children, our churches, and our schools according to our word but must keep all things entirely under His Word. He is the Lord. He declares, "I am the LORD, and there is none else, there is no God beside me: I girded thee, though thou hast not known me" (Isa. 45:5). God has girded or armed us before we knew Him, and He girds us to stand in His name against all enemies of His Kingdom.

The enemy we face is the oldest and the basic enemy of God and His people. It is humanism, the worship of the creature, of man. The first

humanistic manifesto was issued in the Garden of Eden by the tempter. Its affirmation is that every man must be his own god, knowing or determining for himself what constitutes good and evil (Gen. 3:5). Humanism's war against God is the oldest and most central of all wars, but the least recognized. If we know the Lord, we know who His enemies are.

God's word to His enemies remains the same: "Let my people go"!

8

AUTHORITY AND ANARCHY

Chalcedon Report No. 23, August 1, 1967

The evidences of anarchy are increasing on all sides. Criminality rioting, looting, burning, and general lawlessness are becoming "normal" in our society, and law and order unusual and "abnormal." Who, in 1964, would have believed that in 1967 over eighty cities would see racial violence, and the violence has only begun. The anarchism of existentialism is apparent in radical student movements, in popular music, and in the "hippies." The churches are proclaiming this gospel of anarchism: one recent sermon in a prominent church was on the "Advantages of Adultery." The world of business and civil government is also saturated with dishonesty and immorality, as Fred J. Cook has shown in *The Corrupted Land: The Social Morality of Modern America* (1966).

But what we have seen is only the beginning. The worst is still ahead of us, and people may soon recall 1967 as "the good old days" of peace and quiet.

We have no right to be surprised at all this. Basic to all social order is *authority,* religious authority. The authority undergirding Western civilization has been the authority of the triune God. Christian authority led, *first*, to godly peace and to law and order. In other cultures, order is imposed by force and by a pagan religious faith which induces subjection. Christian law and order, instead of stifling man and society, liberated it. *Second*, this liberation of the Christian was twofold. Man was freed from the burden of sin and guilt, thereby gaining *inner* liberty, and man was freed from subjection to a divine state or ruler, thereby gaining *outer* liberty. *Third*, the free Christian man was able then to capitalize, to work productively, and to save for the future. The modern world of technology has only arisen as a result of this Christian heritage.

Now, however, Christian authority is denied. All godly authority is

overthrown in church, state, school, home, business, and private associations. And when men deny and despise God's authority, it is then nothing for them to deny and flout all human authority. Freedom from God's authority means finally freedom from all authority, and the result is that man moves steadily and rapidly into the abyss of chaos and anarchy.

Having denied God, man makes himself a god and insists on equality, since all men are gods. The basic principle in law today is *equality,* so that it is now predicted that lawsuits will demand equality of income as the next step in the "civil rights" revolution. Richard M. Elman, in *The Poorhouse State* (1966), favors a high "guaranteed annual income" for all on welfare and an end to "doctrines of individual achievement" as means of victimizing the poor (p. 299).

In the name of equality, we are being led into socialism and communism. Even the "right to privacy" is being steadily attacked. Thus, a psychologist has attacked the concept as a front for evil and deviation and has written, "An honest mind should be an open window," i.e., should withhold nothing. Moreover, "The closed door, in most households, is not so much a guardian of privacy, as a symptom of prudery; a barrier between the generations, an obstacle to fluent sex education, a reinforcement of guilt and repression" (Chester C. Bennett, "What Price Privacy?" in the *American Psychologist* [Journal of the American Psychological Association Inc.] 22, no. 5 [May 1967]: pp. 371–376).

Equality is the basic principle of anarchy. It levels all things and denies authority, that is, any authority other than the anarchic individual. Where God's supreme and absolute authority is recognized, then equality is automatically denied, because all things then are good or evil, better or worse, higher or lower, as they fulfil God's moral law or represent His legitimate authority. In the history of socialism, over and over again its basic premise is cited: "If there is no God, then all things are equal." All men are then equal, all ideas are equal; good and evil are equal, right and wrong are equal. The only difference in things, as John Dewey pointed out, is then pragmatic; all things are equal, but some are more useful at the moment.

The destruction of authority in our Western civilization and all over the world, is now far gone. The result will increasingly be anarchy.

Historically, collectivism has succeeded best where it has had a background of authoritarianism. Marxism has succeeded most, as in Russia and China, where it can utilize a strong tradition of authority, of church and state in Russia, of family and state in China. In every area, however, Marxism itself creates anarchy and moves towards anarchy and collapse; without outside help, every Marxist economy and state would collapse.

Western civilization, by denying the sovereign authority of God, is moving steadily into anarchy. It is destroying its foundations. Christian law and order are disappearing, and evil is being rewarded. The rioters are given federal subsidies, and the godly are taxed to provide the millions of dollars given to these anarchistic revolutionists. Liberty is disappearing rapidly, and not a week passes but someone in our circle reports on a further intrusion of statist power. Moreover, capitalization is being destroyed, as confiscatory taxation makes it increasingly impossible. Also, the products of our statist schools increasingly lack the capacity to capitalize. They share, in varying degrees, the ideology of the "hippies." They have "dropped out": they will only coast, not build.

Thus, we are seeing the basic products of Christian authority, 1) law and order, 2) Christian liberty, spiritual and material, and 3) capitalization, rapidly disappear from our civilization. They cannot be restored by a gimmick. No political candidate or officeholder can recreate this sequence or reestablish a spiritual condition. The mob, the majority, governs the politicians today, and the forces of anarchism are growing.

We have anarchy because we do not have godly authority. To reestablish law and order, and liberty, and to capitalize our culture, we must again have godly authority. The sovereignty of God must become our basic concern: "Man's chief end is to glorify God and to enjoy Him forever." In terms of this, we must also "teach" or "make disciples" of all nations (Matt. 28:19), and this requires self-discipline. The weakness of much of evangelical Christianity is a moralistic reduction of the faith to a few "thou shalt nots," but the alternative is not license, but, as Christian athletes (1 Cor. 9:27), to commit our entire being to the cause of Christ and His sovereign authority.

Anarchy is the end product of the denial of God's authority. Armed officers can and must quell revolutionary anarchy, but they cannot destroy the anarchy in the hearts of men. That inner anarchy, like a cancer, is destroying the life of Western civilization. Instead of declining, each year the forces of anarchism in church, state, school, business, society, and home are growing. They will not disappear until anarchy is replaced by God's authority. Until men seek that remedy, the anarchy will increase, and will steadily strike closer to home. And when it strikes, it will not come knocking politely.

How can we have God's blessing in the face of all these things? We must render to God what belongs to God, His due. Men must become godly men, heads of their households, spiritually and materially. We must render to God the faith and obedience which is His due spiritually and materially, the tithe which He requires (Mal. 3:8–10). The tithe belongs

to God, not to the church, which is often at odds with God, and must be administered for godly causes. We must recognize that the future is in God's hands, not in the hands of godless conspiracies (Ps. 2), and we can have no part in God's future apart from God's terms.

As Joshua said, "Choose ye this day whom ye will serve . . . but as for me and my house, we will serve the LORD" (Josh. 24:15).

9

AUTHORITY

Chalcedon Report No. 79, March 1, 1972

One of the persistent problems facing the state in every age has been the question of *authority*. How can the state justify its claim to power over the people? By what right does the state claim its jurisdiction and its authority? The basic argument has usually been historical, an appeal to tradition, inheritance, and long possession. Kings have justified their rule by appealing to the fact that they inherited the throne, all the while conveniently forgetting that someone in their family's past once seized the throne. Similarly, civil governments which once gained power by revolution piously condemn all new revolutions and declare that they are the only legitimate authority. A painfully pathetic example of this tired argument appears in Vine Deloria Jr., "An Indian's Plea to the Churches" (*Los Angeles Times*, February 6, 1972, p. G-L-2). Deloria, an Indian, says to white Americans, that, before their coming, "we inhabited and owned the continent upon which you now live." The heart of his argument is that the Indian has a prior right to America and thus a moral claim against the rest of us. The fact is that there were no such "people" as "the American Indian" prior to Columbus, but many warring peoples, often culturally and perhaps racially diverse, each supplanting others before them and seeking ascendancy over one another. Shall we acknowledge the Indian's "right" to America, and must then the Indian relinquish it to a tribe which can prove it was the original, displaced "owner" of America?

Shall we say also that England must be dispossessed of all who are of Norman blood, and returned to Anglo-Saxons? Must the Anglo-Saxons return it to the Britons, and the Britons to those whom they displaced? And must France be returned to the Celts or Gauls (Galatians) in its midst, and they in turn restore it to the Basques whom they displaced?

The historical argument leads to moral insanity. The authority of a state cannot depend on an original historical claim, although possession has an element of authority to it.

Another answer to the problem of authority is the democratic one. It was raised in an English rebellion of 1381, when the popular cry was,

> When Adam delved, and Eve span,
> Who was then the gentleman?

Authority rests in the people, supposedly, and the only moral ground of authority is the will of the people, in this view. In effect, the voice of the people is the voice of God. This view again breaks down in practice. Must the civil government be changed or overthrown whenever the people change their mind? Is man, any more than the state, the source of authority?

This is the heart of the issue: is authority derived from man, from history, from the state, or from tradition, or is it derived from God? On the other hand, is it derived from *force*? Very clearly, force and the state are inseparable. The state has the power of the sword, the power of coercion, and it can compel men and take life. Is its only authority simply power, naked force? More than a few people have held this to be the case. Some of these have been radical statists and others anarchists. In either case, the state is not much more than a gangster who rules with a gun in his hand and only by force.

This is a view which appeals most to the intellectually simple-minded and morally derelict. It denies that the governing force in history is moral and religious. Men allow power to that which, rightly or wrongly, they hold to be morally legitimate and right. When men ceased to believe in kings as the repository of divine right and authority, then kings quickly gave way to "the people" as the source of right. Today, "the democratic state" has moral authority in the eyes of the people, and they will endure more at its hands than men earlier endured from kings.

Men at one time believed in the "King's Touch," the healing power of the king. This faith was mild compared to the faith of contemporary man in the power of the state. The state is looked to for every kind of answer, the solution to problems of poverty, health, war, natural disasters, and even death itself is supposedly going to be overcome by the state's power to apply science and solutions to every realm. Recently, someone in California filed suit against the federal government for damages in the 1971 earthquake! The state has become god for modern man, and therefore the state is responsible and accountable for all things. Perhaps someone will next accuse the state because natural death overcomes man.

The state is powerful today, because the state has a religious and moral force in the lives of people. The "common man" has not heard of Hegel, but he is a Hegelian, and the state is for him a god walking on the earth, whose duty it is to provide him with cradle-to-grave security. A state senator from a very conservative district recently told me that, in answer to a questionnaire geared to revealing the implicit socialism and statism of people, 75 percent of the people in his district were shown to be statist to the core while formally conservative. He added that, however socialistic many legislators are, the pressure from their districts is even more to the left in terms of practical demands. Even people who cry for lower taxes demand more benefits and subsidies, all of which means more statism. Statism is thus the religion and the morality of most men.

The state, however, is also very weak today in that it is a god that fails people, and its more brilliant sons are savagely at war with it because of its failures. They demand all things from the state and then turn on it savagely as a Baal that has failed them. Their morality and faith is still statist, but it is deeply infected with bitterness and despair.

Force rules history, but that ruling force is moral and religious force and conviction. *The Letters of Junius* held otherwise. The *Letters* spoke of "the first original right of the people, from which all laws derive their authority," and also of tradition as authority: "One precedent creates another. They soon accumulate and constitute a law. What yesterday was fact, today is doctrine." But men overthrow both precedent and "original right" when it violates their moral convictions, so this view is superficial. Men find their basic and ultimate authority in what they hold to be *truth*. The modern age being a humanistic one, men have sought for truth on the human and temporal level, and the state has thus come to be the basic institution for them. Humanistic man believes that the state is the way to the good life; the state is the final authority over men, and the state is the supreme court in all things. Not surprisingly, the courts of the state have increasingly become lawmakers, because the standard for legality is man and the fullness of life for man. If capital punishment limits man's life, then capital punishment must be ruled unlawful. If war limits man's life, then war must be challenged in the courts. If men have a "right" to good food, housing, clothing, and all things else, whether or not they work for them, then the courts must and will establish men's "rights" to these things. The courts are keeping pace with the religious beliefs of modern man.

In view of our humanism, it is not surprising that constitutionalism is virtually dead. Even the conservative defenders of the constitution want the results of it without the Christian presuppositions and faith which

undergird it. As Drucker points out, "Constitutionalism is much more than a respect for law . . . It is a belief that power, to be beneficial, must be subject to general and unchangeable rules. It is an assertion that ends and means cannot be meaningfully separated or considered apart from each other" (Peter F. Drucker, *Men, Ideas, and Politics* [New York, NY: Harper & Row, 1971], p. 175). Constitutionalism rests on a belief that the sovereign God has an absolute law order to which every human order must relate itself (see Edward S. Corwin, *The "Higher Law" Background of American Constitutional Law* [Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1955]). The essence of humanistic law is that, instead of relating social order to God's absolute law, society must relate law to human needs. This belief is the moral force behind the modern state and the source of its authority.

The failure of humanistic authority is that it is essentially totalitarian and/or anarchistic. If the people are the source of authority, then we must either wind up in a dictatorship, in which the general will or the consensus finds its incarnation in a leader, an elite, or a party, or in anarchism, in which all men as gods do each their "own thing." There is a drift in both directions today.

The basic decisions by states in the second half of the twentieth century have been made outside the normal legislative channels. Thus, in the United States, the basic and most important decisions have not been made by Congress and the normal political process, as Drucker has pointed out. In domestic politics, the basic decisions, with respect to school segregation and reapportionment, were not made by Congress but by the Supreme Court. These decisions, while opposed by many, met favor with many, and they were in line with the basic liberal, humanistic faith of church, school, and people. The opposition to these measures has also depended largely on nonpolitical protest: the legislative branches of "democratic" civil government have not been the primary means of opposition.

Again, in foreign affairs, the United States committed itself to two major wars, in Korea and then in Vietnam, without any legislative action. These commitments were aspects of a humanistic and messianic save-the-world faith, and they were made by Truman and Kennedy, heroes of liberal humanism. The opposition, however, which has developed towards the Vietnam War is also grounded in humanism, and this opposition has bypassed state means increasingly for direct action and pressure.

Thus, while faith in the state remains, there is an increasing breakdown in the authority of the state, because its moral foundations are crumbling. The decline in law enforcement and the rise of lawlessness

is a symptom of the breakdown. What many people forget is that law enforcement is not basically a police and court affair but a moral concern. Most laws cannot be enforced unless they are first of all enforced by the moral conscience of the people. No state, however dictatorial, can enforce a law which is radically at odds with the conscience of its people. Before a revolution can occur in the political realm, it must be preceded by a revolution in the religious and moral sphere. Before the French Revolution could occur, a religious and moral decline and collapse had sapped the life of France. The Russian Revolution was preceded by a widespread decline of vital faith and a growing humanism. The people in the Soviet Union have widespread discontents, but most of them are morally in agreement with their regime and thus lack the moral force which is the forerunner and mainspring of change.

The modern state thus has great power but a declining authority. In this it resembles the regimes of kings like Charles I and James II of England, power without moral authority, in each case a prelude to ruin. In William Langland's poem, *Piers Plowman*, the angel declares to the clergy and king of the late fourteenth century: "King and a Prince art thou, Tomorrow nothing." The moral force was gone from the social order, and the result was a long era of revolution and civil war, when men who had power today, tomorrow had nothing.

Langland's answers were unfortunately too much like those of the royalty and nobility of his day, and his earnest hope for a new order was frustrated. His answer was "charity" and a bold and heedless following of Christ. In this he echoed the "virtues" prized by the upper class of his day, the very men who were destroying England. For them, virtue meant "a prodigal generosity ('largesse') and the quality of being physically rash ('outrageous')" (Gervase Mathew, *The Court of Richard II* [New York, NY: Norton, 1968], p. 22). In this impotence Langland is followed by the youth of our day, who echo the statist principles and humanism they are supposedly rebelling against.

The only moral force which can undercut the power of statism is a Biblical faith in the sovereign and triune God and His absolute law-word. God said of all the nations of Isaiah's day, and of all history, that they are "nothing" in His sight (Isa. 40:23–24). "Behold, the nations are as a drop of a bucket, and are counted as the small dust of the balance: behold, he taketh up the isles as a very little thing" (Isa. 40:15). As long as men believe that salvation comes by the state, its politicians and leaders, and by the laws of the state, they will give the power of a god to the state, and the moral force of a god as well. In our day, both conservatives and leftists are at odds with the state, and often at war with it, but both are

agreed in seeing it as their savior, and they concentrate their energies on statist action and control as the key to salvation. They want to capture the state machinery, such as its socialistic schools, rather than to establish independent and Christian schools. However angry they may be at the state, and rebellious against its authority, they will bow down before the state as their god and savior until they turn to their true Lord and God and serve Him only. The state will shrink to its proper place *only* when men give God His due priority and authority. There is no other way.

The power of the state will not be broken by lawless rebellion but by godly faith. As Sister M. Margaret P. McCarran observed recently, "Christ came into a world that was exactly the same kind of mess. He honored legitimate authority no matter how evil its bearer. He lived peaceably in the world of real people for thirty years in spite of revolutions, overtaxation, aggressor nations, and surrounding paganism . . . Our era is not a mere repetition of a historical pattern, it is the same pattern. However, our Lord said, 'I have overcome the world.' He is still saying it, it is still the same world" (letter, December 7, 1971).

The world has always been ruled by religious and moral force. The issue is between the moral forces of humanism and Christianity. You have your choice: are you a part of the problem, or a part in the victory?

10

DEATH OF GOD THINKING

Chalcedon Report No. 41, January 1, 1969

The Death of God movement is one of the deepest and most powerful forces in the modern world. The mistake most people make in trying to understand it is that they only see its most obvious manifestation in men like Altizer. But the Death of God movement is everywhere, and it is extremely powerful in conservative and evangelical circles.

This point is important, very important. Let us examine it briefly but carefully. If a man professes to be a Christian and yet is guilty of sexual offenses against God's law, he is in effect saying, by his persistent contempt of the law, that for him God is dead in the area of sexual morality. He is denying, to all practical intent, that God and His law govern the sphere of sexual activity, and he must therefore be classified, whatever his religious profession, as a member of the God is Dead school.

Now the same reasoning applies to every other sphere of life. If a man professes to be a Christian and yet favors the public (or statist) schools, and sends his children to them, he is declaring that God is dead in at least the sphere of education. He is denying the sovereignty and the existence of God for educational life. No less than the sexual offender, he is saying that God is dead and can be safely disregarded in the area of education.

To speak even more plainly: some who find fault with my emphasis on free schools as against state schools, and Christian education as against statist, humanistic education, tell me that we should concentrate on "realistic" objectives, like keeping the public schools in line, or getting prayer back into the public schools. But trying to make socialistic education work for freedom, or humanistic education serve God, is like trying to make adultery a respectable part of marriage. Education is either under God, or it is under man and man's authority. The purpose of education cannot be the service of the state (public schools), or the service

of the church (parochial schools), but the service and glory of God. No school can serve two masters: ultimately, it will serve the church or the state rather than God, and our public schools and church schools are steadily revealing their true nature.

But to go a step further: some very devout ministers have taken exception to my emphasis on economics and the gold standard; they feel I should be "preaching the gospel" instead. And, of course, I am. I am declaring the good news that God is alive and governs not only the church but the state, school, science, economics, agriculture, art, and every other sphere. Our modern economics is the Death of God economics: it denies that God exists and governs the sphere of economics by His law. The statist economics of our day holds that economic truths are relative truths, that the state can determine economic policy in terms of its needs and without reference to objective law. But "conservative" or "libertarian" economics has become no less relativistic. Its position is anarchistic. Since there is no truth, no absolute truth, then let a free market exist for *all* ideas. As a result, some prominent "libertarian" economists have become strong friends of radical causes and bitter enemies of Christianity. One professor told me of his "libertarian" economist colleague who regards, as the great enemy of libertarianism, Christianity because, with its authoritative and infallible Bible, its doctrine of an absolute God and His absolute truth, it denies a free marketplace for all ideas.

As against all this, we must affirm that God's law is alive and operative in economics as in every sphere. We must affirm that economic disaster looms ahead for our relativistic economics because it denies God's absolute laws.

And that disaster draws daily closer. Federal Reserve statistics indicate that by November 1968, the money supply for 1968 had been increased by 23 percent: that spells approaching runaway inflation. But, even more serious, all this new paper money pumped into the economy failed to give the demanded inflationary prosperity, and federal income via taxes was definitely lower. Now, even greater inflation is planned for 1969, and Washington, D.C., expects the paper dollar to be worth radically less. Accordingly, almost certainly, before Nixon takes office, President Johnson will institute large pay raises which take effect within ninety days unless killed by Congress. Congress will see its salaries go from $30,000 a year to $50,000; the chief justice, from $40,000 to $75,000, and associate justices from $39,000 to $65,000, and so on. These salary increases are based on anticipated inflation, so that we have here a vivid illustration of what the Kappel Commission expects to happen to the dollar.

If a man denies God's existence in the economic sphere and fails to

prepare for the future in terms of godly economics, he will fall under the same judgment as all other profligates and unbelievers.

But, to continue, a man may claim to believe in God when he is actually an atheist to all practical intent if he tries to separate religion and the state, if he denies God His sovereignty over the state. It is impossible to separate religion and state. All law is enacted morality, and all morality rests on religious foundations, and is the expression of religion. Thus, every legal system, i.e., every state, represents a religious order and is a religious institution. The state cannot be neutral to religion. It is either Christian or anti-Christian. A state may be neutral with respect to churches, i.e., the particular institutional forms of Christianity, but it cannot be neutral with respect to Christianity. Today, Christianity is in the process of being disestablished as the religion of Western states, and humanism is rapidly being established as the official religion of church, state, and school. The decisions of the courts increasingly have little reference to Christianity and older legislation: they are religious decisions which promulgate the faith of humanism.

It is amusing, and not at all surprising, that some humanists, like Erich Fromm, are proposing a humanistic Vatican, to be called the "National Voice of the American Conscience," to "make technology subservient to humane ideals," (Erich Fromm, *The Revolution of Hope*; see also Kimmis Hendrick, "Fromm proposes volunteer group to 'humanize technology,'" in *The Christian Science Monitor*, December 7, 1968, p. 21).

In every area, all authority is in essence religious authority. The religions vary from country to country, but authority is in essence religious. When men deny the ultimate and absolute authority of God, they do so in the name of another ultimate authority, the autonomous consciousness of man. Where authority is broken, either chaos and anarchy will reign after a time, or brutal coercion will prevail. As Hilaire du Berrier, in his superb reports has pointed out, the tragedy of Vietnam is due to the destruction of the emperor's authority. The emperor's authority has politico-religious roots which went deep into the life of Vietnam. As Christians, we may rightly hold that a Christian-theistic doctrine of authority should prevail, but we may not destroy institutions by revolutionary activity: we must create new institutions by means of new (converted) men. But, to return to *H du B Reports*, the weakness of South Vietnam is the inability of any of the successive governments to command authority in a situation where every man now feels, with the emperor gone, that he is as much an authority as the head of the state. In North Vietnam, legitimate authority has been replaced by brutal coercion, and this coercion seeks to replace the old authority with a new and Marxist concept.

Science, too, must be under authority, or it will make itself the authority. We should not be surprised at the article written by the British anthropologist, Edmund R. Leach, "We Scientists Have the Right to Play God" (*The Saturday Evening Post*, November 16, 1968, pp. 16, 20). And why not? Leach's point is logical: a god is needed, and, if God is dead, as Leach believes, then the scientists, as the new authorities, must play god and have a right to do so, if not a duty. We have no right to be surprised at this: we have so long been a part of the God is Dead movement (dead in education, in economics, in the state, in science, art, and all things else) that we should at least recognize that our chickens are coming home to roost. And, when we have claimed God is dead everywhere else, should we be surprised that His death is being proclaimed in the churches? In short, Altizer and his cohorts who proclaim the God is Dead theology are more logical than the conservatives and evangelicals who are shocked by this but fail to see their part in this movement.

The truth is, our finest people have become sadly schizophrenic. They believe in God, and they live sober, godly, and productive lives, but they have not and do not wage war against the God is Dead movement as it takes over one domain of life after another. Outside the church and their personal lives, they have joined the Death of God movement. But a man cannot serve two masters; sooner or later, he will hate the one and serve the other.

The same is true of the unbeliever who tries to cling to aspects of the Christian worldview. Mark Twain was a sad case in point. He was a professed agnostic who still retained a Biblical frame of reference. For example, he saw man as a sinner, thoroughly depraved and fallen, and at this point Mark Twain was at war with his age. In 1884 he decided to satirize the already growing romantic view of the American Indian, and so he started to write a *Huck Finn and Tom Sawyer Among the Indians*. He used some actual historical narratives as his basic story. Tom Sawyer, believing in the noble savage, the marvelous natural man, was to have his faith destroyed. The book is very amusing as it begins, as Tom spouts the liberal view of man, the noble savage as against the polluted white man. But Peggy Mills is taken captive, and Twain recorded this, and he knew what it meant: Richard Dodge had described it in a book, "how Indians customarily treated a recalcitrant female captive, tying her to pegs in the ground with thongs and then abusing her until not infrequently death releases her." *Life* magazine says that Twain stopped writing and left the book unfinished because he "was by modern standards a hopelessly prudish Victorian" ("Huck Finn & Tom Sawyer Among the Indians," *Life*, December 20, 1968, p. 50A). But this is grossly unfair to Twain; the

truth is, the book had ceased to be funny. It was no longer a Tom Sawyer book but a grim encounter with human depravity, with fallen man. The answer was beyond laughter, beyond satire: it was a grim, religious issue, and Twain dropped it. He was unwilling to push his view of man to its logical end, but he was equally unwilling to push his unbelief to its logical end. As Dr. Van Til has often written, man fights epistemological self-consciousness; man refuses to know the truth about himself and about his knowledge. When faced with the ultimate issues, he drops them and turns to trifling things. As Douglas M. Scott observed of Goethe's *Faust*, "we see a scholar who has exhausted the resources of study and bursts out to experience what holds the world together, to learn the inmost secrets of creation and what does he experience? A student brawl in a tavern and a love affair in which he plays an inglorious part" (Douglas M. Scott, *Urfaust: A Translation* [Woodbury, NY: Barron's Educational Series, 1958], p. xxiv).

Faust in effect proclaimed the death of God when he turned to Mephistopheles for power and wisdom. But the end result was that Faust became a trifler and a seducer, and he died. The real proclamation of Faust from the onset was the death of Faust: he died to the real world for the imagined world of Satan and Satan's false authority. Marlowe's *Faustus*, as he turned to the black arts, declared,

> O, what a world of profit and delight,
> Of power, of honour, of omnipotence,
> Is promised to the studious artisan!
> All things that move between the quiet poles
> Shall be at my command . . .

He dreamed of becoming "a mighty god" and ended a frightened, crying man. Not God, but Faustus ended dead.

And so it is today: either we become alive to God in *every* sphere of life, or we become to that extent dead to Him. But God remains alive.

11

AUTHORITY

Chalcedon Report No. 48, August 1, 1969

Our subject this month is *authority*; let us begin with *police authority*. In the early 1920s, in Detroit, my father went one day to meet a newly-arriving immigrant, an elderly priest. The old man's life had been spent in the Near East and Europe; he came directly from the Continent. After their greeting, my father asked certain plain questions about conditions in the Old World, and the priest hastily shushed him, indicating the presence of a policeman nearby. My father laughed with delight and explained that, in America the police are our friends and protectors. The old man could not have been more emphatic in his disbelief. On their way home, my father stopped at a home near a school for a few minutes. The school was letting out, and children ran happily to the crossing. The patrolman was a favorite of all the children, and the children competed happily to hold his hand. At this, the old priest broke down and wept openly. This, he said, was the difference between America and the Old World; here, the police were loved by the children and regarded by the people as their protectors; there, the police were feared as political agents.

What has happened since then? If the police have changed, it is generally very much for the better: better trained, more courteous, more honest, and better informed on the law. That old priest, who died in the 1940s, always spoke of the authority and honor of the policeman's position in America. Things have changed since then. What is the reason? And what has changed?

Very clearly, the police have been the target of a subversive attack; there has been a systematic attempt to discredit the police. Granted, but an attack is a failure unless it finds a receptive people. Why have people been so ready to accept anti-police propaganda? Faults are there in the police as in every group in society, but why this demand for perfection?

Why the total hostility to law and order? Some insist that anyone who uses the term "law and order" favorably belongs to the enemy, i.e., is a part of a hated establishment. Why?

Let us examine briefly the mainsprings of the modern or humanistic era in order to know the answer. *Education* has been the basic faith and hope of modern man. "Knowledge is power," and education is man's salvation. Added to this is humanistic man's denial, *first*, that man is a sinner, and, *second*, that even in his sin man has an inescapable knowledge of God and of God's law (Rom. 1:18–20). Instead, humanistic man, after John Locke, held to the belief that man's mind is a blank piece of paper awaiting the work of the teacher. The child, therefore, could be, it was held, totally reconditioned by the right kind of education. If only the church and family could be prevented from polluting the child's mind before the school reached it, utopia would speedily arrive. The school and university have, over the generations, worked successfully to undercut the authority of the home and of Christianity.

This has meant replacing the authority of God with the authority of man. But, if man is his own authority, who can be an authority over man, except many men, many gods outvoting one god? Moreover, then, there can be no overall law binding either individual man or mass man. Law and authority thus become enemies to humanistic man and his schools.

Numerous college and university students have reported to me their experiences, all very much alike. Education professors commonly begin a course by saying, "How can we educate for the future, when we do not know what the future is? There is no truth for today and tomorrow alike. We cannot teach a body of knowledge as valid for tomorrow. The one reality is *change*, and we must *educate* for change, for continuous revolution." An historian began a course by denying that there is such a thing as history, a law professor by attacking the idea of law, and so on. Only in the sciences is there much educational discipline left, and only because without it, their field would collapse; even here, engineers and others report a growing decline.

If man is his own authority, then there is no authority over man, and God, parents, and police become symbols of tyranny and oppression, because authority other than anarchistic man's is intolerable. The New Left is the logical and inescapable product of modern education because it is anarchistic and statist to the core. Anarchism and statism are different aspects of the same humanistic creed. The anarchist denies the state: man is his only god, law, and authority. The statist (Marxist, Fabian, Fascist, or democratic) says, true, but many men have more authority than one man. In either case, there is an erosion of authority, a breakdown of law

and order. We are getting today what we have paid for: our public schools are delivering precisely the product of humanistic education that they have been asked to deliver. To deny Christian faith a place in education, to convert schools into statist agencies, and then to expect anything other than what we have is the mark of a fool. And fools can be more dangerous than knaves, because the fool is on every side of the field.

Every society, whether a backward tribe or a highly advanced nation, represents a law order. Every law order is an expression of a moral and religious faith. Change the faith and morality which undergird that law order, and its authority and its ability to maintain itself begins to collapse.

This is our problem. Our Christian foundations have been destroyed. We now have *humanism* as the established religion of church, state, school, and society. This new religion is denying and shattering the old authority with only anarchism and statism as its alternatives. The result is growing chaos.

This is not all. Because humanism makes a man his own authority, it enthrones childishness, self-indulgence, and tantrums over maturity, self-discipline, and reason. Much of the protests have been marked by more emphasis on childishness than on issues. Observers have noted the high glee and immense self-satisfaction many of these demonstrators show on urinating and even defecating in public. The glow of childish delight in these acts was the most startling aspect of the performance, the sheer joy in a baby's act.

This impulse is deeply imbedded in our humanistic age. Not too long ago, a television interviewer asked a group of guests, kindergarten children all, what they would most like to be. The answers were the same: they all wanted to be babies! Why? Because, they answered, babies have nothing to do, and they are cared for! There was a time when kindergarten children wanted to be grownups; this was the social ideal, maturity. Now it is babyhood. Elderly women dress like little girls, and old men like small boys, and they try to act as though perpetual youth was their hope. Is it any wonder that high school and college youth act like babies, and that kindergarten children want to be babies, when the adults of our time are themselves at war with mature responsibility? Is it any wonder that authority is gone? A baby has to be trained into respect for authority, but grownup babies are at war against authority, and therefore at war against life as God ordained it.

Authority is an inescapable necessity. It is authority which binds man to man in society. This binding is only secondarily by force; the essential and primary power of authority rests in a common faith and a general assent to certain religious presuppositions. Humanism denies the principle

of transcendental authority. It affirms the satanic principle that every man is his own god, knowing or deciding for himself what constitutes good and evil (Gen. 3:5). The world of autonomous, humanistic man is a world of lawlessness in which every man asserts his independence of all laws not of his own making or choosing. Humanism leads to self-righteousness, since every man is right in his own eyes, and there is no other law. The war of the humanist against law and order is *an immoral, self-righteous protest*, in that he begins by assuming religiously that righteousness was born with him and that all law and order is by definition evil. The total humanist will, if logical, become the total criminal, totally at war against all law and order. And this is precisely the goal of the "new intellectuals." The police have been able in the past to cope with ordinary criminals, but the total criminal works to subvert every basis of authority and law, in church, state, and school, in the courts and in the legislative chambers. His warfare is more nearly total war than anything else we have yet seen. But it is also destructive of himself. Man needs air for his physical life, and law is the air of his social life. Unless that law is true law, God's law, society dies of strangulation.

We are thus in the last days of a humanistic era. Man's attempt to return to the womb is a fast trip to the tomb. The world of humanism is sick; let it die. Its spoiled brats are bent on suicidal destruction. Mature man will work for Christian Reconstruction.

12

MYTH OF CONSENT

Chalcedon Report No. 141, May 1977

The myth of consent, so basic to the modern age, rests on the doctrine of the sovereignty of man. Because man is sovereign, nothing is valid unless man gives his free assent to it. Where man's assent is not secured, civil disobedience, it is held, is not only justifiable, but sometimes a moral necessity.

This doctrine of the sovereignty of man began, of course, as a doctrine of the sovereignty of some men. With Plato, it meant the sovereignty of the philosopher-kings, the elite planners of society and the rulers of the state. This form of the doctrine is still very much with us and takes a variety of forms: the dictatorship of the proletariat, the fuehrer principle, the brain-trust concept, and so on. A major and early form of this belief in the modern era was the doctrine of the divine right of kings. Although it pretended to Biblical roots, its origins were in ancient paganism.

The divine right of kings gave way to the sovereignty of the aristocracy in many areas, and the aristocracy treated the right to rule as their own special privilege, a right of birth and inheritance.

The next to claim the right to rule were the middle classes. The Industrial Revolution was their handiwork; they were responsible for the great and important changes in society, and progress had been made dramatically under their leadership. The aristocracy bitterly opposed this rise of the middle classes, and it saw only disaster ahead in this shift of power. The shift occurred all the same, and the aristocracy went into eclipse.

Almost at once, however, the middle classes were challenged everywhere. Their own advances had sufficiently improved the lot of the lower middle classes to make them highly articulate and vocal. The lower classes ceased to be the silent, servile, and unknown sector of society and became highly vocal. It was because this new power in society was

becoming no longer invisible but visible that the aristocracy and intellectuals began to make themselves self-appointed voices of the lower classes. After some time, they gained an appreciative response, and such men as Lenin and F. D. Roosevelt became possible, in person very alien to the lower classes, but in action idolized by them and made their voices. The intellectuals and aristocrats did not create the new locale of sovereignty: they saw it coming and attached their own ideas and goals to it.

The sovereignty of man had begun with kings and concluded with "Power to the People," a faith used by Hitler, Stalin, and democratic leaders to gain and retain power. The logic of the sovereignty of man had come to mean the sovereignty of man in the mass, and it became necessary for other classes to ally themselves with the masses.

When John Locke formulated the doctrine of consent, by consenting man he meant a very limited class of man. The logic of his myth, however, meant the extension of that consent to all men. If all men are sovereigns, then no man can be compelled, and nothing is valid for any man without his consent.

Max Stirner, the great thinker of anarchism, saw this clearly. Granted man's sovereignty, no man could be compelled; all men are bound only by their own will. The state is then only a substitute god, and man cannot allow himself to be coerced by any god.

Karl Marx recognized the danger in Stirner's thought. In perhaps his most violent work, he attacked Stirner savagely. Marx realized that the logic of humanism requires that every man be his own god and that no man be compelled. Anarchism, however, for Marx meant the collapse of humanism into disorder and defeat. The way out was socialism, the sovereignty of the scientific socialist order and its freedom to remake man into that "free" condition where he would naturally function in terms of an overriding humanistic plan.

Thus, in one form or another, the sovereignty of man has led to the enslavement of man, the breakdown of social order, and what Dr. Cornelius Van Til has in another context called integration downward into the void.

Apart from the sovereignty of God, society has no real principle of law and order. The logic of Stirner is the logic of humanism, of the sovereignty of man. Stirner argued that all men who have any moral hesitation about incest are still Christians, because they are governed by something other than their will. The truly sovereign man knows no law except his own will and desire. Because the truly sovereign man can tolerate no other sovereign, it is a moral necessity for him to defy every law of God and man. As Sartre recognized, freedom then becomes negation. The

result, whether in politics or art, is a program of rebellion, revolution, and negation.

This, then, is the necessary course of the modern world, rebellion, revolution, and negation, as long as it remains faithful to its humanistic faith.

The alternative, the sovereignty of God, declares that there is a mandatory law and order. This mandatory law and order is not the expression of man's sovereignty or of a class interest but of God's infallible Word. Whereas the sovereignty of man leads to a world of conflicting interests, man against God, man against man, class against class, and race against race, the sovereignty of God leads to a total harmony of interests. The universe is totally God's creation and absolutely serves and fulfills His purpose, which includes the fall and sin of man, and uses it to further His perfect decree.

The myth of consent supposedly stresses man's responsibility; in actuality, it destroys it, because it makes an untenable claim of sovereignty for man. Under God's sovereignty, man's creaturely freedom and consent have their place, because man has found his place. The logic of the modern age is leading to attempts at dictatorship almost everywhere, but at the same time a growing threat of anarchy. Because man is a creature, only when he submits to God's sovereignty can man know freedom as a man, a creature.

13

INFALLIBILITY

Chalcedon Report No. 85, September 1972

LURKING in the background of every system of thought is an implicit doctrine of infallibility. Men require, in their philosophies and faiths, an assurance that their way to truth is actually, potentially, or ultimately the true and certain guide. Various concepts of infallibility have been offered, although the word *infallibility* has usually been avoided. The infallibility of the aesthetic experience was thus the implicit faith of the philosopher Croce. The Enlightenment saw *criticism* as that sure guide, the intellectual critique of the philosophes. "The organized habit of criticism" would eliminate superstition and religion and bring forth the pure light of truth. Hume, in *An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding*, called for a grand book-burning of all works not ruled by "criticism." These men believed, as Peter Gay points out (Peter Gay, *The Enlightenment*, vol. 1 [New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf, 1967], pp. 141–145), in "the omni-competence of criticism." They held that "All things are equally subject to criticism" (p. 150), because "criticism" by the autonomous mind of man is the sure guide to truth. Other concepts of infallibility (the scientific method, etc.) can be cited.

When the state began to claim priority over man, like the philosophes, the scientists, and the aesthetes who were to follow, it too claimed to be infallible. Such claims by the state were not uncommon in antiquity. In Frederick II (1194–1250), the medieval church faced a great antagonist who boldly claimed infallibility.

Kantorowicz wrote of him, "His knowledge of natural law now reinforces his unity with God and further established his infallibility; for he goes on to say 'therefore we scorn to err.' The Pope under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost may be infallible in matters of faith, similarly the Emperor 'overfilled by *Justitia*' is infallible in matters of law. In accordance

with this imperial infallibility, Frederick adopted, as the Norman Kings before him had done, the sentence of Roman law: 'to discuss the Emperor's judgments, decrees, and statues is sacrilege,' a sentence that was so vital to the constitution of the whole state that Frederick boldly quoted it to the Pope when he ventured to criticize some measure of the Emperor's" (Ernst Kantorowicz, *Frederick the Second, 1194–1250* [New York, NY: Ungar Publishing Co., 1957], p. 232). Frederick saw himself as "law incarnate upon earth" (p. 233). He held also that "it is sacrilege to debate whether that man is worthy whom the Emperor has chosen and appointed" (p. 235).

The doctrine of the divine right of kings was a form of this doctrine of the infallibility of the state. In 1660, in the trial of the men who had executed Charles I of England for his treason to the state, the presiding judge, Sir Orlando Bridgeman, asserted this doctrine bluntly: "The trial opened on Tuesday (October 9, 1660) with the presiding judge's charge to the jury. Bridgeman traced the legal position of the monarchy from the earliest times, showing that no single person or community of persons had any coercive power over the King of England; that the King was supreme Governor, subject to none but God, and could do no wrong, and that if he can do no wrong he could not be punished for any wrong" (Patrick Morrah, *1660: The Year of Restoration* [Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1960], p. 184).

This idea of infallibility did not disappear with kings; instead, it was transferred to democracies and to socialism. The dictatorship of the proletariat is the infallible voice of history for Marxists. In democracy, the old pagan principle prevails, *vox populi, vox dei*, the voice of the people is the voice of God.

Politics thus has become a major area of messianic and infallible activities. Frances Stevenson, Lloyd George's secretary, recorded at the 1919 peace conference a suppressed paragraph of Woodrow Wilson's opening speech, in which Wilson explained "how Christianity had failed in its purpose after two thousand years, but the League of Nations was going to go one better than Christianity and would supply all defects" (A. J. P. Taylor, ed., *Lloyd George: A Diary by Frances Stevenson* [New York, NY: Harper & Row, 1971]). The modern state increasingly sees itself as man's savior and as the infallible voice of man and history; it seeks progressively to eliminate criticism and to become the effectual god of the world.

When humanism began to divorce the idea of infallibility from God and His Word, and to attach it to men and institutions, one of the immediate results was that a variety of claims to infallibility resulted. This power and authority, having been separated from God, was thus "up for

grabs" by men. The medieval university was one such claimant, and it sought to instruct kings and popes as the voice of infallible reason. The doctrine of academic freedom is an aspect of this claim to infallibility. The academy is beyond control by men because it is in its freedom the infallible source of truth.

The artist was another claimant to infallibility. Previously, he had been an artisan, a businessman whose activity was the arts. Whether an architect, sculptor, painter, or writer, he was a working man of practical status and function. With the rise of humanistic versions of infallibility, the artist developed. He became self-consciously a new kind of prophet, outside the normal affairs of men and beyond the control of law. The Bohemian idea of the artist developed. Instead of being a skilled and disciplined artisan, he was now supposedly an inspired man. The artistic frenzy and studied irresponsibility were systematically cultivated. The less normal and the less sane an artist acted, it came to be held, the more he was inspired. As men denied the supernatural, inspiration was sought, not from above, but from below. It was necessary to break laws, to cultivate chaos and primitivism, in order to reach the fountains of the new inspiration and the new infallibility. This meant the end of disciplined art and the rapid development of "spontaneous" and unthinking art. It meant, too, that a premium was placed on being more and more irresponsible, lawless, and primitive as evidence of inspiration.

All this was not unrelated to the development in politics. When inspiration and infallibility were transferred from God to man, it was at first kings who exercised this power, then parliaments and assemblies. But as the source of power moved from above (God) to below (evolution, chaos, and the primitive), authority also moved downward. It moved from kings to the aristocracy, from the aristocracy to the middle classes, from the middle classes to the lower classes, and now from the lower classes to the criminals and psychopaths. It is not the black as such who is favored in this new mood but the lawless black. It is not the working man who is now the hero of the left but the criminal and the welfare recipient. Power and authority have moved downward.

As a result, the children of the upper, middle, and lower classes increasingly ape the hoodlum and the psychopath. They imitate the new prophets of history by wearing their hair long, by being lawless, and by despising authority, because they have come to believe in the infallibility of the existential moment and its experience.

Moreover, as men look for the infallible word and experience downward, they will soon look beyond the criminal and the psychopath to the demonic and occult. As a result, there is already a widespread interest

in magic and witchcraft, and various forms of Satanism flourish and abound. Those who are busily, and religiously, seeking the newest inspired voice are in eager pursuit of the newest and most extreme form of occult authority.

The morality of God's infallible Word, it is held, must give way to the new morality of the new infallibility of existential experience. Not too long ago, a prominent Hollywood actress committed suicide because she was pregnant by a prominent actor who refused to marry her. Today, some young actresses are deliberately giving birth to children out of wedlock, with as much publicity as possible, in order to gain the approval of the "now generation," those to whom the existential moment is the infallible and inspired word. Immoralism is now a matter of boasting. In many circles among youth, there is a new Phariseeism pretending to be sexually profligate even when one is not, in order to gain acceptance as intelligent and modern.

The voice of the people is the voice of God, in terms of democratic thinking, but increasingly "the people" are defined in terms of the lowest common denominator, so that the standards are brought down to the level of the lowest of the low. Men worship the fountain of this new infallibility, the primitive and the outlaw. Some years ago, I sat next to an anthropologist who spoke with strong emotion about the nobility and beauty of a backward people whose habits under discussion hardly bear repeating even today. He despised our middle-class culture; although personally very neat and clean, he rhapsodized over the filth of his "unspoiled" tribe. Such attitudes are routine now. A few days ago, in a television film of a native culture, natives were shown picking and eating lice and fleas out of each other's hair. Meanwhile, the narrator, with reverent tones, spoke of how wonderfully these unspoiled people lived! I recall the wry comment of a very able Christian Negro that he faced the ultimate in disadvantages in America: racists disliked him for his color, and liberals and radicals disliked him for being Christian, peaceful, and prosperous!

As a result, the state, which once gained great power as it claimed infallibility for itself, now finds that its source of inspiration, the people, is its major problem. A disintegrating force has been unleashed by the belief that power and authority lie downward, so that the state is faced with the corrosive pressures of anarchy. Its response is a suppressing coercion, but coercion does not answer the problem of authority. The new nihilism in the Soviet Union is a major threat, as is the same mood in the United States. Men who have become their own gods and their own infallible oracles will not submit to any authority.

There can be no return to legitimate authority until men return to

the faith that establishes that authority. The infallible power is not man but God; the infallible word is not in or from man but in and from God alone. The greater man's pretensions, the greater his emptiness becomes. As E. E. Cummings expressed this emptiness after World War I,

> i am a birdcage without any bird,
> a collar looking for a dog, a kiss
> without lips; a prayer lacking any knees.

In Cummings's poetry, man was empty; his "I" had become an insignificant "i," not deserving a capital letter, because man and life had become meaningless. In the poetry of Wallace Stevens, death also became meaningless; modern man has no hope or dreams, only nightmares: "And that's life, then: things as they are." When man looks within for his inspiration, when he seeks it in man as such, the more faithfully he looks, the closer he comes to the grim fact that man is nothing apart from God. Man is a creature who can only be known, understood, and interpreted in terms of God's infallible Word. The institutions of man, church, state, school, family, and all things else are only to be known and understood in terms of God's Word. To attempt the understanding and development of anything apart from God is to take a toboggan ride to meaninglessness, despair, and anarchy.

14

THE NEW SOVEREIGN OR GOD

A Special Chalcedon Alert no. 3
Chalcedon Report No. 217, August 1983

THE most common term for *God* in the Old Testament is Lord (*Adonai* in the Hebrew), and for Jesus Christ in the New Testament is again Lord (*Kyrios* in the Greek). It means absolute owner, God, or sovereign. In the ancient world, the state or the ruler claimed lordship or sovereignty; the battle between Rome and the early church was over this issue. Rome was ready to recognize any religion as licit or legal and give it a license to operate if it would declare, "Caesar is lord." The answer of faithful Christians was the profession of faith in terms of Philippians 2:9–11, that "Jesus Christ is Lord." This was the beginning of a long battle between church and state which still marks European history. The European settlement was in part an uneasy compromise. The church gained many of its claimed exemptions, but the rulers of the state asserted a sovereignty under God by grace. Thus, an English halfpenny of 1966 carries this inscription: "Elizabeth II — Dei Gratia Regina," Elizabeth II by the grace of God. The coronation service stressed the covenantal nature of her throne. However, even in the days of George VI, some of the coins, in Britain and the dominions, limited "Dei Gratia" to "D.G.," while retaining "Rex" (as in a 1944 halfpenny). Newer coins now omit even "D.G." God and His grace have been dropped as meaningless baggage even in a country heavily wedded to tradition and forms. (Thus, in the new penny of 1971, only "D.G." remained. In the large Australian $0.20 piece of 1981, not even this truncated reference to God's grace and overlordship remained.)

The United States, ostensibly, was to take another course. The Constitution deliberately omitted all reference to sovereignty, and the prevalent belief was, rightly, that it belongs only to God. On the jubilee of the Constitution, April 30, 1839, John Quincy Adams declared that the War of

Independence had been a revolt against "the omnipotence of Parliament" to "the omnipotence of the God of battles." Of sovereignty, Adams, a Unitarian and a liberal of his day, said: "The grossly immoral and dishonest doctrine of despotic state sovereignty, the exclusive judge of its own obligations, and responsible to no power on earth or in heaven, for the violation of them, is not there. The Declaration says it is not in me. The Constitution says it is not in me."

Very early, however, John Marshall introduced the doctrine of sovereignty into U.S. Supreme Court decisions. Especially in the twentieth century, and since 1936, the doctrine has grown rapidly to its logical conclusion. In the Bob Jones University case, this was very clear. We may or may not agree with the interracial dating policy of Bob Jones University: this was a minor and peripheral issue in the court's decision. The court chose to assert unlimited federal sovereignty: public policy, not freedom, shall prevail. If public policy favors abortion and homosexuality, then these cannot be opposed. Suits are already being prepared to destroy churches opposed to abortion, homosexuality, and homosexuals and women as pastors and priests. Public policy is simply another word for totalitarianism: it means that the will of the state is the law, and there is no appeal against the state, the new god walking on earth.

In a subsequent decision, abortion was held to be a human right which no law can infringe. As professor of law Charles E. Rice in *Beyond Abortion: The Theory and Practice of the Secular State* (Chicago, IL: Franciscan Herald Press, 1979), has pointed out, the courts now define a person legally, i.e., whether or not one is biologically and medically a living human being is replaced by whether or not the courts define us as a legal person. The door has been opened, not only for abortion, but for the elimination of the sick, the senile, and all hated groups as legal nonpersons.

Thus, in these two areas we have seen the First Amendment wiped out by a new doctrine, the mandatory conformity to public policy (implicitly for taxed as well as tax-exempt groups), and the right of the state to kill all whom it considers to be nonpersons.

15

THE PRINCIPLE OF CHANGE

Chalcedon Report No. 195, November 1981

CHANGE is a necessity in a fallen, sinful world, but the principle behind change determines the value of change. Is it the sovereignty of man, or is it the sovereignty of God?

The U.S. Constitution deliberately omits all reference to sovereignty, because the framers regarded it as a theological, not a political, attribute. Having just waged war against one sovereign power, they were not about to create another.

Very early, however, the concept of sovereignty was reintroduced, and, significantly, with respect to money and banking. The constitutional limitation of money to gold and/or silver barred the federal government, and all branches of the United States, from claiming any sovereign power to create arbitrary monetary values. However, in the U.S. Bank controversy under Washington, Hamilton argued that "every power vested in a Government is in its nature *sovereign*, and includes by *force* of the *term*, a right to employ all the *means* requisite, and fairly *applicable* to the attainment of the *ends* of such power; and which are not precluded by restrictions and exceptions specified in the constitution; or not immoral, or not contrary to the essential ends of political society." These last three restraining clauses proved to be meaningless: where sovereignty exists, there can be no restraint upon it. A sovereign is a lord: he restrains and is not restrained.

This doctrine of sovereignty was made law by Chief Justice John Marshall in *McCulloch v. Maryland*; the United States and its member states were all held to be sovereign. In the years that followed, from the early 1800s to 1935, the concept of sovereignty was amplified, and legal tender established, so that the Constitution became a pretext and a façade. In court decisions, the governing principle became and is the doctrine

of statist sovereignty. The Constitution was dead, and no one knew it, since sovereignty operated behind the façade of constitutionalism. (Henry Mark Holzer, in *Government's Money Monopoly* [New York, NY: Books in Focus, 1981], as a lawyer, very ably traces the development of this monetary sovereignty through various court decisions.)

The implications of this are far-reaching. A humanistic doctrine of sovereignty is now the governing principle. No law nor any moral restraint can bind a sovereign power: it defines all things. Hence, only to the unchanging God, who alone is truly sovereign, can we ascribe such power. In the hands of any other agency, it is the principle of tyranny.

Not surprisingly, in *Time*, October 5, 1981, "All That Talk About Gold," the objection to gold is that it imposes, according to Ernst Schneider of Switzerland, a "discipline" the world does not want. According to Charles Schultze, Carter's chief economic adviser, gold operates in a "fixed mechanical way" rather than by "trusting human beings." Exactly. Humanism wants no external order to discipline in any sphere. It is making a new Tower of Babel of the whole world; confusion and destruction are ahead of us. We must, in every sphere of life, political, economic, educational, ecclesiastical, and all things else, acknowledge always and only the sovereignty of the triune God.

16

RELIGION AND THE STATE

Chalcedon Report No. 152, April 1978

One of the key points of confusion in the modern mind, an error doing great damage to the cause of Christ, is the failure to distinguish between the separation of *church* and state, and the separation of *religion* and the state. *Church* and state can be separated; they are two different institutions. They can be subordinate one to the other, interdependent, or separate; or, in the case of anti-Christian states, the church can be denied a legal existence.

Religion and the state is another matter entirely. It is impossible to separate the two, and the idea of a nonreligious or religiously neutral state is a myth, and a very dangerous myth. A state cannot exist without laws, and all laws are expressions of one or another religious faith. Laws are enacted morality, and procedures for the enforcement of that morality. Laws and morality in general are expressions of religion, of ultimate concern, of a faith in what constitutes true and ultimate order. Every legal system is inescapably an establishment of religion. There can thus be no separation of religion and the state.

The important question is this: since every state or civil government is an establishment of religion, what will the religion of the state be? The laws of all civil governments represent a doctrine of religious order, a faith in moral government and truth. If a state is not Christian, it will be an expression of humanistic, Buddhist, Islamic, Shinto, Hindu, or some other religious system of order, morality, or law.

To talk, thus, of the separation of religion and the state is clearly wrong: it is impossible. People who indulge in such talk are, *first*, clearly ignorant of the basic facts of the matter and the nature of law. *Second*, if they are not ignorant, they are then working quietly to supplant one kind of religion with another, to replace one doctrine of law and morality with

another doctrine derived from an alien religion.

One of the problems of Western history has long been the mixture of conflicting laws and religions in its political order. The Christian foundations of law have had many admixtures of ancient forms of pagan law. Now, more than ever before, the pagan element is militant and is self-conscious in its desire to purge civil government all traces of Christian law and morality. Humanism, the religion of man, seeks to destroy Christian doctrines of law in favor of humanistic doctrines. Humanism is increasingly the religion of our laws and of our courts. It is clearly the established religion in all state schools, from kindergarten through the university.

The triumph of humanism will mean the suppression and persecution of Christianity. Signs are not lacking that this is already in progress. No Christian can be indifferent to this struggle and retain the name and blessing of the Lord. Either Christianity becomes the source of law, or humanism will be. The humanists are right in seeing the need for a religiously consistent system of laws. All law is an expression of a religious faith. Before this century is over, it will be apparent whether churchmen are humanists or Christians. This is a time for decision. Just as there can be no separation of religion and the state, so there can be no evasion of the necessity to stand.

The challenge of Elijah is again before us: "How long halt ye between two opinions? if the Lord be God, follow him: but if Baal, then follow him" (1 Kings 18:21).

17

WHO IS THE LORD?: CONFLICT WITH CAESAR

Chalcedon Report No. 155, July 1978

In order to understand the origins of the church and state conflict, it is important to recognize the roots of the problem in pagan faith and practice. In paganism, the state saw itself as the sovereign, and, as the sovereign, its life and power constituted an umbrella under which all things existed. To have a legitimate function, all things had to be licensed, controlled, and taxed by the state, and the state was seen as that power in whom and under whom all peoples and institutions had their life and being. The function of religion under that umbrella was to assist the state by providing social cement. The very word *liturgy* in origin means *public work*; religion and its rites were among the public works of the state. Rome thus did not want to persecute any religion: it only sought to bring them all under control as licensed practices. Rome persecuted the church, not because of religious hostility, but because the church refused to become a licensed religion, and Rome regarded this as a *political*, not a religious offense. Legge observed, "The officials of the Roman Empire in times of persecution sought to force the Christians to sacrifice, not to any heathen gods, but to the Genius of the Emperor and the Fortune of the City of Rome; and at all times the Christian's refusal was looked upon not as a religious but as a political offense" (Francis Legge, *Forerunners and Rivals of Christianity from 330 B.C. to 330 A.D.*, vol. I [New York, NY: University Books, (1915) 1964], p. xxiv).

The sacrifice to the imperial image meant that the Christian acknowledged the sovereignty or lordship of Caesar and Caesar's right to license, control, or tax the church. This the Christians refused to do. Those who submitted were regarded as apostates and not Christian. Why?

The Bible makes clear in all its aspects that God alone is Sovereign.

"The earth is the Lord's" (Ps. 24:1, etc.). He is the lawmaker, and His law is set forth in the Scripture. The basic and original Christian baptismal confession was and is, "Jesus is Lord" (Eph. 4:5; Phil. 2:11, 1 Tim. 6:3, etc.). The most common New Testament designation of Jesus is *Lord*, in the Greek, *kyrios*. The word *kurios* means both *God* and *absolute property owner* or sovereign.

In the Old Testament as in the New, the state is kept strictly out of any Levitical or ecclesiastical function. Both church and state, like all things else, are equally under God, and equally duty-bound to obey Him, but only God can exercise sovereignty. No one sphere of life can rule over others, i.e., the state over the church, or the church over the state, but each must fulfill its duty to the Lord.

The nature of the church or Christian synagogue has firm roots in the Old Testament: its offices, law, and practice are derived therefrom. It is important, therefore, to examine the Levitical functions and place in the Bible. The Levites were the tribe from whence the priests were derived, but their functions, broader and more basic, survive in Christendom. The Levitical functions include:

1. The Levites received and managed the tithes (Num. 18:21ff.; Heb. 7:5);
2. The Levites were custodians of the place of worship (Num. 1:47–54, etc.);
3. Most important, the Levites were responsible for instruction: they were the teachers of old and young, and this was the heart of their work (Deut. 33:10).

This central emphasis on instruction has been the particular mark of Christianity. It is an emphasis absent in other religions. When interest or emphasis on education declines in Christendom, either from indifference or by reason of statist intervention, Christianity quickly wanes and grows weak. Basic to any renewal of faith is a renewal of the centrality of education.

With respect to the United States, it should be remembered that, in the colonial era, all schooling was Christian, and, until 1833–1834, in Massachusetts, there was no system of state control of education in the young republic. The great floods of immigration which doubled the U.S. population every few years in those days were met and educated by Christian schools. The state-control cause, headed by James G. Carter, Horace Mann, and others, was anti-Christian, Unitarian, and centralist.

In one of the key areas of recent conflict, the very issue manifests the essentially religious nature of the problem, *accreditation*. The word *accreditation* comes from *credo*, I believe. Accreditation is an act of faith. It

looks to an authority regarded as sovereign, i.e., God, the state, reason, etc., as the approving agency and authority. To seek state accreditation, or to submit to it, is to affirm faith in the lordship of the state and to recognize the overall sovereignty of the state as the "umbrella" under which all things reside.

The Bible, on the other hand, affirms the function of the state, and the duty of obedience to the state, as a ministry of justice, or, literally in the Greek, a diaconate of justice (Rom. 13:1–8). Its domain or sphere of operation is to be a "terror . . . to the evil" (Rom. 13:3). The state is not, Hegel to the contrary, God walking on earth: it is a ministry, diaconate, or service under God. Thus, the Bible accredits the state and requires obedience to it "for conscience sake" (Rom. 13:5), i.e., as a matter of conscience towards God, as long as the state is faithful to its calling. In the ultimate nature of things, we must, with St. Peter, declare, "We ought to obey God rather than men" (Acts 5:29).

The modern state has revived the old pagan doctrine of state sovereignty. The word *sovereignty* is absent from the U.S. Constitution. Washington called the idea a monster, and, as late as the Versailles Peace Conference, U.S. Secretary of State Lansing was critical of the concept (A. F. Pollard, *Factors in American History* [New York, NY: Macmillan, 1935], pp. 31–32). Murray commented:

> Nowhere in the American structure is there accumulated the plenitude of legal sovereignty possessed in England by the Queen in Parliament. In fact, the term "legal sovereignty" makes no sense in America, where sovereignty (if the alien term must be used) is purely political. The United States has a government, or better, a structure of government operating on different levels. The American state has no sovereignty in the classic Continental sense. (John Courtney Murray, S.J.: *We Hold These Truths* [New York, NY: Sheed and Ward, 1960], p. 70.)

The modern state everywhere is claiming sovereignty: as the supposed sovereign and lord, it demands that all peoples and institutions live under its shade or umbrella and submit to its licensure, controls, and taxation. The same issue faced by the early church in Rome is again with us. There is no escaping the necessity to stand. The issue is still the same: Who is the Lord? Christ or Caesar? For the Christian, the answer is, now as then, Jesus Christ is Lord.

18

FREEDOM UNDER GOD

Originally a brochure produced for Coast Federal Savings in the late 1960s, this article was published with Rushdoony's other brochures as part of a two-sided paper titled "Comments in Brief" with Chalcedon Report No. 225, April 1984.

One of the great founders of the American system was the Reverend John Cotton (1584–1652), who made basic to colonial government the premise that godly law and order means *limited powers and limited liberty*. Neither man nor his civil governments have the moral right to unlimited power or to unlimited liberty. At all times, it must be power and liberty under law, and, ultimately, *under God* (Deut. 17:14–20; 1 Kings 2:1–4; Prov. 8:15–16).

But today we have demands for both unlimited power and unlimited liberty, which are mutually contradictory ideas. We also have the growing claim that liberty is not under law and under God but *outside the law*. There are those who believe that they can only be free by denying the claims of all law, and by affirming that true rights and true liberty mean a *freedom from law*.

The Biblical faith is that true law is a gift of God, and the ground of man's freedom (Deut. 16:20). Law is the condition of man's life: just as man physically breathes air to live, so socially and personally his environment of life is law, which the grace of God enables him to have and to keep (Ps. 119; Prov. 6:23). Man can no more live without law than he can live without eating. The purpose of God's law is life; as Moses declared, "the Lord commanded us to do all these statutes . . . that he might preserve us alive" (Deut. 6:24). Man was created and is saved by God to live by law, for its discipline is "the way of life" (Prov. 6:23).

Here we have the great division: Americans, reared for generations in the Biblical perspective, have seen freedom as life under God's law, but

many today are asserting that freedom is escape from law.

The alternatives to freedom under God, to liberty under law, were declared clearly by Karl Marx. They are twofold. *First*, one can have anarchism, every man a law unto himself, with no law, and a total "freedom" from any responsibility to anyone. *Second*, one can substitute the state for God, and the total law of the state replaces the law of God. Freedom then disappears, and total statism or communism for man's "welfare" takes its place. This is a denial of liberty as a "bourgeois" ideal and a substitution of state-planned welfare for freedom as man's truer happiness.

Every attempt therefore to remove this republic from "under God" means that either anarchism or communism will surely result, whether planned or not by those who strike at God's place in American life. It is an inescapable alternative.

To restore true liberty, we must restore true law (Isa. 8:20). The Bible speaks of "the perfect law of liberty" (James 1:25; 2:12), because it views God's law as the very source and ground of man's liberty. We must abandon the dangerous idea that freedom means an escape from law: this can only be true if the escape is from communism, which is not true law but is *tyranny*. The word *tyranny* is an ancient Greek word with a simple meaning; it means secular or human rule instead of law, instead of true freedom under God. The American system is neither anarchy or tyranny but *freedom under God*.

19

PEACE AND FREEDOM

Chalcedon Report No. 50, October 1, 1969

A friend recently reported his experience to me. He was debating with a Marxist at a major university campus, and he recognized, in the course of the debate, that both of them were championing "peace and freedom," but with very different meanings. Underlying the words were radically different presuppositions.

Before any of us line up with "freedom fighters," "libertarians," liberty leaguers, lobbies, defenders, or what have you, it is important for us to know what these words mean to those who use them.

One of the key words of the modern era is freedom. The Renaissance and the Enlightenment laid great stress on freedom (and yet produced tyranny), and basic to the dialectics of the modern world are the notions of freedom and nature. This new doctrine of freedom came into its open philosophical expression in Kant and Hegel, and its political expression in revolutionary movements from the French Revolution to the present.

Someone once remarked, after listening to a variety of Marxist, existentialist, New Leftist, and Fabian speakers, that they were nothing but hypocrites, because they championed freedom while promoting statism and totalitarianism. This charge could not be more unjust; these men (and student speakers) were not hypocrites; they were intensely sincere and passionately convinced of the rightness of their position, however wrong from our view.

We cannot understand the movements of our time if we fail to understand what freedom means in the modern age. In Hegel's philosophy, this doctrine found powerful expression, and it has since influenced most modern thinkers: Stirner, Marx, J. S. Mill, Spencer, Nietzsche, Emerson, Dewey, Sartre, Marcuse, and others. Hegel was intensely concerned with freedom, and he traced its history carefully in several studies. For Hegel

and the modern mind, the essential meaning of freedom is man's liberation from and independence of God; freedom from God, this is what liberty means in the modern age.

In America, from the colonials through the founding fathers, it was repeatedly affirmed that freedom from God is slavery to man; after 1860, the modern concept of freedom was clearly dominant in the United States also.

This new freedom was sometimes anarchistic and sometimes totalitarian. (*Anarchism* is a word coming from the Greek, and meaning "without authority"; *tyranny* means confusion, having no divine law.) In either case, its basic idea of liberty is freedom from God. As a result, anarchists and socialists have never been too far apart. Anarchism replaces the authority of God with the authority of the individual man; socialism, democracy, fascism, and other forms of collectivism replace the authority of God with the authority of collective man. Many of the leading figures of both sides have often moved back and forth between anarchism and socialism. Marx incorporated both into his system. John Stuart Mill moved from a semi-anarchism to socialism. Thoreau advocated anarchism; Emerson held to a semi-anarchistic position but was also congenial to socialism (Emerson's influence on Nietzsche has not been fully appreciated; Nietzsche spoke of him as "my beloved Emerson"); abolitionists like William Lloyd Garrison have aspects of both positions in their thinking, and so on.

The liberal, conservative, and radical traditions of our day have all been profoundly influenced by Hegel and the post-Hegelian thinkers, and their ideas have a common secularism, that is, they think of freedom and social order without God. The liberals and the radicals are usually self-consciously atheistic; they knowingly advocate a doctrine of freedom from God as true liberty. The conservative is usually unconsciously atheistic: he denies that he is anti-God, but he by-passes the whole matter because he claims that he wants to avoid "sectarianism."

But if God is not our sovereign source of authority and freedom in every area, then we are to that extent atheistic. The state should not be under the church, nor the church under the state, nor the school under either. Each are under God and positively required to serve Him, or else they are atheistic. Church, state, school, family, and every other sphere of life are either under God, or they are under men as their sovereign power. Freedom from God means servitude to man; freedom under God means freedom from man.

Revolutions in the modern age are essentially revolutions against God. Several of the "new libertarians" have lately stated that it is not necessary

to have a purpose *for* revolution; what is necessary is to have a revolution *against* the idea of a God-given order. In other words, their goal is freedom from God, and to gain this, all existing institutions, because they represent a hangover from a Christian society, *must be destroyed*. The result is total warfare.

When a social order begins to break down, and the end of an age appears, man begins to feel uncertain of his ground because his basic premises are being destroyed. Although the days prior to the Reformation saw less social and economic changes than the seventeenth century witnessed, the lack of faith led men to despair, so that they felt, in the words of historian A. G. Dickens, in *Reformation and Society*, "a dread of universal dissolution." This same dread obsesses men today who live in greater prosperity than their forefathers. Having no faith to live by but a crumbling humanism, they live in "a dread of universal dissolution."

But, even worse, too many of them, as a matter of humanistic principle, are waging a revolutionary war designed to bring about universal dissolution. To gain freedom from God, they seek the destruction of all existing social order.

This is not a limited war. It cannot be fought with a limited faith. More than the church is at stake, and more than a political election and control of the state, schools, or any other sphere. Elections are regularly being won, and the war lost, because every side has the same anti-God doctrine of freedom. And it will not do to talk about "God and America" and feel that words are the answer.

If we are for freedom *under* God rather than *from* God, we must reestablish our institutions, and our society on that basis. We must begin now the task of Christian Reconstruction, establishing Christian homes, Christian schools and institutions, Christian scholarship, a Christian civil order, a social order in its every aspect grounded on the Biblical law-word. And we cannot do that without knowing the Bible. The tragedy of our age is that the church has reduced the Bible to an ecclesiastical or church book, whereas it is God's Word for the *whole* of life, and for every institution.

In 1925, T. S. Eliot wrote a telling poem on "The Hollow Men." The Hollow Men are the men of this generation, men without faith; they are "the stuffed men," full of facts and data, ready with words, but basically meaningless, so that their heads are really "filled with straw." Having no faith, they have no direction; they move, but go nowhere:

> Shape without form, shade without color,
> Paralyzed force, gesture without motion.

They have eyes, but cannot see; they are acted upon, rather than acting. They are hollow of meaning but stuffed with straw, meaningless pretenses at meaning. They can only produce a "Wasteland" out of life.

Hollow men cannot create a social order; they can only destroy it. Hollow men can defend nothing, because they themselves are nothing. We live in a day of hollow men who blame everyone for their predicament except themselves. When they declared their freedom from God, they became hollow men, whatever their politics, conservative or radical.

Sartre defined freedom as man's freedom from God, and its goal or "project is to be God." Man declares his independence from God in order to be his own god. The goal is a futile one, however, and Sartre concluded, "Man is a useless passion." Not surprisingly, humanists who have been proclaiming the death of God are in some cases now going a step beyond. In France, a new and influential philosophy whose spokesman is Michel Foucault is now proclaiming the death of man. Man, as a useless passion and a futile being, must soon disappear, we are told. The Hollow Men are bent on suicide and destruction.

More than that, they have what Albert William Levi so aptly termed Nietzsche's "will to illusion," a love of a lie and a preference for it, a delight in illusions rather than reality, a preference for grand gestures rather than meaningful acts. The result of freedom from God is a generation of Hollow Men.

What *do you* want, Hollow Men, or God's men? If you want Hollow Men, well and good: our schools, universities, churches, and families are all doing an excellent job of producing a generation for whom liberty means freedom from God. They may call themselves leftists, conservatives, libertarians, churchmen, and whatever else they will, but unless they recognize the sovereignty of God over *every* sphere of life and *every* area of thought, they are practical atheists. If what you want is freedom from God, then congratulations! You are doing your job effectively in every area. But if not, "How long halt ye between two opinions? if the LORD be God, follow Him" (1 Kings 18:21).

20

POSTMILLENNIALISM VERSUS EVOLUTION

Chalcedon Report No. 227, June 1984

Recently, a very fine television preacher who should know better dismissed postmillennialism as a product of a Darwinian and evolutionary perspective, and he also equated it with the social gospel. This falsehood has been so often repeated that few stop to consider how obviously false it is.

First of all, postmillennialism long predates Darwin and was an important force in the age of discovery and exploration. Hakluyt's *Voyages* tell us plainly how many of the navigators and explorers were governed by this faith. It was also a part of the Reformation, was shared by many of the Westminster Assembly divines, and it appears in the Larger Catechism. Darwinism came very much later, and, in fact, undermined the postmillennial position.

Second, the reason why evolution undermined the prevailing postmillennial perspective was because it replaced the world of God's total providence with Darwin's world of total chance. Postmillennialism stresses the reality of Romans 8:28, that God makes all things work together for good for them who love Him, for all who are called according to His purpose. The world is God's creation and moves to fulfill His goals. Evolution sees the universe as "red in tooth and claw"; if anything develops, it is by chance or accident. Chance replaces predestination, and total meaninglessness replaces God's total meaning. The churches which accepted Darwin dropped postmillennialism.

Third, because with Darwin the world was now without meaning, and because there was no God with His government and meaning, the believers in evolution replaced God and His providence with the state and the social gospel. The social gospel is the antithesis of postmillennialism.

It sees the state as the only true providence of man, whereas the rise of postmillennialism in every era has meant a renewed awareness of the providence of God.

To equate evolutionary faith with postmillennialism is like identifying good and evil. It involves a radical confusion of meaning, and it reduces history and logic to nonsense.

As creationism has revived, so too has postmillennialism, because the more closely God's creating hand and government are linked to this world, the more men will understand the force of Romans 8:28, and the more literally they will take such promises as Isaiah 60:12, "For the nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish; yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted." The Scripture declares of our Lord, "He shall have dominion also from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth" (Ps. 72:8). This is postmillennialism, not Darwinism!

Postmillennialism believes that the God who created heaven and earth cannot be defeated, either by man or by Satan. His declared purpose from the beginning to the end shall be accomplished, and nothing can stay His hand. "All the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the LORD: and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before thee. For the kingdom is the LORD's: and he is the governor among the nations" (Ps. 22:27–28). "Yea, all kings shall fall down before him: all nations shall serve him" (Ps. 72:11). Can a Christian believe anything less? Ours is the God of victory and salvation.

THE CHURCH

21

WHAT IS THE CHURCH?

Chalcedon Report No. 150, February 1978

One of the central problems plaguing the history of Christianity has been the definition of the church. Part of the problem is that the word *church* comes from *Kyriakos*, as used in phrases such as *Kyriakon doma*, meaning the Christian place of worship, but it is also used for *ecclesia*. The deeper problem is the claim of the worshipping body to be more than it is.

The Old Testament has two words for the covenant people: *edah* (congregation) and *qahal* (assembly). *Ecclesia* covers both meanings. These terms cover the same ground: a single community of believers, or all communities; the covenant people as a worshipping group, or as an army, or as a nation, or in all their capacities. This point is not new; in the past century, such Biblical dictionaries as those of James Hastings and J. O. Douglas have cited it, as has the *Encyclopaedia Judaica* in its article on "Congregation."

In brief, the *church* in the New Testament means God's Kingdom and its constituent parts. The church *in* or *at* Corinth or Philippi meant the covenant people or Kingdom outpost at that point, including the ecclesiastical.

To limit the meaning of the church to the Christian synagogue or chapel is thus to distort radically the meaning of Scripture. It reduces the redemptive scope and function of Christ's work and of His church from a universal and cosmic scale to a limited and institutional one. Jesus Christ declared that, "All power . . . in heaven and in earth" (Matt. 28:18) is given to Him as Lord and King; the false definition of the church, which limits it to the Christian institution for worship, limits Christ's Kingship to the institution's borders and limits the scope of redemption and government.

As a result, the institution for worship takes two courses. *First*, it has often become an imperial church, claiming sovereignty over state, school, and every other area as itself the Kingdom. *Second*, it denies the imperial claim and becomes a withdrawn and monastic group isolated from the world around it, and denying Christ's claims over it.

Both courses are untenable, and they result in a false view of the Kingdom, of eschatology, and of redemption. The Christian synagogue is a part of the church or Kingdom, a necessary and central part, but never itself the church in its entirety or its essence. The Kingdom is in and of the King, and He is more than the sum total of the parts thereof, and is beyond them all. The true church or Kingdom includes the full concourse or general assembly of the firstborn, the entire assembly (Heb. 12:22–24), and is thus inclusive of all men and angels and all their realms. The continuity of the *church* with the Old Testament *theocracy* is repeatedly stressed in the use of such terms as Zion and Jerusalem (Heb. 12:22–24). What the old was, the new now is. Christ declares Himself to be the glorious Lord of the theocracy in its worldwide scope in the Great Commission (Matt. 28:18–20).

The church thus cannot be defined except in terms of Christ as King, and His whole realm in heaven and on earth, and all men and things brought into captivity to and under the dominion of our Redeemer Lord. It is His realm and His new creation.

22

THE LIFE OF THE CHURCH: 1 TIMOTHY 5:1–2

Chalcedon Report No. 318, January 1992

NOTE: "The Life of the Church" was a communion sermon at the Chalcedon Chapel evening service, October 27, 1991. It is published here [*The Chalcedon Report*] because it answers so many questions raised by readers who find the church attempting to govern like the state. Also, many lone women, single, widowed, or divorced find the church acting as though they are their legal guardians and should control them, their lives, activities, and possessions.

> Rebuke not an elder, but entreat him as a father; and the younger men as brethren; The elder women as mothers; the younger as sisters, with all purity. (1 Tim. 5:1–2)

THE Lord God is very blunt about the care of the helpless in society, i.e., single women, abused women, widows, orphans, and aliens. To abuse them incurs God's death penalty on a nation (Exod. 22:21–24), and certainly a church. Whenever and wherever God's people have been faithful to Him, they have cared for the helpless, and protected them.

One of the first problems faced by the church, and this shortly after the ascension of Christ, was that the Grecian or Greek-speaking widows "were neglected in the daily ministration" in favor of the Hebrews (Acts 6:1). For this reason, the apostles created the diaconate and entrusted the deacons with the ministry of care and charity (Acts 6:1–6).

Having said this, let us turn our attention briefly to the church as we know it in the Western world. As against the eastern churches (Orthodox, Armenian, Syrian, Nestorian, etc.), the Western churches are known as *Latin* Christianity because they arose where the Western Roman Empire had existed. The Church of Rome is known as *Roman* Catholic; the

other Western churches could *with equal justice* be known as *Roman* Protestants. Why? Rome built its power on controls by various devices, including humanistic Roman law. Despite the importance commonly given to God's law, the Western churches have very strongly affirmed the necessity of governmental controls over the people in the Roman pattern, a Vatican, a general conference, bishops, a church board, a classis, synod, general assembly, presbytery, and so on. Western churches are more governments and courts than they are *the family of God*. This is not to say the Eastern churches are better; our concern is with *our* problem. The church must be *primarily* a family in Christ, not a Roman imperial power.

Now, the church in Scripture is essentially *the family of God in Christ*; it is not a Roman-style court and government. It is a family, and, while there is government in a family, it is *mainly* through loving care and teaching.

This is what St. Paul is telling Timothy in 1 Timothy 5:1–2. As a young pastor, at least much younger than Paul, an old man, he is given *fatherly* counsel. He must treat the church as family members. The elders, meaning here *older men*, are to be entreated as a father, the younger men as brothers. Older women should be treated as mothers, and younger women as sisters, "with all purity."

The church must thus function essentially as God's family. If there are young men and young women in the church, as yet unmarried, they are to be regarded as the children of the church and given the loving care of all members.

The *concern* is not one to be passed on to a church court: it belongs to all the church family. Members of a family help one another.

Too many churches feel that it is the duty of the church court to govern and rule over all such persons. There is *nothing* in all the Bible that gives a church court the right to rule over widows or single women, many of whom may be and often are much older and wiser than they. The Lord God does not ask us to follow the Roman but the family pattern.

There are *Roman Protestant* churches, however, which deny anyone the "right" to move to another city without permission; to do so means excommunication. Rev. David Chilton has cited from his experience one church which insisted that its session had the "right" to order its members to use white sidewall tires on their automobiles, or to forbid their use. This is *not* the meaning of being a father, or a brother, or a son, or any other family member!

The diaconate was not created to add an *office* to the church but to further and guide a necessary *function* of Christ's family.

Calvin called attention to an interesting fact now forgotten but basic to the life of the early church. There were "daily contributions of believers" for the care of the needy members.[1] A few centuries later, and Calvin quotes him, Pope Gregory I (A.D. 590–604), known also as St. Gregory the Great, declared:

> It is the custom of the apostolic see, at the ordination of a bishop, to command him that all the revenue received by him be divided into four portions; namely one for the bishop and his family for the support of hospitality and entertainment; the second for the clergy; the third for the poor; the fourth for the reparation of Churches.[2]

Our concern is this: the evidence is clear from Scripture and church history that the church once saw itself *essentially* as God's family, not as a lordly Roman power over the people.

The Lord's Table reminds us of that fact. To share a meal has during most of history had a profound meaning. It makes people fellow members. In many parts of the world until recently, a man's life and safety depended on whether or not he was asked to eat with a powerful lord of that area. Breaking bread together meant sharing a common life as family members; it assured a man protection and care of a generous nature.

This was the reason for the daily contributions. I can recall when every church family had a wooden box or two for daily gifts. Coins were added to the boxes for missions or for charity, *and this was done at dinner time.* As the family thanked God in prayer, they remembered with their giving the needy and the mission fields. Children were given pennies (then worth more than today!) to add to the boxes in order to teach them the meaning of being *a family in Christ.*

The church must abandon *legalistic authoritarianism* and once again become God's family in Christ. To do so means also to abandon humanistic law for God's law, and ungodly controls for Christian grace, concern, and love.

The central sacrament of the Christian faith is a family fact, a common sharing of bread and wine from the Lord's Table. We do not cease to be a family, nor do we become Roman consuls and senators, when we leave that table. To be a Christian, a living member of Christ, St. Paul tells us, is this: "we are members one of another" (Eph. 4:25).

1. John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, vol. 2 (Philadelphia, PA: Presbyterian Board of Christian Education, 1936), bk. 4, chap. 4, sec. 5, p. 337.

2. ibid., vol. 2, bk. 4, chap. 4, sect. 7., p. 339.

23

TRIVIALIZING THE CHURCH

Chalcedon Report No. 347, June 1994

For some years now, a false emphasis has been gaining power in churches. I hear frequently from pastors about this, with many variations in the pattern. People approach a church with a demand: Do you have a program for senior citizens? What are your youth activities? What about young couples? What do you do for them?

Such people are not worshipers, nor truly believers. They are consumers. They want the church to be a religious shopping mall catering to them as consumers. Their demands as consumers must, they believe, govern the church.

What they are less honest in stating is that they assume that God exists to meet their consumer needs. There are even books written about prayer which encourage this fantasy. God is seen as the superservant who is ready to jump as soon as He is paged. He sits waiting for the appeals to come so that He can fulfill them.

All this is simply paganism. There was no worship in pagan temples of old. They were simply places to buy favors from the gods.

Of course, many people object at once that our Lord Himself tells us, "Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you" (Matt. 7:7). But we cannot take a text out of its context. These words follow Matthew 6:33, "But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness (or, justice); and all these things shall by added unto you." Moreover, Matthew 7:7 is followed by verses 15–20 that *require* good fruits from all believers. We cannot take precedence over God and His Kingdom. We are not the center of all things; God is.

We trivialize the church when we make it consumer-centered, man-centered. Our tastes cannot govern God. At one very important church, with a membership in the thousands, there were rumblings of discontent

when the senior pastor preached against abortion. It was not that the congregation favored it: they were against abortion. But they wanted a service that made them "feel good." "Feel good" religion is not Christianity. Read through the Bible. Neither the law nor the prophets, the gospels nor the Epistles, cater to man's feelings, nor to his desire to "feel good." Rather, the Word of God constantly calls attention to our sins and shortcomings and undermines our desire to think of ourselves more than the Lord.

The church is trivialized when it is governed by man's feelings and needs, because its calling is to proclaim the Word of the living God, not to be a hospital ship for the weary. I have cited in Random Notes, no. 35, item 7, James Guthrie's words on the day of his execution by beheading. He quoted Psalm 118:24, "This is the day which the LORD hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it." We are the heirs of the faith of men like Guthrie, and the freedom they made possible. Shall we trivialize the church out of existence now? How can we face the Lord, whose church it is, if we reduce it, trivialize it, and cheapen it?

More than one hymn has compared the church to an army, the army of God. Today, the church is too often a nursing home for a flabby people, not an army.

The church needs again to be the mighty force for the Lord celebrated by Thomas Kelly (1769–1854) in his hymn:

> Zion stands with hills surrounded:
> Zion, kept by power divine;
> All her foes shall be confounded,
> Though the world in arms combine.
> Happy Zion,
> What a favored lot is thine!

24

TRIVIALIZING THE FAITH

Chalcedon Report No. 400, November 1998

FOUR of us, all clergymen, were discussing the increasing irrelevance of many churches. Incidents like these were cited. A church in the Midwest called a pastor who apparently was what they wanted, orthodox and resistant to the denomination's growing modernism. He seemed to be all they wanted and more, but dissatisfaction was soon evident. The man, a Westerner, actually wore colored shirts during the week! Another case: two important families resisted the calling of an able, orthodox man because his shoes were not properly shined!

The church has drifted for some time because of the trivialization of the faith by too many peoples. Just as hymns now are expressive more of feeling than doctrine, so too the standards have been reduced to trifles and doctrines underrated. The church has been trivialized, and a trivial church is in some respects more of a problem than an apostate church.

A trivial church is governed by its members, not by the Bible nor by doctrinal standards and confession. A trivial church can become more apostate than a heretical one because it is so radically humanistic. To cite an example, one church, with a thoroughly evangelical pastor, grew rapidly under his ministry, in part because of his able preaching, and in part due to its expansion of ministries to all kinds of age and special-interest groups. The pastor became aware of the fact that special interests were more important to members than the faith. He therefore planned a series of sermons on "Priorities." Our needs cannot outweigh God's requirements in the life of the church. But the committee of women in charge of the weekly bulletin and other publications promptly revised his announcement, saying it would harm the church! As a result of what followed, the pastor resigned.

Trivializing has become standard practice. Hymns celebrate man's

faith more than God's Word and the doctrines of the faith. Trivialization begins with us and our response to our God and His Word. It begins with a trivial people. They can be able, pleasant to know, willing in some ways to work hard, but never except on their terms. The universality or catholicity of the faith is replaced by their smallness and pettiness. If God's absolute and sovereign Word and purpose do not prevail, then man's will is done, and the faith is trivialized.

In Psalm 63:1–2, David speaks of his thirst for God and his intense desire to know more of God, and the better to serve Him. That thirst for God and the knowledge of Him must consume us, or else we have trivialized ourselves and everything we do. Man, created by God to be the heir of all creation, has chosen instead to be a trifler even when entrusted with holy things, and he will pay a price for this. Least of all should the church be a place of trivialization. We need to assess our lives, cleanse ourselves of trivialization, and serve the Lord with all our heart, mind, and being.

25

THE CHURCH

Chalcedon Report No. 381, April 1997

It is sad that Christians have forgotten the meaning of the word *church* in the New Testament. It translates *ecclesia*, an unusual word which meant then the town or ruling council or government for an area.

This means that the church was called into being to become in time the true ruling body for its given area. It was not to attain this position by means of revolution, nor by political activity, but by obedience to the law of God.

As a result, very early Paul called upon the church to create its own courts of law to adjudicate all problems by means of God's law-word (1 Cor. 6). In terms of this law, Paul summons Christians to give generously to assist those in need. A variety of activities marked the early church: law, charity, education, health, and more. The church was an empire within the empire, providing government for a growing number of people. Worship was the energizing point: it sent out a people with marching orders for discipling all nations (Matt. 28:18–20).

Once again, the church is beginning to see itself in these terms. Christian schools and homeschools are areas where the church has again resumed governing. More and more churches are assuming other duties: feeding the homeless, clothing the poor, going into other countries to care for the sick, the blind, and the needy, building shelters, and more.

The church is a Kingdom whose monarch is the King, Jesus Christ. It has a plan for the peaceful conquest of all things, and for the regeneration of fallen men. Instead of hostility towards men and nations, we in Christ's name offer peace.

Those who counsel aggression, or who want to pass judgment on the nation to justify hostile actions, are wrong. Ours is the Prince of Peace, and we are called to serve Him, not to supplement or alter His strategy.

When men set aside God's law or any part of His Word, they then assume the right to use more "appropriate" means, and they thereby pervert the faith. Neither the church, nor the faith, nor the Bible are man's property, and man has no right to alter, subtract, or to add to what is God's, not his. As an instrument of God's government, the church must be faithful to its King. It has a mandate to obey, not to supplement, His Word.

26

PASSIVE "CHRISTIANITY"

Chalcedon Report No. 189, May 1981

The March 1981 issue of *Moody Monthly* has a page of letters from church members with a very common complaint: one person has been a member of a particular church for sixteen months, and, until the past Christmas, no one visited her or invited her into their home, except apparently the pastor and his wife. Another, a member for six years, feels left out because her husband does not attend with her; although people are kind to her, she feels hurt because other members go to one another's homes, and she is not asked. Another visited a new church and felt totally ignored, and so on and on.

This is a familiar complaint one can hear from coast to coast, year in and year out. It is always evil, and the complainers are clearly in sin. No one is called to be a passive Christian, to be courted, waited upon, or soothed by the pastor and church. Passive Christianity is a contradiction in terms.

I have heard young people in their twenties, and retired people, make like complaints of being ignored in church. "In two years, the pastor never called on me," said a husky man in his late twenties; it did not matter to him that the pastor had been in and out of surgery for two years and had sometimes been in the pulpit laboring under some pain; it did not occur to him to call on the pastor!

Passive Christianity is an offense to Almighty God. If a member is at all able-bodied, let him or her volunteer to call on the shut-ins, the sick, and the visitors. If a newcomers wants friends, let them be friendly, let them volunteer to help, and they will soon have friends enough.

The church is Christ's army. Its purpose is not to provide breakfast in bed for all members, and a social lift for the unsocial, but a faith for life, preparation for battle against the powers of darkness, and a strategy of

life for victory. The ineffectiveness of the modern church is partially due to this passivity.

Our Lord makes it very clear that He had no use for passive church members; in fact, He sends them to hell! He demands that they visit Him in the person of the stranger or alien, the naked and the needy, the sick, and the persecuted and imprisoned Christian. "Verily I say unto you, inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me" (Matt. 25:40). Of the passive, complaining church members who want the church to wait on them, our Lord says, "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal" (Matt. 25:46).

This is strong language from our Lord, but our Lord did not establish the church to be a pampering agency but a mighty army which shall overthrow the very gates of hell (Matt. 16:18). The church is not our property; we cannot ask it to serve us. Rather, we are called to serve the Lord, and, clearly, the Kingdom of God cometh not by egocentricity and whining.

27

THE DEMAND FOR PERFECTION IN THE CHURCH

Chalcedon Report No. 351, October 1994

It is understandable that, in a time of decadence, many people will long for and demand perfection in the church, but it is neither right nor moral. To expect perfection this side of heaven is unwarranted. Our life here is to be one of *growth in grace*, sanctification, and community. Christians are *required* by Scripture to be forbearing one of another. Paul tells us that we "walk worthy of the vocation wherewith we are called" only if we walk "with all lowliness and meekness, with longsuffering, forbearing one another in love" (Eph. 4:1–2; cf. Col. 3:13). Yet we find the "super-saints" ready to create divisions over things we are never told to fight about: counseling programs, psalm singing, dress codes, attendance at evening services and prayer meetings, and so on and on. There is no mandate for any division over these things. Too many zealots believe that man's controls can do better than the working of the Holy Spirit. They substitute zeal for faith, and intemperance for patience.

Over the years, I have counseled, with poor results, many zealous persons thus: "You can never convert anyone by spitting in his face," but too many seem to believe that the Holy Spirit inspires them to spit!

We have only to read the epistles of Paul, James, and John to realize how weak and sinful the early church was. The Corinthian and other churches would be consigned to hell by our current perfectionists! But the apostles and their successors made the early church a world-conquering power.

The churches which have stressed perfection have become stagnant, not growing, churches. They become authoritarian and substitute controls for sanctification. They split groups, and then themselves split again and again as they refine subtle points of doctrine in a way which would

exclude the apostles! When I was young, there was a presbytery bitterly and evenly divided over a disagreement on lapsarianism. Not surprisingly, they made the faith a mockery, and the churches finally went modernist. I have, over the years, written and told people that lapsarianism is wrong, whether infra-, supra-, or sublapsarianism, because it posits a time sequence in the mind of God, a blasphemous assumption. Too often, self-styled champions of the faith have discredited it more than its enemies. In all circles of the churches and theologies, the perfectionists are insistent, "My will be done, because I know the mind of God." If we are Christians, "we are members one of another" (Eph. 4:25), *not judges*.

Heresy is holding to an opinion that differs from revealed truth. But what happens when we take something which we believe is revealed, or which is revealed, but which is not a doctrine of the triune God nor of salvation, and then use it to condemn and to bludgeon others, and to divide Christ's church? Are we not then Pharisees if we insist that what is important to us is equally important to the triune God? Again and again, groups stressing to the point of division practices and doctrines not essential to salvation have become irrelevant to Christ. They have become castaways, laid up on a shelf as not usable. Is there no fear of God in their eyes that they rend His church?

The Pharisees were the most moral, best educated, and the finest people of their day, but they ended up rejecting the Christ. The Pharisees are with us still.

28

UNCONSTRUCTIVE RELIGION

Chalcedon Report No. 362, September 1995

DURING the many years of my life, I have more than a few times been disappointed in men whose knowledge at first glance made them notable. Their problem was a past-bound vision. Their focus was on the early church, or the medieval church, or the Reformation church, and so on and on. If their interest was political, they often looked backward to a particular era in history.

Now, such interests can be good, but too often such people idealize the past and want a return to something no longer tenable. The modernist, on the other hand, wants a continual revision of the content of the faith in terms of the spirit of the age. Those of us who hold that it is God's enscriptured Word that is alone authoritative must recognize that it must transform and govern our todays and tomorrows.

We have broken with Christ the King if we are not future-oriented in terms of the whole of God's law-word. Our Lord commands our priorities with these words: "But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness" (Matt. 6:33). The goal is also set forth: "The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever" (Rev. 11:15).

Our focus must be on His Kingdom, not on a past or present church. To make the church our priority is to become implicit humanists. There are too many people who believe that, because they are in the "right church," all is well with their souls for time and eternity.

Our Lord, in the parable of judgment, speaks of His judgment on those who call Him Lord and declare themselves to be His people. He declares,

> Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels: For I was an hungered, and ye gave me no meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me no drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me not in; naked, and ye

> clothed me not: sick, and in prison, and ye visited me not. Then shall they also answer him saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungered, or a thirst, or a stranger, or naked, or sick, or in prison, and did not minister unto thee? Then shall he answer them, saying, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not to me. And these shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal. (Matt. 25:41–46)

On our own, none of us would dare to make so strong a statement, but our Lord made it. Today, church members are giving a decreasing amount to all forms of benevolence as well as in their gifts to their local church. They seem to believe that by a profession of faith, some attendance to church, and a minimal giving, they have bought fire and life insurance from Jesus Christ, the superagent. If this parable means what it so plainly says, we are in trouble. Ours is an unconstructive, or nonconstructive, religion which will pay us off with judgment. Our Lord tells us, "by their fruits ye shall know them" (Matt. 7:20), and his brother, James, declares, "For as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also" (James 2:26).

We are not here to please ourselves but to please and to serve our triune God. We live in an age of disintegration: the opportunities have never been greater, perhaps, to meet our Lord's mandate.

But too many churches are quibbling over trifles. They are angry if the pastor preaches the Ten Commandments, angry if he stresses doctrine instead of catering to this or that group, and hostile if he strives to please God rather than man. Of such a person David said, "There is no fear of God before his eyes" (Ps. 36:1).

Because of the crisis of our times, God is giving us one of the greatest opportunities in all of history to be *effectual*, to have a major impact on men and nations, and to become constructive believers, not empty and hollow men.

We cannot all go out to do what many are doing, on Chalcedon's staff and in various churches and organizations. But we can pray, and we can give. Read again Matthew 25:41–46: what will we say when we face Him?

29

COPYCAT CHURCHIANITY

Chalcedon Report No. 323, June 1992

When churches became antinomian and gave up God's law, they began to seek their models and law from the world. For example, in terms of Deuteronomy 21:18–21, incorrigible or habitual criminals were to be executed; this law still survived in most of the United States until after World War II. Depending on the state, after the third or fourth conviction, a criminal was ruled to be habitual and was executed. But, long before this, many churches had shifted their views *from* restitution in most cases and death for capital offenses *to* the prison system. This belief that prisons could redeem criminals came from humanism. The prison was to be comparable to a monastery (hence the use of the word "cells," derived from a monk's cell or room); isolation would allow man's "divine inner light" to redeem him, a Quaker and humanistic faith. Now we have a phenomenally large professional criminal class.

At one time, the task of the pastorate with troubled people was "the cure of souls," i.e., to ascertain whether or not the person was saved, to require the fruits of repentance, and to insist on God's law as the way of holiness. Now, in imitation of the world, we have ungodly counseling. To cite one example: a woman, an alcoholic, a "barfly," promiscuous, and neglectful of the children, went to the church when her husband left the house with temporary custody of the children. What was the attitude of his church? The church, knowing all the facts, sided at once with the woman. Their attitude was, "This marriage must be saved." Her verbal professions of faith and a desire to change are being accepted at face value as valid despite a virtually daily evidence to the contrary. There must be, says the church, counseling, *our* counseling, or else excommunication! I can cite like examples where the husband is the offender. In each and every case, the innocent party is the target of official church

hostility for refusing to accept a verbal, tearful, "repentance," something experienced dozens of times over.

The church is imitating the world too often. This is not only ungodly, but it means that all such churches will be judged with the world and die with it.

30

IS CAESAR OUR LORD?

Chalcedon Report No. 321, April 1992

Under considerable pressure from Christians, Governor Pete Wilson of California in late 1991 vetoed a "gay rights" bill; he then quietly, by an executive order, required the California Department of Industrial Relations to rule on homosexual complaints of job discrimination; no exception is made for churches, Christian schools, and nonprofit Christian organizations.

At the same time, many churchmen are working to get a vouchers plan passed by a corrupt California legislature. What do they want, homosexuals in their schools and pulpits? Where state funds go, so, too, do controls. The possibility of a First Amendment case against Governor Wilson's order will be surrendered.

President George Bush, Vice President Dan Quayle, and Secretary of Education Lamar Alexander worked in late 1991 to get a school choice voucher plan through the Pennsylvania House of Representatives. Happily, they failed; unhappily, they will try again. President Bush not only signed a "gay rights" bill earlier, with a celebration party in the White House with homosexuals, but he fired the liaison officer to evangelicals, Douglas Wead, when Wead protested this action. Can anyone believe Bush has the Christian cause at heart? His voucher plan will enslave Christian schools.

Are we again in days like those of Hosea, who said of Israel, "The days of visitation are come, the days of recompense are come; Israel shall know it: the prophet is a fool, the spiritual man is mad, for the multitude of thine iniquity . . ." (Hosea 9:7).

I learned recently that one country in Europe is deftly undermining Christianity. The churches are established, and everyone pays a 6 percent church tax; if he joins the church, the tax becomes 12 percent! I

mentioned this last week to a friend who had been visiting relatives in still another Western Europe country; she reported a like situation there! Is it any wonder that Christianity is dying in such countries? Is this what we want here?

No church deserves to live if the believers do not support it, and no Christian school or parochial school can be true to the faith if it looks to our petty caesars, anti-Christians but not honest enough to say so, for their support.

Have our "spiritual men" gone mad as in Hosea's day? It is time to take stock of ourselves, and of our churches. They do not belong to us, nor to the clergy, nor to bishops, nor to the church and its authorities. They are Christ's possessions, His embassies to the nations. Hence Paul called himself an "ambassador" of Christ, and the church early called itself a *parochial*, an extraterritorial domain belonging to a foreign power, Christ the King (our word *parish* is derived from *parochial*). It is therefore outside state control, licensure, regulation, certification, or taxation. Are we about to surrender all this? Shall we soon see the churches join the ranks of those in our Lord's day who said, "we will not have this man to reign over us" (Luke 19:14). Will we crucify Christ afresh (Heb. 6:6) for, not silver, but paper?

"And if it seem evil unto you to serve the LORD, choose you this day whom ye will serve" (Josh. 24:15). Be honest about it: if Caesar is your lord, serve him, but if your Lord is Christ, serve Him with all your heart, mind, being, and *pocketbook*. Or is that too great a test of faith for you?

31

WHAT IS CIVIL RELIGION?

Chalcedon Report No. 207, November 1982

Among the dishonest charges levelled against Christian orthodoxy is the assertion that it has been and is guilty of "civil religion." Even reputable historians are assuming as fact this very dishonest claim; one such scholar speaks of John Foxe as a leader in the movement in which "the saga of the chosen people of the Old Testament" was identified with "the elect people of England." One evangelical "Amen Charlie" to the liberal establishment has written against the idea of a Christian state and "the notion that God has been at work" through the history of the American people and nation.

The fact is that the New Testament declares the continuity of the chosen people through the Christian community, which can include its churches, states, families, and more. The twelve apostles succeed the twelve patriarchs. The church is the true Israel of God, and believers are the sons of Abraham in Christ. The New Testament identifies the believer and the community of believers with the chosen people of the Old Testament.

This means that "the elect people of England," the United States, Canada, Japan, Chad, and all the world, and their institutions when brought under the dominion of Christ, are to be seen as in continuity with ancient Israel as God's chosen people. To deny this is to deny the Bible.

A civil religion is one in which the state is man's savior. This describes the modern state. A civil religion has no transcendence beyond the state; this is the faith of modernists and political liberals on the whole, and of non-Christian conservatives. In a civil religion, there is no power over the national or world state, and this again describes the faith of those who charge orthodoxy with "civil religion."

To deny the continuity of Christians with the chosen people of the Old Testament is to deny their salvation; it means that they are not the chosen

of God in Jesus Christ. It means that we are outside of Christ, David's greater Son, and that we have no part in the election of grace. For a man, church, school, family, state, or any other institution to be a part of the chosen people means that it is an instrument whereby God manifests His grace, law, order, and covenant to this world. Election means the sovereignty of grace.

Civil religion means the sovereignty of the state, never the sovereignty of God. It is civil religion which we see all around us in liberal religion and humanistic politics. M. Stanton Evans recently commented, with respect to our liberal churches, that they do not believe in mixing Christianity and politics, so they avoid Christianity altogether. This is civil religion!

32

THE FALSE DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

Chalcedon Report No. 334, May 1993

Few doctrinal heresies have received less attention than a remarkably audacious misuse of the authority of the Holy Ghost, or, the Holy Spirit. We have here one of the keys to an understanding of the modern world.

When apostles and elders met at the Council of Jerusalem, they debated and discussed the matter at hand and concluded, "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us . . . "; they thereby declared their decision to be that of God the Spirit also, a holy and an infallible Word. This set a pattern which the state in time imitated, claiming for itself the same authority in its pronouncements as did the Council of Jerusalem, i.e., the authority of God, the Spirit.

About A.D. 980, the Holy Roman emperor Otto III was portrayed on a sacramental vessel as the protector of the Holy Ghost, "because only he can restore the Jerusalem of Eternal Peace. To him is entrusted the Dove of Inspiration" (Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy, *Out of Revolution*, p. 503). Earlier, the pagan Roman Empire had regarded itself as *both* church and state; the civil magistrates were also priests, and the emperor was the *Pontifex Maximus*, a title later adopted by the papacy. The state was in Roman thought the supreme religious institution (Ernest Barker, *Church, State and Study*, pp. 11, 20, 32).

In *The King's Two Bodies*, Ernst H. Kantorowicz described the medieval political theology which in effect made the king a divine-human being like Christ, and the state therefore as his church. Pope John VIII praised the Carolingian emperor Charles II as "the savior of the world constituted by God," whom "God established as the Prince of His people in imitation of the true King Christ, His Son . . . so that what he [Christ] owned by nature, the king might attain to by grace" (p. 87).

In Matthew 18:20, our Lord declares, "For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." This text has been used to claim Christ's authority and infallibility for human decisions. Steadily, the decisions of civil counsels claimed the same authority. In England, under Henry VIII, John More told Thomas Cromwell,

> . . . an act of parliament made in the realm for the common wealth of the same ought rather to be observed within the same realm than any general council. And I think that the Holy Ghost is as verily present at such an act as it ever was at any general council. (Charles T. Wood, *Joan of Arc and Richard III*, p. 115.)

The presence of the Holy Spirit had been transferred from church to state, from general councils of the church to the parliaments and congresses of state.

Part of this shift meant the divine right of kings (and, later, parliaments) and the "healing touch" of the savior-kings as they "healed" the sick.

Even more, it meant that the realm of *inspiration* and *salvation* had been transferred from the church to the state. Many medieval and Reformation era preachers moved peoples greatly. In the Middle Ages, men like San Bernardino, Savonarola, and others, including unknown wandering friars, moved people powerfully and passionately. With the Reformation, people hung on the words of Luther, Calvin, Knox, and others. As late as Jacques Saurin, great throngs listened to preachers as oracles of God, as "Spirit-filled" men proclaiming God's Word.

At the same time, however, politicians began to command people similarly. Whether in parliament or congress, these humanistic orators began to command great throngs, and men hung on their words. The people were unconsciously adopting the new view of the state as man's true church and savior, and the statist leader as an oracle commanding life and the future.

As a result, political campaigns are now comparable to old-time camp meetings and revivals. They are occasions of intense passions and feelings by peoples whose hope for the future is a political hope. With the twentieth century in particular, the state became man's savior, and a succession of political messiahs were in evidence from Woodrow Wilson on.

The Holy Ghost was transferred from the church to the state and then secularized as the general will. Not surprisingly, Jean-Jacques Rousseau held the general will, the "New Holy Spirit," to be infallible. Where the church has been held to be infallible, the triumph of church power has meant often a cruel regard for those in dissent. This, however, was a

minor matter when compared to the powers of the infallible civil government. The twentieth century has seen the triumph of statism, and the highest percentage of mass murders, wartime deaths, state-created famines, slave labor camps, etc., in any century of all history. G. Elliot's *Twentieth Century Book of the Dead* documented the mass murders of statism.

Hegel's humanistic doctrine of the *Spirit* made the doctrine radically naturalistic and amoral. All restraints were removed, and the amoral, evolving *Geist* or Spirit simply did what it did, and there was no moral law over it. John More's civil Holy Ghost had blended with Hegel's naturalistic, evolutionary Spirit to create literally a "holy" terror.

St. Paul tells us, "where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty" (2 Cor. 3:17). Where the spirit of the modern state is, there is slavery and death.

We fail to understand the modern age unless we recognize that it possesses its own doctrine of the Spirit, but it is not the Spirit of God but something else.

The state, having claimed to be the possessor of the Spirit, however understood, has claimed thereby to be the source of justice (righteousness) and law. At the same time, churchmen have denied to God sovereignty and therefore the right to be the source of law and justice. Antinomianism has surrendered not only God's law but also His sovereignty, for, as the first edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* noted, "Law may be defined, The command of the sovereign power, containing a common rule of life for the subject." For most churchmen, that sovereign is no longer God but the state. They have sold their Lord for less than thirty pieces of silver, for nothing, in fact.

But God the Lord the King remains. And the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of truth, will be heard. Let the nations tremble.

33

INDULGENCES[1]

Chalcedon Report No. 324, July 1992

A sound covenantal theology is basic to true confession. The forms of confession can be observed without meaning. From the medieval era, if not from the earliest days of the church, however, confession has been made. It has essentially these elements. *First*, the sinner has to be repentant. There has to be contrition, sorrow for sin, and a desire to make amends. Then, *second*, the sin has to be confessed; this has taken different forms: to the congregation, to the offended person or persons, to the priest, or the pastor, depending on the era and the church laws; *third*, the sinner has to make some form of amends, satisfaction, or restitution, in order to be forgiven.

This requirement was early tied to being allowed to receive communion. This had and has the best of reasons: the church cannot treat communion as a rite to which any man, including an unrepentant sinner who has not made restitution, can have access. At this point a difference sets in, which, from one perspective, is a hair's width, and, from another, an unbridgeable canyon. The *church* acts as the agency for the confessional. The confession, however, is to God through Christ. If, in the mind of the sinner, or in the thinking of the church, the church and its functions take priority over God and His law-word, then the church compounds the sin and becomes the greater sinner. When, for example, the church compounds the evil by insisting on forgiveness and reconciliation where no restitution has been made, then the church's sin is much greater before God.

The church radically changed societies for the better by *insisting* on restitution rather than vengeance. We have no historian, to my knowledge,

1. This article is a section of a later published book on the theology of confession, *The Cure of Souls: Recovering the Biblical Doctrine of Confession.* — editor

who has studied the social revolution wrought by this insistence. It was a major battle against paganism, and it made civilization and godly law order possible. The basic premise of God's law is this: "To me belongeth vengeance and recompense" (Deut. 32:35). The whole point of God's law is to substitute God's law-word, His vengeance against sin, for man's vengeance. As God's law is bypassed, human devices take over, and justice wanes.

When pilgrimages were imposed in the medieval era for restitution as the penance of sin, the results were a boon to the economy of the pilgrimage cities, but no moral advancement for society. Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales* give us a telling account of how superficial these trips were to most pilgrims. This is not to deny that some pilgrims were truly contrite, but the pilgrimage could not replace restitution to God and to man.

Pilgrimages became good business, big business. They were in a sense precursors to the foreign travel plans of many a current travel agency. More than a few fundamentalist and evangelical churches sponsor trips to the "Holy Land," and the returning travelers are ecstatic on what a "blessing" the trip was. The godly went and returned godly people; the sanctimonious sinners were no different, despite their gush. The trips are minor semihistorical guided tours.

Erasmus, near the Reformation era, denounced pilgrimages as "tourist excursions" (Andrew McCall, *The Medieval Underworld* [New York, NY: Dorset Press, 1979], p. 34). The pilgrimages became less than holy, and a statute of Richard II in England, 1388, decreed that all persons claiming to be pilgrims who could not produce "a letter of passage" were to be arrested, unless infirm (ibid., p. 35n).

Pardoners were created by the medieval church to sell pardons, a fundraising device which rapidly fell into disrepute. The Council of Trent abolished the office. Long before then, pardoners, more than any other churchmen, perhaps, were held in disrepute. In *The Canterbury Tales* (ca. 1380s or 1390s), when it is the Pardoner's turn to tell a story, the other pilgrims at once told the host, "No, don't let him tell us any ribaldry! Tell us some moral thing so that we can be instructed, and then we shall be glad to listen." The Pardoner, an able preacher, gave them a good tale, but, at the finish, added:

> But sirs, I forget one word in my tale: I have relics and pardons in my bag, as fine as any man's in England, which were given to me by the Pope's own hand. If any of you wish, out of piety, to make an offering and to receive my absolution, come up at once, kneel down here, and humbly receive my pardon. Or else you can accept pardon as you travel, fresh and new at the end of every mile, just so you make another offering each time of nobles or pennies

> which are good and genuine. It is an honor to everyone here that you have available a pardoner with sufficient power to absolve you as you ride through the country, in case of accidents which might happen. Perhaps one or two of you will fall off your horses and break your necks. See what security is to all of you that I happen to be in your group and can absolve you, both high and low, when the soul passes from the body. I suggest that our Host, here, shall be first; for his is most enveloped in sin. Come on, Sir Host, make the first offering right now, and you can kiss each one of the relics. Yes, for just a groat! Unbuckle your purse at once. (*The Canterbury Tales of Geoffrey Chaucer*, modern English prose trans. by R. M. Lumiansky [New York, NY: Washington Square Press, 1960], pp. 298–299).

The host's answer was a very profane one: pardoners were not held in respect long before Erasmus. A pardoner, and many were "fakes," could make more money in one day than a person could in a month or more. Pardoners would disrupt church services and drown out the Mass with their loud preaching in church yards. Such indulgences were profitable to Rome and were therefore tolerated (McCall, *The Medieval Underworld*, p. 38).

There is a very important aspect to indulgences, in that what the church did, the kings soon imitated. In the place of God's law, the king's law began to prevail, and the sentence would be a long imprisonment unless the convicted person paid a heavy "fine" or ransom. Royal and presidential pardons have as their origin this precedent, now accepted as a privilege of being a high officer of state, in the United States, a governor or a president. There is no reason to believe that the medieval payments to the crown for the release of an offender have disappeared. Some current pardons and paroles are difficult to relate to justice. Kings assessed the ability of the offender to pay, and they assessed him accordingly. In McCall's words:

> Far more important, in their eyes, was the profit to be made out of granting pardons: so that on the whole, in the later Middle Ages, the buying of a pardon became a straightforward financial transaction; and once again, therefore, an important means of evading the full ferocity of the law was generally available to all but the impecunious, the friendless and those people who, whether as a group or individually, excited the particular enmity either of the King himself or of his judicial representatives. (ibid., p. 81.)

Many Protestants are very prone to cite the indulgences corruption that Luther confronted, but they are to obtuse to see our modern courts and legal system as an heir to the medieval indulgences system. Once men depart from God's law, they must create some kind of system to supplant it. Any substitute for God's law is evil. Thus, in considering the

meaning of Biblical confession and restitution, we must also face up to what its alternatives have been and are. They are all around us, in church and state, and they are varying forms of sin, whether practiced by men, churches, or states.

There would be a hue and cry today if *any* church attempted to sell indulgences. Why is there no like hue and cry when the same premise of indulgences is practiced by the state in a far worse form? Prisons are schools for crime and sodomy. Fines enrich the state: they do not make restitution to the offended person. Pardons often have reference to political pressure, not to justice. Protests against the death penalty for capital offenses are protests against God's justice.

Anyone who condemns the medieval system of indulgences without at the same time condemning our statist and humanistic legal system is a hypocrite.

The whole system of indulgences, whether by church or by state, denies that crimes and sins are essentially against God and His law. Luther's work is only half done, and the abolition of indulgences by the Council of Trent did not abolish its use by the state.

Chaucer's pilgrims ridiculed the Pardoner and held him in contempt, as does modern man, the state. The pilgrims, however, had *no answer* to what they knew to be an evil because they did not know the law-word of God. The modern citizen is more evil than the pardoners of old; he tolerates and supports an evil system of state indulgences as though it were justice. God's vengeance will not fail to exact His price.

34

JUDGMENT AND ATONEMENT

Chalcedon Report No. 362, September 1995

At one time, sermons on judgment and on atonement were commonplace. Now they are rare, and this is one reason why the church is relatively impotent. Consider, for example, Luke 11:49–51 and its meaning.

> Therefore also said the wisdom of God, I will send them prophets and apostles, and some of them they shall slay and persecute. That the blood of all the prophets, which was shed from the foundation of the world, may be required of this generation: From the blood of Abel unto the blood of Zacharias, which perished between the altar and the temple: verily I say unto you, It shall be required of this generation. (Luke 11:49–51)

Our Lord here speaks of Judaea in His day, and He summarizes much Old Testament teaching. Sin is either atoned for, or it accumulates as a judgment against a people. Past history is not morally past: it has present consequences. If a man seeks God's atonement, the burden of sin is cancelled. If not, the burden accumulates and becomes a growing drag on the present.

If we examine the problems confronting men and nations, we see quickly enough that they are a burden and an inheritance from the past. Present sins are always problems enough, but when past sins are added to them, then indeed the burden becomes a destructive one.

The meaning of atonement is that this burden is cancelled and removed. We then no longer go about as burdened, haunted peoples, bowed down with the impossible weight of sins from Abel to our time. We find in the atonement both the love and the justice of God, His justice giving the sinless One, God the Son, to make atonement for our sins, and His love, in that, "while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us" (Rom. 5:8). The legal necessity for atonement was met by Christ for us. There must

be the legal penalty of death for the transgression of the law, for rebellion against God, and God provides our substitute in Christ. "Sin is the transgression of the law" (1 John 3:4), and its penalty is death. This Jesus Christ assumes for us. Our sins find atonement in and through Him; they are covered, and they are blotted out. Sin is serious because the law is serious: it is the justice, the righteousness of God. The atonement is the only way out of the deadly cycle of sin and judgment, guilt and the burden of the past. Our sins are imputed to Christ: He bears our sins, our iniquity (Isa. 53:6, 12; John 1:29; 2 Cor. 5:21; Gal. 3:13; Heb. 9:28; 1 Pet. 2:24), the legal obligation and penalty which they incur.

If we are not in the grace of atonement, we are the heirs of all the sins of history from the murder of Cain of Abel to the present time. We may live respectably, and we may view sin as the work of street gangs and criminals, but unless we have by atonement been separated from the world of the fallen Adam, we have a grim inheritance of judgment.

"Sin is any want of conformity unto, or transgression of, the law of God" (1 John 3:4), according to the Westminster Shorter Catechism, Answer 14. The "respectable" man who rejects God and His law is no less guilty of the essential offense of rebellion against God than the criminal. His offenses against his fellow men may be minimal, but his offenses against God are great.

Our age minimizes both God's judgment and atonement because it minimizes sin. We live in an antinomian era, one which regards God's law as a relic of the past and as little more than a curiosity in our time. It will not recognize the crushing weight of man's past from Cain's sin to ours, because it refuses to recognize God as Sovereign. He is too often viewed by "believers" as a kindly, grandfatherly figure, and little more. *The wrath of God* is neither talked about nor preached.

Early in history, Indian thought recognized the seriousness of sin, and hence its doctrine of karma. But karma has no atonement; man must by virtue and by endless reincarnations work off his sin and guilt and thereby escape from his past. Few more hopeless doctrines are imaginable.

The current Western, humanistic discounting of sin has led to a like pessimism and despair about the future. For too many, humanistic psychotherapy has replaced atonement, with sad results. The churches have contributed to the problem by their antinomianism. Antinomianism undermines the doctrine of the atonement because it downgrades the law and also sin.

Our Lord's words in Luke 11:49–51, cited above, are commonly discounted, and their application is limited to Judaea in our Lord's day. But the Old Testament makes it clear that God holds all nations in all ages

accountable to Him and to His law. All men work either in the grace and freedom of the atonement, or under the curse and the burden of God's judgment. There is no middle ground.

We are evading Biblical religion if we ignore this fact. We can no more divorce ourselves from history and our responsibilities in it than we can divorce ourselves from our times, our families, our race, and our persons.

Harold J. Berman, in *Law and Revolution*, has shown how central to our Western legal system the doctrine of the atonement is, and how, with the decline of this doctrine, our law structures are collapsing. The churches, with their diluted or wayward theologies, have a key responsibility for our present crisis.

35

INFLATION

Chalcedon Report No. 198, February 1982

A news item recently called attention to the fact that Israel in 1981 had an inflation rate of 101.5 percent, down 30 percent from 1980, but not down to the 98 percent the state had sought to attain. Very obviously, the worst enemy Israel faces is its own inflation, not external enemies. In any country, inflation destroys values and penalizes the thrifty, hardworking, and solvent in favor of debtors. Moreover, wages never keep pace with inflation. (How many, I wonder, in Israel received a pay increase of 101.5 percent in 1981? The difference between the increase in income and inflation spells disaster everywhere.)

However, there is an even more serious aspect: inflation means that no true standard exists; every day the monetary "standard" is variable. But this points to a lack of standards in the people themselves. Instead of holding to a faith and moral law which is unchanging, a changing and unstable yardstick exists.

In the past two decades, we have seen changes in the prevailing judgment concerning abortion, homosexuality, and much, much more. These changes rest in the same perspective which produces inflation: the validity of all standards external to the will of man is denied. Man as his own god determines whatever he deems is good or evil.

Inflation does not stop because men deplore it, no more than crime ends because people are weary of its threat. A change in monetary policy is necessary, and the change in policy presupposes a change in perspective. In the early years after World War II, Richard Weaver wrote a book with a telling title: *Ideas Have Consequences*. Even more, we can say that a man's faith has consequences.

That humanism should lead us to the present crisis should not surprise us; humanists are true to their faith. The sad fact is that, with

evangelicals so numerous in the United States, their fruits are so few. Our Lord says, "by their fruits ye shall know them" (Matt. 7:20). If our faith is inflated with pious fluff, empty professions, and an unwillingness to obey the Lord, the churches will be as solvent as Israel, the Soviet Union the United States, Britain, and all other inflation-sick nations.

Is the church its own worst enemy?

36

IRRELEVANT CHURCH MEMBERS

Chalcedon Report No. 325, August 1992

It constantly amazes me how intensely some readers respond against any statement favorable to the clergy. (Some of these persons are not on our mailing list but have read a borrowed copy.) I am reminded of Isaiah 24:2, where God declares that His judgment will fall equally on all the unfaithful. His judgment will be "as with the people, so with the priest; as with the servant, so with his master; as with the maid, so with her mistress; as with the buyer, so with the seller; as with the lender, so with the borrower; as with the taker of usury, so with the giver of usury to him."

Consider now, how faithful are you to the Lord? Do you obey His law-word? Do you tithe? (There are certainly more than a few godly groups and missions deserving of your tithe.) Are your children in a Christian school, or homeschooled, or are they in humanistic, statist hands for indoctrination? Besides going to church, are you applying the faith to your daily life? Do you thank God regularly for His providential care? Do you thank faithful pastors and Christians for their work?

Do you demand a Christian America when you do not vote nor contribute to the campaigns of godly candidates? (About 50 percent of evangelicals do not vote, and only perhaps 1–2 percent will support a candidate financially.)

Is it any wonder that Christians, clearly the majority in the United States, are irrelevant? Who can respect such impotence?

The churches have become large and powerful institutions. They are everywhere in our cities and towns. (I know of one small town, not too far away, with six active churches and a population of perhaps 1,700. This is not unusual. Only one of those churches is modernist.) But what good is a Rolls-Royce, a Mercedes, or a Volkswagen if it is only kept in the garage? Are we not told by our Lord that "By their fruits ye shall know

them" (Matt. 7:20), and, by His brother James, "For as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also" (James 2:26)? We may tolerate dead bodies, but the Lord by His judgments buries them.

Church membership is at an all-time high, but not Christianity. What good are well-paved city sidewalks if they are unsafe to walk on? "Except the LORD build the house, they labour in vain that build it: except the LORD keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain" (Ps. 127:1).

In some of our previous issues of the *Chalcedon Report*, you have read of the charitable ministry of one of our staff members, John Upton, Orphan Aid, and also his work in gaining free surgical corrections for deformed children whose parents cannot afford the costs. John received savage hostility from the ungodly; his office was broken into and his records destroyed and only reconstituted with difficulty. Well, from the ungodly, this was not too surprising. But the attacks from church people were startling. Their attitude was, "By what church authority do you do these things?" The question is not new. We are told in Matthew 21:23, "And when he [Jesus] was come into the temple, the chief priests and the elders of the people came unto him as he was teaching, and said, By what authority doest thou these things? and who gave thee this authority?" Men who will not do the work of the Lord have always been prone to challenge the work of those who do. John Upton not only wept and sobbed over the sight of the discarded Romanian children, he did something about it and continues to do so. By what authority can he be challenged? *Not by the Lord's.* Children are being salvaged physically and saved spiritually.

It is time for the pulpit and the pew to abandon their pharisaic irrelevance to the challenges confronting them. And it is time to support all godly activities. We cannot be blessed by God if we are like the sleeping virgins whose lamps burned out (Matt. 25:1–13). Let us give heed to St. Paul's words to the church. "Awake, thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light" (Eph. 5:14).

37

IRRELEVANCE OF CHURCHMEN

Chalcedon Report No. 104, April 1974

It was around 1660 that the structure of Western civilization began its shift from a Christian to a humanistic basis. In England, this meant the accession of Charles II; in France, Louis XIV was soon to begin changing the country; Germany, recuperating from the Thirty Years' War, was no longer determined by religion but by the balance of power. Spain was lacking in the religious fervor of Philip II of some years previously, and Russia was beginning its westernization in terms of humanism.

Earlier, the goal of all Christians had been godly rule in every area of life: in the individual by means of regeneration and sanctification, in the state by means of obedience to God's law, in education by the government of all disciplines in terms of Christian premises, and in every area of life by the Scriptures. But, as Lamont pointed out, "By 1660 these assumptions are no longer widely tenable . . . Virtue was now an end in itself, not a means to an end" (i.e., the world under God's law), and the province of religion was reduced to the inner life alone (William M. Lamont, *Godly Rule: Politics and Religion, 1603–60* [London, England: Macmillan, 1969], pp. 163, 166). The older dream persisted longer in America and was revived by some theologians after 1740, but in the mid-1800s, it too had faded.

Increasingly, the church saw itself in terms of a new calling. Previously, it had declared the requirements of the Word of God for every area of life. It had required the state to be specifically Christian, the schools to educate in terms of the Word of God, callings and vocations to be governed by Biblical premises, and every area of life to be under the dominion of God. The requirement to be Christian was not limited to the church: it was mandatory for the whole world and for every aspect and sphere thereof. After 1660, and especially with the rise of pietism, the role of the church (and the Christian) was limited to *piety and worship*. Previously,

this limited concern had been the characteristic of mystics and some (but by no means all) cloistered persons, monks and nuns. Now, the entire church began to remake itself into a cloister. "Every man a priest" had become "every man a monk."

As the church began its slow retreat from the world, the humanists began their conquest of it. The state was first of all captured, and, especially after the French Revolution, became more and more openly humanistic in one country after another. Schools were also captured, turned into state institutions, and made the voices of the new established religion, humanism. Law was steadily changed from a Biblical to a humanistic basis and one area after another captured for the new religion. This conquest was capped by the possession of the churches by the new religion. Priest and pastor began to proclaim, not the Word of God, but the word of man, not regeneration by the sovereign and saving grace of God, but revolution by the supposedly sovereign power of man. Not the Kingdom of God but the kingdom of man was the gospel of the new order in the churches. The new pilgrimage of man was not to Bethlehem or Golgotha, but to Dracula's castle (see report no. 103).

This was not the first time humanism had captured the church, nor the first time the church had been irrelevant to its purpose and hostile to it. Barraclough has written, of the Renaissance popes, that "the popes of the first half of the fifteenth century, from Martin V to Nicholas V, gave way again both to fiscalism on a scale unthought of earlier (for example, the wholesale creation of new offices for the sole purpose of selling them), and to nepotism so unashamed (for example, the placing of the pope's illegitimate offspring in the college of Cardinals) that it might be thought that Christendom would have revolted in scandal. What is astounding is that it did not: and the fact that it did not is the best evidence that people had, so to say, already 'written off' the papacy; it no longer had any hold over men's minds — not even enough to provoke angry hostility" (Geoffrey Barraclough, *The Medieval Papacy* [New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1968], p. 192). Once again, the church does not matter much, because it has ceased to be relevant: its gospel is the state. It has confused godly rule with statist rule, and its answer to most problems is the capture and control of the state.

What marvelous wisdom churchmen have shown in recent years: now that the ship of state is sinking, they clamber aboard! The gospel of statism is creating a world crisis for civilization, and the churches have found it to be the hope of man, not his problem. Apparently in the belief that a drowning man needs more water, churchmen are giving a world sickened by means of humanism even more humanism.

But the irrelevance of churchmen does not mean the irrelevance of God, who is the only ground of all relevance. All things have their being and their meaning in His creative act, and no reconstruction, progress, or hope is tenable or possible apart from Him.

The crisis of our time is a hopeful and heartening fact: it means emphatically that the world is under God's law, that what a man sows that shall he also reap. True, it means times of crisis and judgment, but how else is history cleared of the debris of man's sin and folly? What takes place on television is pale and lifeless when compared to the excitement and development of the world around us. History is the work of God, and it has a good beginning and ending.

38

GOVERNMENT AND THE DIACONATE

Chalcedon Report No. 354, January 1995

Over the years, I have repeatedly stressed the fact that it is a dangerous and potentially totalitarian fact to speak of *the state as the* government. The word *government* means many things. For us it must mean primarily the self-government of the Christian man as the *first* and basic sphere of government. If man is not self-governing, then every other sphere of government is warped. The *second* sphere is the family, and its importance in Scripture is evident from beginning to end. The family is indeed the great nursery and training ground for all spheres of government, including and especially, self-government. *Third*, the church is a government, and like the family, God-ordained. *Fourth*, the school is a government, as is, *fifth*, our vocation, which governs us daily. *Sixth*, a variety of private organizations, community relationships, and personal and family networks all govern us. Then, *seventh*, the state is a government, one form among many. In the English-speaking world, and in this country for generations, it was referred to as *civil government*, not government per se.

These spheres of government are in their fullness a product of Christianity. In most of the world, religion has been controlled by the state as a department thereof. For example, Rome allowed no unlicensed religion or god. The Roman Senate could make and unmake gods. No unlicensed groups, organizations, or meetings were permitted. Islam sees the state as the true church, and so on and on. The division of life into dependent, interacting spheres is an aspect of Biblical faith, with deep roots in the Old Testament.

This Biblical perspective is heightened by the fact of the tithe and the tax. According to Numbers 18:25–26, the Levites were to receive the tithe and then tithe a tenth part of the tithe to the priests. The care of the sanctuary and its music were given to the Levites, as were health, education,

and charity. Deacons in the early church were called Levites because such areas were under their control. The civil tax, called an atonement or covering, protecting tax, was half a shekel, the same for all males aged twenty and over. Well into the medieval era *at least*, this tax was collected among Jews for civil purposes (Exod. 30:11–16). What this tells us is that neither church nor state was to be, under God's law, a powerful institution commanding society. The Levites, later deacons, had more extensive and diffuse duties. The Levites were not a centralized institution, but local ministers of God's grace and mercy.

The pattern is a clear one: a high degree of decentralization, with a strong emphasis on the individual and his family to govern in their spheres and to provide the necessary support to enable the Levites, or the deacons and their coworkers, to minister in God's Name.

We first meet deacons in the New Testament in Acts 6. The early church was practicing the Biblical care of the needy in its midst. The work became too much for the apostles, and seven deacons were chosen. The Levitical duties were thus given to a new order of Levites. These deacons not only cared for widows but also taught, and in Acts 7 we see Stephen as a powerful teacher of the faith. In Philippians 1:1, Paul addresses "the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons." The deacons are clearly important in the Lord's service. In 1 Timothy 3:10–13, we see how similar the requirements for deacons are to those for bishops or presbyters:

> And let these also first be proved; then let them use the office of a deacon, being found blameless. Even so must their wives be grave, not slanderers, sober, faithful in all things. Let the deacons be the husbands of one wife, ruling their children and their own houses well. For they that have used the office of a deacon well purchase to themselves a good degree, and great boldness in the faith which is in Christ Jesus.

Perhaps a good summary of deacons in the early centuries is that given by Schaff:

> The office of these deacons, according to the narrative in Acts, was to minister at the table in the daily love-feasts and to attend to the wants of the poor and the sick. The primitive churches were charitable societies, taking care of the widows and orphans, dispensing hospitality to strangers, and relieving the needs of the poor. The presbyters were the custodians, the deacons the collectors and distributors, of the charitable funds. To this work a kind of pastoral care of souls very naturally attached itself, since poverty and sickness afford the best occasions and the most urgent demand for edifying instruction and consolation. Hence, living faith and exemplary conduct were necessary qualifications for the office of deacon.

> Two of the Jerusalem deacons, Stephen and Philip, labored also as preachers and evangelists, but in the exercise of a personal gift rather than of official duty.
>
> In post-apostolic times, when the bishop was raised above the presbyter and the presbyter became priest, the deacon was regarded as Levite, and his primary function of care of the poor was lost in the function of assisting the priest in the subordinate parts of public worship and the administration of the sacraments. The diaconate became the first of the three orders of the ministry and a stepping-stone of the priesthood. At the same time the deacon, by his intimacy with the bishop as his agent and messenger, acquired an advantage over the priest. (Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, vol. 1, [New York, NY: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1882], pp. 499–500)

There is no adequate history of the diaconate, but one fact in its history deserves both attention and revival. Just as the presbyter's calling is a full-time ministry, so, too, the deacon's service requires a full-time commitment. As the church revives and strengthens the diaconate and makes it a vocation for those called to it, so, too, will the church grow and society become steadily Christianized. Nothing is clearer from Acts than the fact that the seven deacons were not part-time workers but full-time servants of Christ. The Christian Levites were the functioning grace and mercy of Christ's Kingdom. The deacons revealed clearly that Christ's Kingdom is indeed a government. The works of charity carried on by the deacons were in marked contrast to the costly and evil welfarism of Rome. At times, this made deacons a special target of persecution because their work not only manifested Christ's royal government, but also His grace and mercy.

We today face the coming collapse of the welfare state and its programs, all of which have helped to destroy the recipients of statist welfare. As our modern Rome faces collapse, we need to revive the diaconate in its holy and necessary calling.

All this leads in one direction and to one conclusion: *we must take government back from the state and restore it to Jesus Christ*. The *government* in every sphere of life and thought *must be* and shall be upon His shoulder (Isa. 9:6). Because He is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords (1 Tim. 6:15), nothing can be withheld from His rule. He has said, "*All power* is given unto me in heaven and in earth" (Matt. 28:18), and I therefore find it baffling that churchmen who profess to believe the Bible prefer their political party to God's Christ and to God's law.

The church has confused worship with Christianity. The church is a barren place if it be no more than a worship center. It must be the training

center, the barracks building of God's army, where Christ's people are prepared to exercise dominion in those spheres of life which surround them.

A letter I received a few days ago from a young man in the deep South very clearly raises an issue which is critically important for our time. He wrote in part:

> I have a Christian roommate who maintains an eschatology that pre-tribulation dispensationalism is proven to be the only end-time occurrence according to Scripture.
>
> I told him I was a reconstructionist postmillennialist of the Augustinian school of teaching, that I thought the Church of Jesus Christ would prevail in real time. I do not believe in a pre-tribulation rapture.
>
> My roommate said I was a heretic and all postmillennialists are heretics.
>
> Do you have any advice for me? He also said that a professing Christian need not lead a holy life to be saved. He just makes a profession of faith on the spot and he gets zapped with the Holy Spirit and he is saved just like that.
>
> What is your opinion of the above? (Letter, in part, of September 1994)

Such thinking is commonplace. Sadly, many who are neither Arminian nor dispensationalist premillennialists have come to believe that a bare confession of faith is binding on God but not on them. Such positions may *appeal* to the Bible, but they are not *governed* by the Word of God.

I began by calling attention to the fact that we today falsely equate *government* with the state, or civil government. At times over the centuries, the church or some of the churches have sought to equate government with the *state*. If Isaiah 9:6, Matthew 28:18, and many other texts are right, we must equate government with our Lord, Jesus Christ. He is Priest, Prophet and King.

As our great High Priest, He has made atonement for us, intercedes for us, and prays for us. As the great Prophet, He speaks God's clear and infallible word to us. As King, He is our ruler and our lawgiver. If we look elsewhere for any of these things, we are faithless, because other lords have then had dominion over us (Isa. 26:13).

When other lords have dominion over us, the Lord God gives us over into captivity to our enemies. He will not defend nor bless those who will not have Him as their King. This is why we are in the state we are in. The question, then, is this: "Why speak ye not a word of bringing the King back? (2 Sam. 19:10).

39

THE UNKNOWN JOHN CALVIN

Chalcedon Report No. 347, June 1994

An historian, Stephen A. McKnight, has called attention to the significance of Boccaccio's thinking as manifested in the first story of *The Decameron*. The setting is the plague of 1348. Seven ladies and three young men leave the city for the countryside to escape the plague. They retreat from the church and prayer because they see it as futile in the face of the plague. They entertain themselves with cynical stories about people *and* the church. The first story concerns a notary, a scoundrel, described as "belike the worst man that ever was born" (*The Decameron of Giovanni Boccaccio*, trans. John Payne [New York, NY: Triangle Books, (1931) 1940], p. 18). While visiting Burgundy on business, this man, Ciapperello da Prato, fell deathly ill. A cheat, a thief, a lecher, and a murderer, Ciapperello makes a radically false confession to a priest in which he appears to be a saintly man with a tender conscience. He concludes with a general statement of confession shrewdly intended as a manipulation of the rite in his favor. The naïve friar priest takes Ciapperello to be a saint, and he is buried in holy ground; miracles ensue at the grave of this "holy" man.

McKnight pointed out that here and elsewhere, Boccaccio developed "the key theme of appearance versus reality" (Stephen A. McKnight, *Sacralizing the Secular: The Renaissance Origins of Modernity* [Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 1989], 31n). In fact, "Boccaccio's characters demonstrate that — at least on the human plane — appearance is reality" (ibid.). Boccaccio, a priest, saw life as secular. He affirmed "the intrinsic value of secular existence." *The sacred and the secular are no longer essentially related by God's government and providence.* In fact, "The sacred does not disappear; there is still concern for salvation, but salvation seems to have little to do with everyday life" (ibid., p. 32). We see this conclusion in men like Galileo, who limited

the relevance of the Bible to salvation (ibid., p. 3ff.). The Bible was no longer seen as governing the totality of life and thought, but as limited to salvation and to providing a devotional manual. It was no longer seen as marching orders for all of life.

A new temper now prevailed, in Catholicism, and in Protestantism later on. The Bible was viewed narrowly as a church manual, and no more. Later on, in men like Bacon, Comte, and Marx, the new temper was developed further, according to McKnight:

> . . . each writer's work displays the three primary characteristics of modernity: the consciousness of an epochal break with the past; a conviction that this break is due to an epistemological advance; and the belief that this new knowledge provides man the means of overcoming his alienation and regaining his true humanity. (ibid., p. 91)

We can begin to see why Christianity is so impotent now. We live in a secularized world, where appearance *is* reality, and where Christianity is no longer seen as truly universal a faith but is limited to a concern for the afterlife. Biblical law is denied, and Calvinism is reduced to ideas about God and predestination, whereas it is much more because it requires the government of all things by God and His law-word. It is an abandonment of Christianity not to see Jesus Christ as now and forever "the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords" (1 Tim. 6:15). If Christ is not our King, then He is not our Priest nor Prophet. His offices are inseparable. How can He be our Prophet if He is not the absolute, King, Lord, and Governor of all creation? And how can Christ be our great High Priest if He is not totally efficacious in His royal government of all things? Christianity no longer commands all things because it has been limited to a faith for the church rather than a faith for the world and for every sphere of life and thought. It has ceased to be universal or catholic, and catholicity does not mean control but a universality of total and efficacious relevance. A limited Christ is simply no Christ at all.

John Calvin sought to restore catholicity to the faith. As C. Gregg Singer observed, "Calvin found in the Scriptures the only adequate remedy for the human dilemma" (C. Gregg Singer, "Calvin and the Social Order," in Jacob T. Hoogstra, ed., *John Calvin: Contemporary Prophet: A Symposium* [Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1959], p. 229). The charge of bibliolatry is often leveled against Calvin and his successors precisely because the Bible is the norm. As against the word of man, Calvinism affirms the Word of God. As Singer noted, the problems faced by modern sociology exist "simply because modern America has neglected those basic Biblical principles which God has given for the guidance of His people" (C. Gregg

Singer, *John Calvin: His Roots and Fruit* [Philadelphia, PA: Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Co., 1967], p. 68). Calvin held that, because God is God, all men are under the discipline of His moral law (Basil Hall, *John Calvin* [London, England: Routledge and Kegan Paul, (1956) 1962], p. 27). Calvin saw every aspect of the faith as very important. For example, he took the virtue of hospitality so seriously that he welcomed with joy strangers passing through Geneva (Emanuel Stickelberger, *Calvin: A Life* [Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1954], p. 83). This is an aspect of Calvin's life we must not forget. As a young man, Calvin left Noyon for Paris, at the risk of his life, to meet with Servetus in the hope of converting him. Servetus did not keep the appointment. Years later, when Servetus was a prisoner, Calvin reminded him of that episode (R. N. Carew Hunt, *Calvin* [London, England: Centenary Press, 1933], p. 47).

For Calvin, the kingship of Christ over all things was far more than a vague title. Commenting on Isaiah 9:6, "and the government shall be upon his shoulder," Calvin wrote,

> He therefore shows that the Messiah will be different from indolent kings, who leave off business and cares, and live at their ease; for he will be able to *bear the burden*. Thus he asserts the superiority and grandeur of his government, because by his own power Christ will obtain homage to himself, and he will discharge his office, not only with the tips of his fingers, but with his full strength. (John Calvin, *Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Isaiah*, vol. 1 [Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1958], p. 308).

The kingship of Christ is a working rule. The Christian is called to extend the scope of the Kingdom into every realm. The early and medieval church had governed education, charity, and more. By Calvin's time, the cities had invaded these spheres, taking over the ownership of hospitals, orphanages, and so on. Such a situation prevailed in Geneva. Both with the help of the council and without it, Calvin moved to a full ministry to human needs. Deacons were assigned to their duties: *hospitals* were an important area. A hospital then was housing for pilgrims, orphans, the elderly poor, the sick, and others. Poor relief included those in and out of hospitals alike. Jobs were created for the healthy poor, who had to work to receive aid. At that time, the vagrancy problem in Europe was a major one because plague and war had destroyed the old patterns. The poor had to be cared for, according to Calvin, as a Christian duty. We have two accounts of Reformed worship, and its stress on alms:

> (1551) He finishes the sermon in the space of an hour, and, a prayer having been added, concludes. At first he admonishes the church, if there are any worthy or necessary reasons — no doubt if there are marriages or baptisms, if

> any poor or sick person commends himself to the prayers of the church, and other things of the kind.
>
> Meanwhile two deacons walk about the whole church asking from each person alms for the use of the poor, but in silence, in order that they may not disturb the prayers. Thus they place before the eyes of each one a little bag hung on a long staff. And the same (deacons) stand at the door of the church, so that if those who were more intently attending to the prayers contributed nothing, they may give their alms in going out. (Elsie Anne McKee, *John Calvin on the Diaconate and Liturgical Almsgiving* [Geneva, Switzerland: Librairie Droz S.A., 1984], p. 39)

Another account gives us a like report on the importance of charity in Calvinistic worship:

> Then, a psalm having been sung, the whole church is dismissed in peace by the preacher, with the commendation of the poor and the blessing, in these words: "Remember your poor and let each in turn pray for the others. And may God have mercy on you and bless you. May the divine countenance shed His light upon you for the glory of His holy name, and keep you in His holy and saving peace. Amen."
>
> When, however, these things are said by the preacher, the deacons according to their turns must place themselves in order at the doors of the church, and after the church is dismissed, they diligently collect alms at the very doors of the church, and immediately they write down whatever they have collected, in the church itself. Moreover, this is also customarily always observed in all the other gatherings of the church. (ibid., p. 40)

The importance of the concluding clause cannot be stressed too much: "This is also customarily *always* observed in *all* the other gatherings of the church." The charitable concern one for another marked all church meetings. Very obviously, the life of faith and the life of the church meant exactly what Paul said in Ephesians 4:25, "for we are members one of another."

This is an aspect of Calvin's thinking, and of the Reformed churches in those years and later, that we seldom hear mentioned. Failure, however, to stress this aspect of Calvinism means to misunderstand it. It was not merely doctrine: it was faith and life inseparably connected.

Calvin himself answered the question, which are the Reformed churches?, with these words:

> Do we want to show that there is reformation among us? We must begin at this point, that is, there must be pastors who bear purely the doctrine of salvation, and then deacons who have the care of the poor. (ibid., p. 184)

We hear routinely that the Reformed definition of a true church is one

where the Word is faithfully preached, the sacraments properly administered, and true discipline enforced. All this has its place, but Calvin gave an intensely practical definition:

> We saw this morning what position St. Paul discusses here, that is, that of those who in the ancient church were ordained to distribute the alms. It is certain that God wants such a rule observed in His church; that is, that there be care for the poor — and not only that each one privately support those who are poor, but that there be a public office, people ordained to have the care of those who are in need so that things may be conducted as they ought. And if that is not done, it is certain that we cannot boast that we have a church well-ordered and according to the gospel, but there is just so much confusion. (ibid., p. 183)

Almsgiving was made a basic aspect of worship. Calvin saw both church and state under Christ's kingship. He did not downgrade material things such as almsgiving. He held, "From this we also gather that no form of life is more praiseworthy before God than that which yields usefulness to society" (ibid., p. 118). It is true that the Five Points of Calvinism do summarize doctrine of great importance to Calvin. It is true, also, that the three marks of a church can be found in Calvin. All the same, they give us a warped summary of Calvinism if we neglect the very great importance to Calvin of Christian charity, of being members one of another. To discuss Calvin without reference to his stress on the diaconate is like describing Switzerland with never a reference to the Alps. It can be accurate as far as it goes, but still be false.

We have seen how Boccaccio replaced reality with appearance. This became the Renaissance view, and it is seen very clearly in Castiglione's *Book of the Courtier.* Calvin's perspective was a plain and clear return to reality. Neither the ungodly nor the churchy are happy with it, but this is their loss in a fearful way.

40

THE MESSENGER OF LIGHT

Chalcedon Report No. 317, December 1991

In a very, very important and much neglected text, St. Paul tells us:

> For such are false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ. And no marvel; for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light. Therefore it is no great thing if his ministers also be transformed as the ministers of righteousness; whose end shall be according to their works. (2 Cor. 11:13–15)

The word *angel* means *messenger*, i.e., a messenger of God. Thus Satan is here presented as one who appears as a messenger of light, truth, or justice (righteousness). With this in mind, let us look at some of the main appearances of Satan in the Bible.

First, we meet him as the "serpent" in Genesis 3:1–5 (cf. Rev. 12:9). The word translated as *serpent* from the Hebrew has the implication of "the shining one." Thus, in God's chosen place, the Garden of Eden, this messenger of truth appears to say that God's every word is not to be believed or obeyed. "Yea, hath God said?" (Gen. 3:1). This false angel or messenger, the bearer of supposed truth, then declares that man's true fulfillment comes in being one's own god, one's own determiner of good and evil, right and wrong, law and morality (Gen. 3:1–6). He does not issue a summons to do evil but to see the light!

Second, we again meet with Satan in a holy place, heaven, before the Lord, to accuse God's righteous man, Job, of being self-centered, not just (Job 2:1–7). Again Satan professes to be the advocate of truth and light, so that he is once more accusing God of evil while presenting himself as the champion of truth. His program is emphatically not God's law-word and grace.

Third, in Zechariah 3:1–10, Satan appears to indict Joshua, the high

priest, as unfit for God's service because he is an unclean man in Satan's eyes. This messenger of truth denies both God's law and grace in favor of a humanistic truth and light. Humanism is the world's second oldest religion (Gen. 3:1–6), and its "truth" is man-made, and its "light" comes from man's self-centered thinking.

Fourth, we again meet this false messenger of light and justice in Matthew 4:1–11, in the temptation of our Lord. Here his program of light is very plainly stated: (*a*) "Command that these stones be made bread." If you are indeed a just God incarnate, solve the economic problems of mankind first. Give men cradle-to-grave, or womb-to-tomb, security. Anything short of that by an omnipotent God is injustice and cruelty; this was a demand for a welfare or socialist economy; (*b*) "cast thyself down" from the "pinnacle of the temple" and have God's angels rescue thee; make faith unnecessary; provide men with sight, with evidence that demands only one verdict, because faith is too difficult a way; (*c*) "fall down and worship me," i.e., recognize the rightness and justice of my position and that I am man's true friend and savior, the true messenger of light. Our Lord's answer to all three temptations came from God's law: "It is written . . . It is written . . . It is written . . ." God the Son stood *only* on God's law-word. He was the true light.

Fifth, we meet Satan in St. Paul's words in 2 Corinthians 11:13–15. He is in the church: only the best places for him! There was no need to work on Nero; fallen men are already champions of Satan's false light. He is in the church, in "false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of light" like their master, who presents himself as an "angel" or messenger "of light." His ministers, Satan's ministers, have now presented themselves "as the ministers of righteousness" or justice. Our Lord shortly after the temptation affirmed that the whole law of God stands (Matt. 5:17–19); we live in terms of God's grace and law. Thus, once again, we meet with Satan, in the church, in high places, claiming to be the true apostles. Satan is not on skid row: he is, whether in church, state, or any place else, schools and universities included, wherever men claim to present the truth, or personal or social salvation, apart from Christ and the whole Word of God. He is there as the supposed and pretended messenger of light and justice.

Such men worked against St. Paul. Paul, however, made it clear that such people

> . . . trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ. But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. (Gal. 1:7–8)

But, from Paul's time to ours, such accursed and pretended messengers of light are very much in evidence in every sphere.

To cite an example, a few years ago, a man left a grace-filled wife and boys to go to another state with a married woman. After a time, he abandoned her, then a second woman. He later secured a Mexican divorce, married a third woman with whom he went heavily into group sex orgies. (Later, he was wanted in two states for swindling widows.) Meanwhile, a lawyer advised the abandoned wife to get a divorce; since her state did not recognize Mexican divorces as valid, the ex-husband could return and take the house, which she was paying for. She was at once ostracized by one church after another. Ministers did not want a divorced woman; she should have kept a light burning for him in the window until death. One nationally prominent pastor told her: maybe he left you because you kept your legs crossed. This godly woman who alone reared her children, supported them, and kept them, with difficulties, faithful to Christ, gained mainly abuse from "respectable" pastors who wanted good donors, not people with problems. I could recite endless cases of this sort. I have spoken with two persons involved in like situations in the past two days.

It is not I but God Himself, through St. Paul and all of Scripture, who warns us that Satan comes as an angel or messenger of light, or the true faith, and it both hurts and angers me as a pastor to see men in church, state, and elsewhere pretending to be the sources of light as servants of Satan, respectable servants, of course!

But Jesus Christ alone is that "true Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world" (John 1:9). All men know His truth, even though they hold it down or suppress it in their unrighteousness or injustice (Rom. 1:18). From start to finish, the Bible is the Word of the triune God, of God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost. Men need to live "by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God" (Matt. 4:4). As the Father says of the incarnate Son, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; *hear ye Him*" (Matt. 17:5).

41

FAILURE AND RECOVERY

Chalcedon Report No. 69, May 1, 1971

An age without faith and the leadership of faith is like a rudderless ship. It will be driven by every current and is destined for shipwreck, unless it is repaired and given direction.

The central failure of the modern age has been the failure of the churches. In the United States, as nowhere else in the world, the culture should be dominated by the churches. The majority of Americans are church members. If we eliminate those who are modernists, we must still recognize that thirty to forty million Protestants claim to be evangelicals who believe that the Bible is the infallible Word of God. No other group in America, however, has less impact on the national life. The communists, who are less than 1 percent of the population, exercise a deeper influence. But this is not all. The more this Protestant evangelicalism is "revived," the more irrelevant it becomes. The deeply rooted antinomianism of its pietism (and the same antinomianism or anti-law temper is apparent in Roman Catholic pietism, as witness St. Alphonsus Maria de Liguori) has made it unable to work effectively in society. It has become present-oriented and experiential. Its answer to problems is not the application of God's law-word to man and society, but instead a yearning for more emotional experiences and supposedly charismatic manifestations. Such experiences have been pursued to the point of the demonic.

Jesus Christ required His followers to be good fruit-pickers, "by their fruits ye shall know them" (Matt. 7:20). He came as the great Redeemer to save His people by grace, in order to restore them to the way of sanctification, the law (Matt. 5:17–18; Luke 16:17; Rom. 8:4). The law of God is His future-oriented program for man and society; it is the means of warfare and conquest which God has ordained. The emphasis on experience as a substitute for law is antinomian and anti-Christian. The

"Jesus freaks" who want to repeat with God what they experienced with narcotics ("Freak out with Jesus") are guilty of blasphemy as well as irrelevance. Their concern is not with God but with themselves. Quite rightly, the reviewer of one such leader's book commented, "after all the shouting and talking about God, it is Mr. B. (the hippy pastor-author), not our Lord who is the hero of the book." What people seek in pietist experiences is themselves and their satisfaction or fulfillment; what they seek in obeying the law-word of God by faith is His kingdom and righteousness.

Pietism is a form of modernism. The open modernist finds his truth in the world, not in God's enscriptured Word. The pietist formally retains that Word but practically denies it. When science began to dominate the minds of men in the eighteenth century, it emphasized *experimentalism* as the main and even only source of truth. This idea infiltrated the churches, and "experimental religion" or revivalism was born. To "prove" his conversion, many American churches demanded experimental or experiential evidence in the form of a revival experience. Godly faith and law-abiding living were not accepted as proof. Christian schools were regarded with hostility as a breeding ground of formal or "head" religion as against "heart" religion, and the result was that the churches began their decline from relevance. From men who worked to bring every area of life and thought into captivity to Christ, churchmen became men who sought an emotional experience within and retreated from the world into the cell of their withdrawn souls. To such people, Christian schools and postmillennial thinking became horrors to be decried. From being the dominating and future-oriented leaders of society, the churches began their retreat to a lower-class, present- and experience-oriented status. Even the Calvinistic Presbyterians were conquered by the new trend. Faith was not enough for church membership; they began to require an "experience."

Not surprisingly, the whole tradition of pietism has been readily infected by existentialism (Kierkegaard and others among Protestants, Gabriel Marcel among Roman Catholics), and with good reason. Existentialism is simply a more honest and rigorous form of experimentalism and pietism. It emphasizes the moment, and the experience of the moment, in divorce from the past, all law, and all schooling and morality. Logically, Sartre and others divorce that experience even from God to bring about the total self-concern of the questing, experiencing soul.

Because of this emphasis on experience, increasingly the churches seek new dimensions of experience for their members, new forms of worship, "Jesus rock," participation in demonstrations, the experience of peoples of other colors, sensitivity training, and so on. "Social relevance" is to be

found, they insist, in experience. A hard, systematic study of Scripture, the application of this knowledge of Scripture to the problem of communism, economics, race, political society, and family order is avoided. Not study, not an understanding in the light of Scripture of our world and problems, but an existential experience is held to be the answer. With amazing callousness and brutality, people are used to provide these experiences. Import some black children, they insist, into your Christian school or church, and give your children and adults a new dimension of experience. Trot out some minority groups into our groups, so that we can revel in our growing social experience. Like dolls that are moved at will by little girls in their play, so these churchmen want to treat people, as lifeless dolls to dance to their tune, so that their social experience may be enriched and fulfilled. Not surprisingly, the black response to this unfeeling integration game has been black nationalism and an ugly, hostile segregationism.

Into this world of a decaying church, Marxism made an easy headway. The conquests of Marxism have been largely violent and brutal. They have been grounded on conspiratorial and revolutionary action. This action has been made possible, however, by the default of all other leadership. The growing bankruptcy of the modern world made it susceptible to overthrow by any well-organized group, because the real revolution had already occurred. That real revolution was the progressive abandonment and overthrow of orthodox Christianity by leaders and people. The forms of faith were retained, but the power was gone, and the collapse of the churches was rapid.

Marxism, despite its evils, was at least future-oriented. It had a plan and vision for man's future. As a result, it was able to capitalize on the spiritual vacuum of the twentieth century and to capture many superior minds.

The shallowness of its future-orientation became very quickly apparent wherever Marxism gained power, and the disillusionment of its followers has been very real. Moreover, Marxism has become, in every country where it has gained power, very rapidly and inescapably bureaucratic, a super-establishment. It moves in terms of power, not faith.

The results have been gradually apparent. The brutality of Marxist states has not abated and has in some areas increased. The hostility to Christianity has often been intensified. But a bureaucracy is not adventurous; it is usually concerned with protecting and perpetuating itself. It can be exceedingly brutal in its self-protection, but it lacks initiative, although it has momentum. Thus, the bureaucratic momentum carries world Marxism along the same lines established by Lenin and Stalin, but

the bureaucratic self-protection makes it both resistant to change and unwilling to risk defeat. A bureaucracy is thus present-oriented; as a result, it can blunder into serious disaster because of its inflexibility and its inability to see consequences beyond self-perpetuation.

What happens in a world of present-oriented people? A basic lawlessness sets in. No law is recognized as valid if it does not suit the person or people. The situation becomes comparable to a busy intersection, where traffic lights are suddenly removed, together with policemen, and every driver races to the intersection as though he alone existed. The wise driver thinks ahead; the fool tramps on the gas pedal.

The failure of the churches, and the inner decay of Marxism, is matched by the decay of capitalism. As Irving Kristol and Daniel Bell have shown (in *The Public Interest*, no. 21 [Fall 1970]), capitalism has declined because it has lost its basic faith.

We can add that most capitalists (like labor) are not libertarians. They do not believe in free enterprise but are instead champions of protectionism and subsidies. The rise of capitalism was an aspect of the development of Christian faith. Without agreeing with much or all that Weber and Tawney have written on the subject, it must still be granted that the development of capitalism had deep roots in Christian theology. Those roots are now largely gone, and with them the faith and the rationale that made for a society of dedicated entrepreneurs. Too often today, when a businessman talks about freedom, he is not too different in his basic premises from the New Leftist student. His concept of freedom is not too closely tied to responsibility; it is merely a desire to be free from the state's regulation while reaping the benefits of the state's subsidies. When freedom as an ideal is divorced from independence and responsibility, it is not truly freedom but welfarism disguised.

Meanwhile, in this context of civil, economic, and religious irresponsibility, hatred flourishes as one group after another tries to push all the blame on a particular class, race, or group. That tensions and hostilities are a part of life, every wise man will readily acknowledge. That conflict is sometimes unavoidable is all too true. Under normal circumstances, law is the means whereby society controls hostilities and wages war against its enemies. Those who work to aggravate hostilities are fools. As Solomon observed, "He that passeth by, and meddleth with strife belonging not to him, is like one that taketh a dog by the ears" (Prov. 26:17). When you declare war, you had better be prepared to wage it. This is a lesson that many blacks and whites, and many working men and many employers, have failed to learn. It is an aspect of the lower-class mind that it does not count the cost nor think ahead.

A future-oriented man recognizes that, while many problems have easy and simple answers, few problems have agreeable people involved. "Your problem is very simple," said a simple-minded pastor once to a husband and wife who could not get along with each other; "you've got to learn to live with each other." How true, and how absurd! Men are not angels, and, sometimes, their problems will not disappear until they disappear, because they will not change. Even simple problems thus are often not simply solved. Passing a law, or making an obvious statement as that pastor did, is no answer.

Our progress in the past usually came slowly, and our recovery will come slowly. It will come as men, each in his own sphere of action, begin the task of reconstruction. Reconstruction begins with our lives and God's grace; it extends to our vocations, our institutions, homes, and society. Life and progress are made up of a great number of little things; we cover a mile by small steps, and the surest move forward is that small step rather than a giant daydream.

Remember, a shovel turns over more earth than a wrecked tractor. Our religious, civil, and educational institutions are largely like wrecked tractors today. It is time, then, for shovel work, a great and exciting time when new foundations shall be laid, a world recaptured, and a future established by those who will work for it.

42

"AWAKE, THOU THAT SLEEPEST"

Chalcedon Report No. 351, October 1994

I once knew a very superior man whose mother constantly embarrassed him. She had a framed picture of him as a happy baby, sitting on a skin rug, bare of all clothing. No visitor failed to get an account of how wonderful a baby he had been. The man resented this, and I thought it foolish on his part until something he said opened my eyes. This man had taken over his father's business and made it again profitable. He was a leader in his church, and the mainstay of the extended family; he had been an outstanding athlete in high school and at the university, but all that his mother saw was his cuteness as a baby. She saw him only as she had adored him, not as a man of *faith* and stature.

We cloud and limit our vision if we do not see all things in terms of the present under God. We exist for the Lord, and so, too, do our children. The Victorians have often been wrongly criticized for many things, but in one area they were indeed very faulty. They overpersonalized things so that objective standards gave way to personal ones. The result was sentimentalism, and inappropriate and major emotional reaction to minor matters. We are still Victorians in our reactions to romances, films, and television in that we indulge in the exploitations of feelings for emotional goals, not in terms of reality.

If God is not our essential and basic concern, we will drift into a misplaced concern over trifles, and we then become triflers, well-meaning, earnest, and kindly, but triflers.

Now, our problem today is that the church is not like a mighty army of the Lord but more like a collection of doting mothers who are more excited and happy over their sons' baby pictures than their sons' solid work for the Lord. We have misplaced emphases all around us.

Antinomianism leads to a weak and feminized church. It trivializes

the Christian life and calling. It is interesting to note that, at the height of the medieval era, the cult of the infant Jesus, the holy bambino, replaced the great earnestness of the faith with sentimentalism. The church declined into pietism and an inability to cope with internal problems. The problems of the church had *not* increased, but its ability to cope with them decreased.

We have a like problem today. Pietism, sentimentalism, and emotionalism have emasculated the church.

> Wherefore he saith, Awake, thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light. (Eph. 5:14)

43

THE PROCESS GOD

Chalcedon Report No. 391, February 1998

The origins of modernism go back to the early attacks on Genesis 1–11, and on the Mosaic law. These were seen as evidence of primitive myths and primitive law. The nineteenth century saw much interest in ancient legal codes; these supposedly showed common elements with Mosaic law, and thus it was held that Mosaic law was derivative, not original. Similarly, worldwide myths of creation, of a universal flood and the like, supposedly proved the mythological nature of the Biblical account; it apparently did not occur to these scholars that the Biblical account was true, and these others, derivative.

We see today a similar development in evangelical and Reformed circles. Earlier, God's law was dropped as pertinent only to the Hebrew tribes and therefore "primitive" and rural in orientation. But law is the sovereign's will for his people, and to abandon God's law is to deny Him sovereignty. It is thus no surprise that many circles within fundamentalism, having denied God's law, have denied any present lordship to Jesus Christ. If He has now no law, He cannot be Lord. The logic of God's world has thus led many antinomians, if not virtually all, to deny lordship to Jesus Christ.

In some evangelical and Reformed circles, as well as in other theological traditions, there is today a militant antinomianism and a hostility to the historicity of Genesis 1–11. Some churchmen express openly their contempt for those who defend Genesis chapters 1–11. Supposedly, they who accept the Scripture have naively read symbolic material as though it were history. Of course, the Biblical text speaks clearly as history, and it stresses the days of creation as actual twenty-four-hour days.

Such an approach has great implications for theology and Biblical interpretation. If Genesis chapters 1–11 are not literal history, why not read

the resurrection accounts as symbolic also? Certainly, the virgin birth accounts read at times like poetry, so why not call them symbolism too?

The champions of the symbolic view are contemptuous of those who affirm the historicity of Genesis 1–11. Their arguments against Genesis 1–11 are vague and specious, but their scorn is very real. Having in effect adopted a non-Biblical view of God, they cannot concede veracity to His Word. Their god is process, not the Creator.

God as process is basic to those who want evolution together with a religious faith that somehow retains the god concept. Evolution is a process whose god is time. The alternative to the Biblical God is chance, and, very early, it was held that, *given enough time,* chance could accomplish anything. Julian Huxley and others have held this view; given enough time, anything can happen in a world of chance. If a great number of monkeys type on typewriters for an endless time, they would eventually reproduce all the works of Shakespeare. But this famous illustration is a farce. It presupposed numerous monkeys, typewriters, and warehouses full of paper which somehow are fed into the typewriters. Where did all these things come from? And what keeps the monkeys at the typewriters for ages, and from wrecking them?! This absurd illustration gives the lie to chance and to evolution. Of such ridiculous assumptions is the myth of evolution made.

The god of evolution is process; process requires billions of years, and it assumes much. Somehow, an original atom came into being, possessing in itself all the potentiality of this cosmos and yet unconscious, a god as great as the Biblical God but conveniently without consciousness or a court! What a convenient god for sinners!

Make no mistake about it. These pious churchmen who want us to take their more "intelligent" view of Genesis 1–11 are busy shifting gods on us! Not surprisingly, one influential Eastern Orthodox theologian who promoted such views was outspoken in his contempt for "Biblicism" and "Bibliolatry," but he promoted another god and a properly aesthetic church! He regarded Protestantism with its faith in Scripture as "primitive."

While these learned fools are busy damning us, we have the interesting fact in view that their outlook is one of loss, as people desert a faith that denies its own articles of religion and its charter, the Bible.

Remember, too, that many of the early church "fathers," being Greco-Roman in their outlook, found the Bible painfully "naive" for such intellectuals as themselves. The church grew in spite of them because there were enough "simple" people who took the Word of God seriously and literally. The future does not belong to men who hate the living God,

because their process-god can neither create nor save. Of course, the god the sinners want is one who lets them be creators, the architects of a new world order. The capitols of the world are full of such gods, and so, too, are the cities and towns. But must the churches be full of them also?

44

THE CHURCH: WHAT IS IT?

Chalcedon Report No. 324, July 1992

> Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular. (1 Cor. 12:27)
>
> And [God] hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the church. (Eph. 1:22)
>
> And he is the head of the body, the church: who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead; in that in all things he might have the preeminence. (Col. 1:18)

If we take the wrong road, we do not reach the right destination. If we begin with error, we go from bad to worse. If we begin with heresy, we end up with blasphemy and evil. Has this happened to Christianity with various doctrines of the church?

One of the high points of church history occurred at Chalcedon when the Tome of Leo was read. St. Leo set forth the orthodox doctrine of Jesus Christ, which Chalcedon declared to be the sole unique incarnation of God in Jesus, "in two natures, without confusion, without change, without division, without separation."

The Definition or Formula of Chalcedon made it clear that *no human being nor institution, nor anything on earth*, could claim to incarnate God and represent His being on earth. The incarnation is sole and unique in Jesus Christ. Now, this doctrine is unique to Biblical faith; no other religion is in any way similar. Some religions deny the possibility of an incarnation, while other religions have such supposed manifestations of the Godhead in age after age.

Chalcedon set forth the Christian position clearly and carefully. If the church had remained faithful to Chalcedon, it would have been spared many evils. Pagan states commonly divinized themselves, their rulers, or high offices. Very early, Holy Roman emperors acted as extensions of the incarnation. Thus, Otto II (A.D. 980–1002) appears on a sacramental

vessel with the dove, symbolizing the Holy Spirit, in his hand: he ostensibly possessed "the Dove of Inspiration."[1] Emperor Otto saw himself as possessing apostolic inspiration and authority over the church.

This doctrine has a long history over the centuries. Medieval and modern kings have seen themselves as God's supreme authority on earth. The doctrine of the divine right of kings is one aspect of this long history.

In its more modern and non-Christian forms, we have the many developments of Hegel's theory that the state is god walking on earth. All factions on the political spectrum, Marxists, Fabian Socialists, fascists, national socialists, Republicans, Democrats, and others, are heirs of Hegel and the belief that ultimate powers are incarnate in the state.

The church, sadly enough, has had its own like development. Within Roman Catholic circles, it has been held that the church is the continuation or extension of the incarnation, a direct contradiction of St. Leo and Chalcedon. Protestants have been less candid: they speak of the church as "the body of Christ," which it is indeed, but they give to that concept an alien anti-Chalcedonian meaning.

Christ, as the second and last Adam, creates through His atonement and by His regenerating power, a *new humanity* to replace the fallen humanity of the first Adam (1 Cor. 15:47–50). The church as the body of Christ is this new humanity, this new human race, being recreated and sanctified by Jesus Christ through the Holy Spirit. The church as the body of Christ represents this new humanity. The deity of Christ is not comingled or confused with His humanity, either by Himself, nor in us as His members, nor in the church as His body.

Where this confusion of the two natures occurs, the canon law or rule of the church then ceases to be the law of God and becomes its own legislation. The calling and function of the church is ministerial, not legislative. It cannot make law; only God can legitimately do so. It must, however, faithfully administer God's law as His servant. Legislation in any sphere of life in independence of God's enscriptured Word is blasphemy and a usurpation of the crown rights of Christ the King.

Because God's law-word is neglected, and most churchmen are ignorant of the Council of Chalcedon, the church has too often replaced Christ with itself. The early church saw its canon rule as the whole Word of God: it saw itself as bound by that word. "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God" (Matt. 4:4; cf. Deut. 8:3). The church today does not see itself as so bound. I hear regularly from people of church judgments that go contrary to Scripture.

1. Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy, *Out of Revolution* (New York, NY: William Morrow, 1938), p. 503.

The world today is lawless. "The transgression of the wicked saith within my heart, that there is no fear of God before his eyes" (Ps. 36:1; cf. Rom. 3:18). Where there is no law, there is no valid ground for judgment nor justice: remove God's law from a society, and you remove justice also. Without God's law, men make their own wills ultimate; each man as his own god knows or determines what is good and evil for himself (Gen. 3:5).

If the church indeed is a continuation on earth of the divine-human Christ, then the church can claim vast powers over men and nations. It is then what Hegel said the state is, God, or at least His extension, walking on earth.

If, on the other hand, the body of Christ is His new humanity, His new human race, then we have a vastly different situation. The church then has a duty in Christ to bring all men to a saving knowledge of Him, and into obedience to His law. It has a duty to reorder and reconstruct all things in terms of His law-word.

Our Lord declares, "Behold, I make all things new (Rev. 21:5), and we, as His new creation, His new human race, are His instruments through whom all things on earth are to be remade. Our calling is not to control others but to serve Jesus Christ's regenerating purpose. He occupies the throne of all creation (Rev. 4:2, 9; etc.), and we are required as His people to do His will, not our own, to obey His law, not our own, to glorify Him, not ourselves and our churches.

St. Paul tells us, "Moreover it is required in stewards, that a man be found faithful" (1 Cor. 4:2). Can we be faithful to the person of our Lord without being faithful to His entire Word? Can we pick and choose where we will be faithful?

When men and churches substitute their words, laws, and judgments for the whole Word of God, are they not joining the enemies of Christ? Are they not then becoming substitutes for Jesus Christ?

I submit that one of the greatest needs of our time is a radical revision of our various doctrines of the church. They go against Scripture, and they bypass Chalcedon. The church must become Christ's steward, not another Jesus.

The church has too often made itself an impediment to our Lord, because it has replaced Jesus Christ and His enscriptured law-word with itself. This is blasphemy.

45

MODERNISM OLD AND NEW, PART 1

Chalcedon Report No. 393, April 1998

The term *modernism* as applied to church history is relatively new, being used to describe the application of higher criticism, scientific discovery, and contemporary culture to the Bible, and the consequent alterations of Christian faith and doctrine in terms of this.

The fact of modernism, however, is as old as the church, and it was present in Judaism, before that in various movements, and in men like Philo. The science and culture of the times have constantly been used to try to revise and remake Christianity. In movements like Gnosticism, it was an effort to convert Christianity into another religion. In other efforts, it was an endeavor to amend and impose the faith by the use of current and prevalent thinking. The converts in the early church were formerly pagans, and they brought their mindset with them, Greco-Roman and other ideas. Neoplatonism very early infected the church extensively in A.D. 390, so that men like Augustine, who took a dim view of the historicity of the Genesis creation account, were, like other church fathers of their day, modernists after a fashion. Some, like Augustine, outgrew and renounced many of their pagan views, while others retained them to their end.

It is thus dangerous and foolish to reverence the church fathers uncritically. Many were painfully in error; others transcended their severe limitations to put us in their debt.

In all sections of Christendom, every era has had its modernisms. Thus, Eastern Orthodoxy is deeply saturated with various forms of Platonism and became in many leaders an alien faith. Rome's main dereliction is also Greek, i.e., Aristotle. Protestantism very early picked up the Enlightenment reverence for rationalism. Thus, the modernism of fundamentalistic churches is their rationalistic apologetics. (Rationalism sees

the priority of understanding in reason; this does not mean that anti-rationalists affirm irrationalism; rather, they insist on God's priority and the primacy of His enscriptured Word.)

For examples of modernism in the church fathers, one can begin with St. Irenaeus (d. ca. A.D. 202), a very able man. In his *Proof of the Apostolic Preaching*, he held, for example, that charity supersedes the law. He also said that the Spirit supersedes the law and also that the Spirit delivers men from the oldness of the letter of the law. We are thus beyond the law and have no need of it (St. Irenaeus, *Proof of the Apostolic Preaching*, trans. Joseph P. Smith, SJ [New York, NY: Newman Press, 1952], pp. 101–106).

St. Gregory of Nyssa (ca. A.D. 335–ca. A.D. 395) was a brilliant theologian, as was his brother, St. Basil, but ability is not necessarily faithfulness to Scripture! His subtle thinking on the doctrine of the Trinity shows the Greek mind at its subtle best; but, in the practicality of interpreting the Bible, he was painfully, embarrassingly, bad. Take, for example, his work, *The Life of Moses*, an attempt to make the Bible readable and understandable to Greeks, especially educated Alexandrian Greeks. Writing early in A.D. 390, Gregory saw the five books of Moses as symbolic, as allegory, not as history. He held, "The narrative is to be understood according to its real intention," and his purpose was to "lay bare the hidden meaning of the history." The actual meaning was irrelevant. The "true" meaning is occult doctrine. "We are in some manner our own parents, giving birth to ourselves by our own free choice in accordance with whatever we wish to be, whether male or female, molding ourselves to the teaching of virtue or vice."

For Gregory, everything in Moses (and elsewhere) is symbolic. Thus, "The ark, constructed out of various boards, would be education in the various disciplines, which holds what it carries above the waves of life" (Gregory of Nyssa, *The Life of Moses*, trans. Abraham J. Malherbe and Everett Ferguson [New York, NY: Paulist Press, 1978], pp. 55–56). Who and what guides us? According to Gregory of Nyssa, "all the movements of our soul are shepherded like sheep, by the will of guiding reason" (ibid., p. 59). Good Platonism, that!

According to Gregory of Nyssa, there will in the end be universal salvation. He "saw" Moses as clearly teaching this (but you and I have minds too darkened to see it). Hell "will not be eternal" because Moses's outstretched hands represent "the healing of pain and the deliverance from punishment" (ibid., p. 18). Gregory was not alone in this opinion.

Naturally, for Gregory of Nyssa the dietary laws could not be about anything so crass as food! They had a higher meaning. So, too, did Mt. Sinai;

climbing it was the ascent to God: "The majority of people scarcely reach its base" (ibid., p. 93).

Clearly, nothing in all this is recognizable as Biblical. Gregory and others like him excelled, however, in developing a rationale for the church, its rites, and its offices, so that the power of the church grew more rapidly than did its understanding.

Am I rejecting patristic literature? Far from it: I respect and use what is good in it, whatever is Biblical. I do very emphatically reject the ungodly reverence for and kowtowing to the authority of idealized church fathers. It is unrealistic and foolish.

We cannot combat the errors of our time if we cannot recognize kindred errors in the past. Ancient modernisms are no more to be accepted than contemporary ones. In every era, the modernisms of the day have reshaped men's views of the Bible when in fact the Bible requires us to reshape our world, our times, and ourselves in terms of the Word of God.

Whatever one says about Gregory of Nyssa, Origen, and others like them, our attitude towards those who give priority to them over the Word of God must elicit our clearer condemnation. These ancients were often in error, sometimes in the truth, but they did represent sometimes feeble, sometimes very real, steps in the growth of the faith. This was true even of Origen, whom I particularly dislike. The important question is this: is the cause of Christ advanced in and through *us?*

46

MODERNISM OLD AND NEW, PART 2

Chalcedon Report No. 394, May 1998

BASIC to all modernism is the tempter's program as set forth in Genesis 3:5, man as his own god, deciding for himself as the ultimate knower, what is good and evil. Thus, man's original sin has become his religious, moral, and philosophical premise. Man has made himself, as Van Til noted in *The Doctrine of Scripture*, "the ultimate judge of what can or cannot be" (Cornelius Van Til, *The Doctrine of Scripture* [n.p.: The Den Dulk Foundation, 1967], p. 13). This means that man sees himself, especially since Kant, as the determiner of reality. As a result, it is not God who is the determiner of reality, but man. Calvinism, with its assertion of God's absolute priority in the creation and predestination of all things, is thus supplanted with Arminianism and humanism. Ultimate decisions are transferred from God to man.

The results are dramatic in their consequences. One woman, newly converted, decided against Arminianism when she realized what a ludicrous image of God it involved, i.e., the Creator of all things sitting in heaven, biting His fingernails while waiting for some silly person to decide for or against Jesus! She recognized the moral repugnance and impossibility of such a view of God.

To deny God's priority in the determination of all things means that it is man who is creative and original in his thinking. This premise led Rilke to write:

> What will you do, God, when I die?
> When I, your pitcher, broken lie?
> When I, your drink, go stale or dry?
> I am your garb, the trade you ply,
> You lose your meaning, losing me.
> (R. M. Rilke, *Poems from the Book of Hours* [Narsdk, CT: New Directions Press, n.d.], p. 81)

Rilke's point was well taken. To deny God's sovereignty and His predestination of all things is to make man the lord and the determiner. The government of all things is then transferred to man, who must work to impose his mind on an ostensibly mindless world. The world is a realm of brute factuality, a random multiverse, and only man can create meaning and direction in this universal surd.

Modern Christianity, whether modernist or evangelical, is essentially centered on the individual, his experience, decision, or action, whether social or personal. It is essentially related to the Romantic movement with its priority on human experience and action. Within the evangelical community, this meant revivalism, with its emphasis on personal decision making. Within the openly modernist churches, this has led to the social gospel and its stress on remaking the social order. This has usually meant political action, but not necessarily so. Now, it is clearly true that conversion is necessary as the beginning of the Christian life, and equally true that faith will express itself in society. The emphasis, however, cannot be on the individual nor on society; both stresses are alike humanistic. Our Lord says plainly that priority must be given to the Kingdom of God and to God's righteousness or justice (Matt. 6:33).

We are so accustomed to giving humanistic concerns priority that it is difficult for us to imagine society as otherwise than it is, a man-centered world. Men want their humanism baptized, not supplanted. Christianization is supposed to make their fallen world more livable, not obsolete nor morally untenable. In this view, Christianity is seen as the *donum superadditum*, the extra topping on the dessert of life to make it even better.

This is the essence of modernism, to give priority to this world and especially man. The alternative is not asceticism nor a retreat from this world after the manner of the desert hermits, but its conquest and transformation by the regenerating power of Jesus Christ and His atonement, and the application of the law-word of God to every area of life and thought. To make this fallen world and its cultures prior to and determinative of God's Kingdom and people is practical modernism.

Modernisms old and new try to adapt Christianity to this world's order and make it useful and usable for man, whereas a truly Christian faith summons us to remake our lives and our world in terms of the triune God and His Word.

47

EVANGELICALISM

Chalcedon Report No. 399, October 1998

Evangelicalism is a beautiful word that has come into a little disrepute because of its misuse in recent years. Early in the twentieth century, a movement arose calling itself fundamentalism. Very early, the Arminian wing gained control, stressed certain views strongly, and became known as the "fighting fundamentalists." While not Reformed, they were zealous and effective, much hated for their successes. After World War II, great segments of this movement drifted into compromises, especially on inerrancy, and called themselves evangelicals. They waged war on fundamentalism, and also often on Cornelius Van Til and his presuppositionalism. The notable institution for evangelicals is Fuller Seminary, at war against Biblical inerrancy, and the Reverend Billy Graham, with his congenial spirit of compromise.

The heart of this new evangelicalism can be seen in the Fuller Seminary position on the Bible. Professor Donald A. Hagner, in *Theology News & Notes*, June 1998, held that "it is hard to imagine anything more debilitating to the work of a Biblical scholar than *a priori* insistence on inerrancy" (p. 7). This new evangelicalism sees its future better based on the critical premise of modernism than on the historic foundations of the Christian faith. It sees orthodoxy as imposing alien, nonscholarly premises on Christian scholarship, whereas the premises of modernism are supposedly scientific and valid. It will not admit that all starting points are *a priori* acts of faith, and that no scholarship is possible without them. The question is, rather, this: do we begin with God or man, with the word according to God or the word according to man? The new evangelicalism begins with man, not with God.

In so doing, it ignores man's fallen state. Certainly Dr. Hagner never mentions nor considers it. Yet the Biblical faith requires it. Is man a fallen

sinner or a capable scholar and judge over God and His Word? Dr. Hagner sees no question of competency, but the Bible presupposes it.

The new evangelicalism is at odds with the Reformation and often in open sympathy with St. Thomas Aquinas and his rationalism. This should not surprise us. Rationalism is too much a part of evangelicalism. Dr. Hagner is concerned with "the credibility of the evangelical perspective in the larger intellectual world" (p. 8). But is it our calling to please that "large intellectual world" or our Almighty God and Redeemer?

As a young man, I recall being told of an aging modernist scholar who in his younger days had held that he was as good a fundamentalist as any! Claims are cheap; affirmations must be yea, yea — not a vague, compromising word. In due time, these new "evangelicals" will discard the term as having served its purpose.

It is our duty to uphold the faith, not the popular, nor the noted. The days of these compromisers are numbered because God is God. One report lists only eleven Christian colleges, universities, or seminaries as still maintaining inerrancy. So much the worse for the rest of them. Christendom has more than once seen the faithful almost disappear, but the true faith survives and revives. Will you?

48

EARLY CHURCH BUILDINGS

Chalcedon Report No. 175, March 1980

One of the things about the early church which upsets some people and puzzles others is the fact that, as soon as churches were built, whether small or large, they were built with a magnificence which goes against certain opinions men hold about early Christianity. Under the influence of evolutionary mythology, men speak of the early church as "primitive Christianity." In its architecture, it should thus represent a "simple" faith and give us no more than a meetinghouse.

In actuality, the first churches not only reflected self-consciously the splendors of the Old Testament Temple but sought to surpass it. We cannot begin to understand the faith of the early church without understanding its architecture. The early church had theological problems and conflicts, but it had certain presuppositions reflected in its architecture, which were very important, and which we need to return to.

From the very beginning, churches were built of the finest materials and on a pattern of magnificence. Later, in the Middle Ages, churches became much larger, as time passed, but they were no more splendid. Churches were built to surpass other structures and to reveal a particularly impressive appearance to one and all.

The reason for this was the nature of the church: it was the palace of God the Son, Jesus Christ, and a palace must be a place of splendor. The church did not belong to the congregation: it belonged to the Lord, Christ the King.

Thus, in the years A.D. 401 to 404, Paulinus of Nola, of Aquitaine, built a church at Cimitile. In a letter, *Epistola 32,* he described this church. On either side of the nave of the church were four rooms (*cubiculi*) "for those who prayed secretly or meditated on the law of God" (Paolo Verzone, *The Art of Europe: The Dark Ages from Theodoric to Charlemagne* [1968], p.

15). The king's palace was the place for prayer or petition, and also for the study of the law of the king.

The churches also had mosaics and paintings. The early church saw in Scripture the fact that the Temple and tabernacle had carved items ordained by God, and it held that, unless abused and worshipped, such objects were permissible. Their purpose was to emphasize that the believer was in the King's palace: they depicted the king, the apostles, angels, and saints, and often throngs of humble believers, in brief, the royal family and servants. These were not realistic works of art; they did not depict personalities, nor action. The eye was emphasized to show the clear gaze of the eternal King on His earthly family.

One may agree or disagree with various aspects of this architecture. It is clear also that some aspects of the mosaics and paintings were more Neoplatonic than Hebraic. However, one aspect of the theology of this architecture rang true: the church is Christ's palace and court, not man's meetinghouse. It is the place for the proclamation of the King of kings, and for the declaration of His grace.

It is this emphasis which the church later lost. In the later Middle Ages, the church began to stress, not God's presence in Christ, but man's soaring aspirations. With the Counter-Reformation and baroque art, the effort was made to impress and please man. The vault of the church seemed to open into heaven, so that man had the illusion of looking up into heaven at will.

Protestantism began its long journey towards the emphasis on the church as man's meeting place, a meetinghouse, where many could feel at home. The same became true of the "worship" of the church: it was governed progressively by a desire to please the people rather than to glorify God. This same impulse has increasingly governed Roman Catholic and other liturgical churches: the satisfaction of the people has become paramount.

This, of course, is humanism. The architecture of the modern church, whether great or small, imposing or simple, is man-centered. The church is no longer seen as the palace of the King of kings, nor as the world's law center and mercy seat. It is a social center instead, ministering to human needs by a variety of sociological and psychological means. The church works to make people feel "at home" rather than in the presence of the King by His grace. Esther 4:11 tells us that, even for a queen, to go into the presence of a king without his consent was death. The church once held this to be true of Christ's palace: to be within His gates was a tremendous privilege, a fact of royal grace; therefore, "Enter into his gates with thanksgiving, and into his courts with praise: be thankful unto him, and bless his name" (Ps. 100:4).

Let us bring back the King, to rejoice again in His law and grace. Let us make of the church again a palace.

49

ARCHITECTURE

Chalcedon Report No. 343, February 1994

Art has always required patronage. The popular taste has generally been for things expressing their ephemeral and often low tastes, so that the triumph of popular taste has frequently been the enthronement of vulgarity. The opinion, common among libertarians and others, that the free market should determine all things, and that nothing has a right to exist if it cannot sell itself profitably, is an absurd idea. It would destroy the arts, religion, much of education, and more. The closest art has come to being profitable is architecture, and architecture meets a necessity: it designs buildings. Even here, the great advances in architecture have come to pass because pagan religions, Christianity, kings, nobles, and wealthy men, and the state have subsidized architecture. The use of architects for the construction of homes for the common man is new. Thus, not even architecture has depended on the market; it has thrived because it has met the demands and received the subsidies of powerful men and institutions.

Behind the subsidy is an idea or faith. Kings and noblemen have had their visions of grandeur which the architects help them realize. The dining table chairs from the time of Louis XIV are little thrones; they are so heavy that a servant was needed to seat someone, especially a woman. The custom of helping a woman seat herself at the dinner table is a mindless relic of the days when such chairs could not be readily moved by a woman.

The museum is a relic and continuation of the concern for the arts, and a form of subsidy. There are indications that ancient Babylonian rulers had their museums. The greatest and most enduring museum has been the church. According to Joachim Menzhausen,

> It would be incorrect to say that collecting as such got its start in the Renaissance, since, long before, cathedral treasuries had been gathered with definite aims and functions. But in the period around 1500 there began in Europe a type of collecting, independent of the Church, that had new motives and structures. Most of the great collectors of this time were at least princes.
>
> Not only did they enjoy extraordinary financial means and high standards of education, they had an interest in the political function of their collections. After all, whatever the first man of any state does, it carries a political accent. (Joachim Menzhausen, "Five Centuries of Art Collecting in Dresden," in Hans-Joachim Hoffmann, et al., *The Splendor of Dresden: Five Centuries of Art Collecting* [New Haven, CT: Eastern Press, 1979], p. 17)

Church architecture set forth the glory of God and His Kingdom. Royal architecture hailed the power and wealth of the monarch. The dining table chairs which a woman did not move were comparable to the Chinese woman of means whose bound feet made work impossible. Being above others, it was her glory to be above work also. (I recall such Chinese women, and their feeble, limited ability to walk.)

Modern church architecture rarely stresses God's glory. Church architecture is now mainly that of democratic togetherness. Its stress is on the church community, not on God. It stresses a democracy of authority, not a command faith. Church buildings now rarely inspire awe because their theology is weak. The exceptions are Eastern Orthodox churches, which in architecture and liturgy, stress adoration, not understanding. Their theologies are not centered on understanding but on mystical adoration.

According to Proverbs 19:23, "The fear of the LORD tendeth to life: and he that hath it shall abide satisfied; he shall not be visited with evil." For modern man, this is an unexpected and strong statement because it tells us that the fear of God is our ground for peace. This is, however, a logical declaration. If we do not fear God, we will fear man. "The fear of man bringeth a snare: but whoso putteth his trust in the LORD shall be safe" (Prov. 29:25). A people who do not fear God will rely heavily on psychiatrists and psychologists. They will also become inordinately preoccupied with themselves and with other people.

The elements of majesty and awe were not eliminated from architecture when the church abandoned them. They were simply transferred to other spheres. They were *retained* in a continuing aspect of the medieval and Reformation world, the school or *university*. Now secularized, the university's architecture maintained a link to the churches of old, whether a cathedral or a village church. They stressed a semi-transcendent republic of letters, a continuing realm comparable to the church triumphant.

The *majestic* in architecture *first* became visible in the state and its building. Louis XIV's Versailles became the model for other European centers of state, and for Washington, D.C., George Washington's plan for a practical, working capital was geopolitical. The capital was to be close to Southern iron deposits and Northern manufacturers, and it was intended to unite North and South. It was also intended to be a point of departure via the Cumberland Gap into the western territories. Jefferson dropped all this to create an American Versailles. The affinity of state architecture to pagan temples has also been strong. (Until the post–World War II era, banks were imitations of Greek temples.) The modern state, like Louis XIV, "the sun king," seeks to supplant God's majesty with its own. It has its shrines and its holy days, now called holidays. At every turn, it invites reverential awe for its majesty and power.

Second, the majestic in architecture early saw the theater as its arena. In its early years, grand opera was a royal or near-royal event. There could be up to fifty scene changes and much in the way of mechanical marvels: figures flying through the air, boats in water, armies of many men, camels, elephants, bears, horsemen, and cannons. Operas could last many hours, and they were very, very expensive because grandeur and majesty had to be set forth. They were major *events* (Friedrich Heer, *The Holy Roman Empire* [New York, NY: Praeger, (1968) 1969], p. 239ff.).

Subsequently, the ethos of grand opera was transferred to the movie theater, once known as *the picture palace*. The luxuries of kings became now the theaters of the people. It was recognized by many that the movie theater was designed to create an atmosphere of delusion among the people. Libraries and railway stations had earlier worked towards the same end, but the architecture of film theaters was most successful. David Naylor rightly called it the architecture of fantasy (David Naylor, *American Picture Palaces: The Architecture of Fantasy* [New York, NY: Prentice Hall, 1981], pp. 31–32.).

In the period between the two World Wars, even smaller cities saw the construction of amazing picture palaces in the style of royal palaces of both Europe and the Far East (ibid., pp. 160–161.). Since then, some of them have disappeared, as witness the San Francisco Fox Theatre. They were built for audiences too numerous to make them economically viable after 1970. The Fox was "the most palatial theater ever built" (ibid., p. 177). It was designed not only to be a "picture palace," but a kind of museum.

The religious overtones were definitely present in more than a few "picture palaces," as witness New York's Roxy Theatre:

> The religious trappings of the "Cathedral of the Motion Picture" included a set of tower chimes, a grand dome encircled by a spotlight gallery, and

> pulpits alongside the stage, reached by curving golden stairways suspended below them.
>
> Before reaching the cathedral interior, the patron passed through the awe-inspiring rotunda, which rose five-stories. Twelve columns of green marble, topped by a circular chariot-race frieze, supported the rotunda's high dome. Spread across the floor was "the largest oval rug ever woven to order," measuring fifty-eight feet by forty feet and weighing more than two tons. (ibid., p. 113)

For the Roxy's opening night, as Naylor's excellent account tells us, a solitary "monk" said, "Let there be light." *The New Yorker's* reviewer commented, "And, by golly, there was light" (ibid., p. 201).

The same spirit of awesome majesty is, in a lesser degree, with us still in award-winning events featured on television wherein "the stars" and luminaries of the film "world" receive their prizes.

Sadly, the churches imitate these imitations of the once awe-inspiring churches and their worship. The earliest known church buildings were made of stone, and their sanctuaries were always *basilicas*, or throne rooms of Christ the King (*basil* means *king*, and *kos*, *royal*). The Bible was regarded, rightly, as the royal law-word, and all stood when it was read. In the early centuries, and for some time to come, all church buildings were basilicas.

When Louis XIV's royal chapel made that monarch central, it was, although done in ritual rather than architecture, the beginning of a major decline in the life of the church. Certainly, it diminished its authority.

The Protestant church is now a meeting place, not a meeting place of God with men, His subjects and His Son's members, His new humanity, but a meeting place of democratic men. In some denominations, a meeting can be called after the service to dismiss the pastor if his preaching offended the people. This makes the people into god, and the church is not God's throne room but a democratic lecture hall.

Architecture is important. I have heard men say that the once authoritative pulpit and church will never return because Calvinism is dead, and the spirit of democracy is triumphing in churches, Catholic and Protestant.

As long as the Word of God is simply an advisory and optional word and not the law-word of Christ the King, democracy will continue to make a shambles of the church. The word and will of man will prevail over the law-word of the triune God. The church will be like a union hall: if a strong authority exists, it will be the authority of a man or a group of men, of an institution, not of the King over all kings and rulers.

Until then, our substitute for "the picture palace," television, will proclaim a more influential word than the church. If I speak from myself and

out of my opinions, I cannot compete with all the dazzling technology of television. If I put on all the amazing stunts of our "designer churches," I underscore my emptiness. Only when I proclaim the whole Word of God in all its splendor will I see God's power attend *His* Word and my service. That imperial Word will shatter, change, and remake men and nations. It will provide a new power and order to the world, and it will renew architecture.

50

IN PAPER WE TRUST?

Chalcedon Report No. 307, February 1991

One of the great fallacies of the modern age has been the trust in documents, contracts, bylaws, and constitutions. In the area of civil government, we can indeed say that constitutionalism marked a major advance in history, but a serious question remains. Did the writing of the documents create the advance, or was it a change in the people? It can be seriously argued that it was a major shift in faith and thought that led to the results too often attributed to the documents. As people have changed, their constitutions and charters have become worthless. The U.S. Constitution retains, at the hands of the courts and the people, little of its original meaning. All the same, for all too many people, their hope for the future is in documents such as the Constitution.

Two strands, among others, have been discernible in U.S. history. The *first* can be called "in the Constitution we trust," or, "in paper we trust," and the *second*, "in God we trust."

There is nothing wrong with written documents, with constitutions, creeds, confessions, contracts, and the like. They have a necessary place in life. The problem is one of trust. Do we depend on a written document for our security, or do we recognize that, "Except the Lord build the house, they labour in vain that build it" (Ps. 127:1)? Our civilization has become highly literate and verbal, and we place undue trust in words rather than life, faith, and action.

I recall a truly dangerous man whose treatment of his wife was physically brutal and dangerous; yet when he said, "But I love her," he felt that all should be excused and forgiven. He even offered to put it into writing, as though a written statement by him would protect his wife! He was in this sense very modern: the written word was equated with reality.

In 1928, the nations of the world gave expression to this illusion when

they united to sign the Kellogg-Briand pact outlawing all wars forever! Only those alive at that time can recall the exhilaration expressed in the press and in public school classrooms. Supposedly the pact was a giant step for mankind: war had been legally abolished!

The illusion continues. Many pacts and treaties have been signed, for example, with the Soviet Union, and all have been broken at will. Still the treaty making continues, and still foolish people believe that progress has been made.

But nations are not alone in their trust in paper. Churches are very prominent sinners in this respect; Catholics, Protestants, Charismatics, all are ready to trust in paper statements.

In the past decades, I have distressed many very, very superior young friends by questioning their efforts to insure the faithfulness of their newly organized church by strictly drawn creedal statements, bylaws, rules, and regulations. Recently, a family in a charismatic church described to me the rigid controls which governed every family and person, and I could only comment, "Don't they believe in the Holy Ghost?" Where written documents give a total prescription for the life and mind of the members, there is no place given for the work of the Spirit.

The early church formulated a few creeds and issued a limited number of rules to cope with such pressing problems as heresies, the treatment of the clergy whom persecutors had maimed, castrated, or blinded, and so on. The goal was not total prescription.

But total prescription is the intent of all too many churches. Those who sometimes profess the greatest zeal for the faith, or for the Holy Spirit, are often the most prescriptive! The early Quakers, with their emphasis on the Spirit as against the word, quickly drew up lists of rules prescribing for clothing, speech, everything, and they soon had nothing to do with the Holy Spirit! In fact, the same overprescription marked virtually all the Anabaptist groups, and a like deadness fell upon them all.

Today, many earnest and orthodox groups draw up very thorough statements of faith and conduct as their safeguard against a deteriorating church. Such statements are usually remarkably mature and able documents; some are literary gems.

But they have a common problem. Neither Catholic nor Protestant statements have proven safeguards in the past. Many of the confessions and creeds of the past are of very great importance; they are milestones in the development of theological knowledge and awareness. We would be greatly poorer without them. They are *standards*. Now, a standard is not an entrance requirement but a goal. This is a very important fact. A standard cannot be required in the same way that Scripture is

mandatory. Moreover, the faith required of the clergy and church officers is not on the same level as that of a catechumen. The new convert needs instruction in the basic elements of Christianity; he cannot be expected to understand everything all at once. The church must not expect maturity in its converts from the beginning. This means that no place is allowed for growth if a full knowledge is required at once. Where there is such a demand, we have an overprescriptive situation. Instead of room for growth being assumed, the rules demand instant maturity, and they result instead in acquiescence and no growth; submission replaces maturation.

There is another aspect to this. In politics, overprescription means socialism, the totally regulated nation. All things are regulated, and the supposedly perfect set of rules will produce a supposedly perfect social order. Overprescription or overregulation within the church creates a socialist church. It may not think of itself as such, but whenever and wherever a church overemphasizes its own rules and regulations, it has accepted the basic premise of socialism.

St. Paul, in Ephesians 4:30, declares, "Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God." The alternative to grieving God's Holy Spirit is to "be renewed in the spirit of your mind" (Eph. 4:23). This is a remarkable statement: our innermost being is to be renewed, our human spirit is to be remade, by the Lord and by His Spirit in order that we "put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness" (Eph. 4:24). Our inner transformation by God's Spirit enables us to change our lives and actions so that we grieve not the Spirit but rather give expression to His directing power. The outside prescription is in the main the faithful preaching of God's Word; the Holy Spirit, working on our spirit, leads us into the ways of knowledge, righteousness or justice, holiness, and dominion. A church becomes the ecclesiastical analogue of the socialist state when it places its trust in rules and regulations, statements and documents. We do better by trusting in God than in paper.

Does no one believe in the Holy Spirit? Or do men think that, compared to the regulations we lay down, He is impotent? Are we abler than God Almighty at arming the believer's mind and life? Have we forgotten the place and power of faithful preaching and teaching? Does a sound faith come by overregulation? St. Paul tells us, "So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God" (Rom. 10:17).

There are today a number of important moves towards church reform and renewal. They are all exciting and wonderful developments, and nothing I have written here is meant to discourage or downgrade their great importance and my delight in them. My concern is that they do not

repeat the errors that they are denouncing by an undue trust in paper. Our position must be: in the Lord, in God we trust.

Paper money is a fitting symbol of our time, a preference of paper over gold and silver. Let it not be said of the church that it prefers its paper prescriptions over the Holy Spirit.

51

THE RECEIVED TEXT

Chalcedon Report No. 383, June 1997

When I was a student, I heard a lecture on the Bible by an ostensibly orthodox Biblical scholar which was very disappointing. He insisted on arguing from within the ranks of the critics and with a ready acceptance of their premises. He assumed the validity of their manuscript evidence and their textual criticism as well as their "reconstruction" of the text. His view of infallibility was limited to the original manuscripts which were nowhere in evidence.

It was with great pleasure that I encountered, some years later, the work of Edward F. Hills, whose studies in the Received Text carried on the work of Dean Burgon. Hills's perspective tied in very closely to Cornelius Van Til's presuppositional philosophy: there are no neutral facts in all the universe, only God-created facts; and all facts are interpreted in terms of the interpreter's presuppositions. This was brought out clearly in 1996 by William O. Einwechter in *English Bible Translations: By What Standard?* Wrong presuppositions always lead to wrong conclusions.

The basic presuppositions of textual criticism are antitheistic and assume a naturalistic and evolving world and history. This means that the writing of the Biblical texts, their transmission, and their histories are totally naturalistic and evolutionary. The Bible is thus in radical contradiction to its expressed nature and history. This view, however much contradicted by various findings, survives all its errors because its basic premise is accepted. Thus, in my student days, more than a few seminary literary books still reflected the opinion that the ancient Hebrews in Moses's day had neither alphabet nor written literature. When it was proven that Moses's era was one of literacy, the critical views continued because this error had not affected their basic premise, namely, the totally naturalistic history of the Bible.

This is at the heart of the problem. People refuse to accept the idea of a valid received text because they cannot accept the God to whom such a belief points. The *Textus Receptus* position requires certain things. *First*, it states that the living God of the Bible not only gave the Word but that He also preserved it over the centuries. Such a view eliminates the need for the critics who must do what God supposedly could not do, protect and preserve the text of His Word. The critics thus make themselves in effect the true givers of the Word.

Second, the doctrine of God necessitated by the Biblical revelation leads to some inescapable conclusions. The God of the Bible can speak only an infallible and inerrant word. Because man is a creature, and a fallen creature, his word can be only an errant and fallible word. He can speak only a proximate and fallible word because he is not God. To be a man is to know one's fallibility and proneness to error.

Third, it is no accident of history that the only works claiming infallibility are imitations of the Bible, having arisen in the Christian era. Examples of this are the *Koran* and the *Book of Mormon*. Ancient religions had at best vague and incoherent "revelations" from spirits and oracles because they had no omnipotent and omniscient God who could speak only infallibly. These ancient religions thus had a vein of incoherence as against the Biblical coherency. The Biblical critics have a view of God which is at best pagan and evolutionary. Their view of God, if they claim one, is of an evolving spirit in the cosmos who is somewhat unconscious and at best incoherent.

Fourth, the Biblical critics and modernist scholars are more consistent than their opponents because they are faithful to their views of God and of history. They have often changed their views on the development of Biblical religion. For example, it was at one time held that all religions moved from simplicity to complexity, as did also languages, supposedly. Later, it was the reverse: earlier stages saw complexity in religion and then in languages also, this complexity being then slowly reduced to simplicity. At all times, however, the modernist position has been clearly naturalistic; the God of the Bible has been rejected in favor of some kind of process whereby men and religions have developed.

The failure of the ostensibly orthodox Biblical scholars of various church and theological backgrounds has been their insistence on implicitly beginning with the same world and life view as their opponents, and then trying to reason their way to a radically different view. One scholar, an otherwise fine man, tried to prove the truth of the resurrection to modernists by arguing from their premises. He convinced no one.

We must begin with the premise or presupposition of the triune God

and His infallible enscriptured Word, or we must begin with a total rejection of that God. The presupposition of fundamentalism, Lutheranism, many Reformed scholars, Anglicans, and others has been Enlightenment rationalism. This presupposition assumes the ultimacy of an impartial reason in all men whereby all things can be correctly assessed and adjudicated. But this is the premise of Scholasticism, not the Reformation.

The question of the Received Text confronts us again with the basic question of the Reformation, our starting point. The history of philosophy since Descartes has shown that, if we begin with the autonomous mind of man and its doubts, all we will end up with finally is doubt, and nothing more. If, however, we begin with the triune God and His enscriptured Word, then we begin and end with all reality. By taking man rather than God as the starting point, the modern age has created its own crisis and is self-destructing. It is the course of folly for Biblical theology and scholarship to self-destruct with it.

52

GOOD PREACHING

Chalcedon Report No. 287, June 1989

Two or three years after World II ended, an elderly pastor took me to lunch one day. He was one of California's outstanding pastors, soon to retire. He saw little good in the years ahead because the church was going "soft." People, he said, felt that with the Depression of the 1930s, and World War II dominating much of the 1940s, they wanted no more seriousness but only sweetness and light.

All men, he said, are sinners, either lost sinners or saved sinners, and they need the blunt, hard Word of God to keep them from being settled on their lees, satisfied in their sins and shortcomings. But people now wanted to "feel good," and they wanted no "negative" word from the pulpit, even though almost the whole of the Bible is "negative" towards man and his desire for a self-satisfied peace.

I thought of him recently as I again heard a complaint about a pastor's plain-spoken preaching. I was reminded of what Isaiah said: "This is a rebellious people, lying children, children that will not hear the law of the Lord: Which say to the seers, See not; and to the prophets, Prophesy not unto us right things, speak unto us smooth things, prophesy deceits" (Isa. 30:9–10). The demand in Isaiah's day was for "positive" preaching by priests and prophets. They wanted sweetness and light, lies, not the Word of God. They did get from most religious leaders the preaching they wanted, but from God they got judgment.

Will this be true of our generation also? Will we get "our kind" of preaching, but God's kind of judgment? Time is running out. Hear ye the word of the LORD! Tell your pastor, give it to us straight, and thank him for it, and for his love in Christ. Remember, our Lord says, "As many as I love, I rebuke and chasten" (Rev. 3:19).

53

DO YOU WANT "SWEETNESS AND LIGHT?"[1]

Chalcedon Report No. 312, July 1991

Like every group or publication, we get letters of complaint; most are anonymous, but some few are signed and gracious. These complain about our "critical" tone; they do not question our facts, but they oppose dealing with the subject.

Back in the 1930s, there were two New Testament professors in California, one a modernist, the other a fundamentalist, who had a common requirement. Both believed that the church was worshipping an imaginary Jesus who fitted Matthew Arnold's requirement for life and religion to be "sweetness and light."

The fundamentalist professor at a Bible school made the students list and tabulate into two columns all the sayings of our Lord which were harsh and judgmental, and all that were kind and comforting. The students found to their dismay that the Lord had an overwhelming preponderance of harsh statements.

The modernist professor, to counteract the sentimentalization of the New Testament, required that all students outline and analyze every verse and every chapter of the New Testament.

What was the point of all this? It was to show that Jesus Christ, the Great Prophet, Priest, and King, spoke as bluntly as did Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and other prophets of old. Why? Because man is a fallen creature, a sinner, he wants a pretty "gospel," a comforting one. Isaiah spoke very plainly about all such preaching:

> That this is a rebellious people, lying children, children that will not hear the law of the Lord: Which say to the seers, See not; and to the prophets,

1. This article was previously untitled. — editor

> Prophesy not unto us right things, speak unto us smooth things, prophesy deceits. (Isa. 30:9–10)

This is why, with a higher percentage than ever before in the United States claiming to be "born again and Bible-believing Christians," the church is more impotent than at any time in our history.

Because man is a fallen creature, and, when saved, still a sinner saved by grace, he needs the plain, blunt Word of God; he needs an uncompromising pulpit, and uncompromising Christian publications.

A German traveler shortly after the mid-nineteenth century, feared only the worst for America's churches. His reason? The churches were still full; everyone went to church in the United States as nowhere in Europe. But the democratic spirit was seeping into all the churches. The members were no longer worshippers: they were consumers; they were in church to be pleased. The clergy, from being prophets of the Word of God, were becoming salesmen "hawking Christ," to use H. Hoeksema's telling term. People wanted a pleasing Christ and a pleasing church. Is it any wonder the "Christian" world is in trouble? It worships the Jesus of its sentimental imagination, a Jesus who cannot save us as does the living Lord.

Those who object to anything other than "sweetness and light" are to be pitied. They do not seem to know the Lord. One writer, in documenting the "feminization" of American culture, placed the responsibility squarely on the clergy, who, by the 1820s, began drifting into humanistic and sentimental thinking and preaching. Men began to leave the church, and one person referred to the "three sexes," "men, women, and preachers."

Perhaps none of the prophets, apostles, or our Lord could qualify for a pulpit today. One sermon, and they would be finished! Am I saying that a pastor should rant at or harangue his people? No; rather, the duty of the pastor is to proclaim God's Word without equivocation.

A very fine pastor, called to the pulpit of a very large Baptist church, soon found that, among the thousands were many guilty of violating the laws of Leviticus 18. He preached on God's call to holiness, using that chapter. He was ousted the following week, with men most flagrantly guilty of some of those sexual offenses leading in the ouster. One of the worst offenders stood up to say that "we need preaching that makes us feel good." The Lord will reward that pastor, and He will punish that church. Let me add that this pastor is a gentle and kindly man who has spent much of his time and his own money helping people. He simply has a "quaint" belief that sin is sin, and sinners must be called to repentance.

If what you want are smooth things, begin by getting rid of your Bible. It is there that the judgment of this world begins.

54

DUMB DOGS, THAT CANNOT BARK

Chalcedon Report No. 313, August 1991

Some years ago, I knew a storekeeper who, to prevent thefts at night, bought a fierce dog, a Doberman, whom he turned loose in the store at closing time. At all other times, the dog was fierce enough, but, one night, a drunkard broke into the store; the dog followed him meekly and allowed himself to be petted. The thief was only caught because he tried to sell the stolen clothing in front of a bar across the street. The owner got rid of the dog.

God through Isaiah calls the pastors of Judah blind watchmen, and says, "they are all dumb dogs, they cannot bark" (Isa. 56:10). God does not accuse these men of modernism; it did not exist then. He does not accuse these shepherds of His flock of false doctrine, only being asleep when they should be warning His flock.

A few years ago, a prominent and well-to-do layman, one highly regarded in the church, decided that it was his duty to see me and rebuke me as a troublemaker on the whole Christian scene. By God's providence, I learned something about the man shortly before his unexpected arrival. He had gone through bankruptcy three times and had cost more than a few trusting Christians and non-Christians a great deal of money. After he spoke, I confronted him with his record of debt. That was business, he said. I read to him the laws of God relative to debt in the Old and New Testaments and asked him where God exempted defrauding widows, orphans, or the rich, in the name of business. No pastor had ever rebuked him on the matter. I went from one violation of law to another on his part, but he insisted that he was under grace. Was grace feeding those to whom he owed money? He left a total enemy, speaking ill of me at every opportunity. At that same time, he continued a highly honored laymen in his church.

Where are God's shepherds when such sins are becoming routine?

In recent months, I have received a few calls from some of you, all faithful friends; all have been confronted with the same problem and have been given the same answer. A homosexual, or several of them, come to a church; they quickly volunteer their services, as an organist, a boy's worker, a choir member, or the like. If our friends protest this fact, the nervous reply by a pastor, or by members, runs usually something like this: "He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her" (John 8:7); this is from the incident of the woman taken in adultery. It is a misuse of Scripture, an *ugly* misuse. If applied as these false shepherds, dumb dogs that cannot bark, mean it, no man could be prosecuted for murder, rape, theft, arson, or anything else, for who, other than Christ, has not sinned? The point our Lord makes is a basic premise of God's law, and usually of laws everywhere. No convicted thief can sit on a jury in a case of theft, nor a convicted murderer on a jury trying a murder case. The scribes and Pharisees who brought the woman were hypocrites, all of them adulterers themselves. Notice that they brought only the adulterous woman, not the man. Then as now, it takes two to commit the act of adultery! When our Lord spoke to them, we are told that they all left, "*being convicted* by their own conscience" (John 8:9). Are these "dumb dogs" who cite John 8:7 calling for the abolition of all law and of all criminal courts as the proper solution? (One of our writers left a prominent church that refused to deal properly with a child molester, nor to report him to the police. He protested, but then left, when it became clear that indications were that both the pastor and an assistant pastor were apparently moral degenerates.)

"Dumb dogs, that cannot bark," means that Christ's undershepherds have a duty to proclaim the whole law-word of God without fear of compromise, or else our Lord will deal with them. "For the time is come that judgment must begin at the house of God: and if it first begin at us, what shall the end be of them that *obey not* the gospel of God?" (1 Pet. 4:17).

The way to success in the pulpit is now, as in Isaiah's day, to listen to the people rather than the Lord, for the people still too often say, "Prophesy not unto us right things, speak unto us smooth things, prophesy deceits" (Isa. 30:10).

The Lord God removes all impediments to His Kingdom: men and nations, great empires and men, and churches as well. "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge: but fools despise wisdom and instruction" (Prov. 1:7).

Joseph McAuliffe has written about "designer churches," and very tellingly so. Unless a church is built on the Lord and His Word, its foundation is but sand, and, when God's judgment strikes, great shall be the fall thereof (Matt. 7:27).

55

BIBLICAL RELEVANCE

Chalcedon Report No. 5, February 1, 1966

One of the unhappy facts of our day is the gap between evangelical Christianity and political action. We have, on the one hand, those whose religion is politics; they expect more than justice from the political order: they expect salvation. A political cause becomes their religion. On the other hand, we have those who say that, because Christ is their Savior, they are not interested in the "dirty business" of politics. Both attitudes are clearly wrong, and dangerous as well. For the Christian to separate himself from political action is to separate himself from responsibility, and to separate himself from responsibility is to separate himself from God.

What we have seen in U.S. politics is a departure from Christian American constitutionalism. In a very important speech, delivered on March 2, 1930, a prominent American declared that the Constitution gave the federal government *no right to interfere in the conduct of public utilities, of banks, of insurance, of business, of agriculture, of education, of social welfare and of a dozen other important features. In these, Washington must not be encouraged to interfere.*

He went on to condemn the idea that "master minds" or a brain trust could be trusted with the powers of decision or regulation:

> The doctrine of regulation and legislation by "master minds" in whose judgment and will all the people may gladly and quietly acquiesce, has been too glaringly apparent at Washington during these past years. Were it possible to find "master minds" so unselfish, so willing to decide unhesitatingly against their own personal interests or private prejudices, men almost godlike in their ability to hold the scales of Justice with an even hand, such a government might be to the interest of the country, but *there are none such in our political horizon, and we cannot expect a complete reversal of all the teachings*

> *of history*. Now to bring about government by oligarchy masquerading as democracy, it is fundamentally essential that practically all authority and control be centralized in our National Government. The individual sovereignty of our States must first be destroyed, except in mere minor matters of legislation. We are safe from the danger of any such departure from the principles on which this country was founded just so long as the individual home rule of the States is scrupulously preserved and fought for whenever it seems in danger.

The governor went on to cite the limited "powers delegated to the United States by the Constitution." They are, briefly, 1) the military power for the purposes of defense, 2) the treaty-making power, "and the sole right of intercourse with foreign States," 3) the issue of money and its protection from counterfeiting, regulation of weights and measures, foreign commerce, protection of patents and copyrights, post offices, and minor federal tribunals in the states, and 4) the power to collect taxes, duties, and imposts, and to pay the debts for the common defense and general welfare of the United States. The governor added,

> On such a small foundation have we erected the whole enormous fabric of Federal Government which costs us $3,500,000,000 every year, and if we do not hold this steady process of building commissions and regulatory bodies and special legislation like huge inverted pyramids over every one of the simple Constitutional provisions, we shall soon be spending many billions of dollars more.

What was absolutely necessary, the governor declared, was a return to basic principles:

> But what are the underlying principles on which this Government is founded? There is, first and foremost, the new thought that every citizen is entitled to live his own life in his own way as long as his conduct does not injure any of his fellow men.

Who was this speaker? It was Governor Franklin Delano Roosevelt of New York, criticizing the leftward drift of the Hoover administration!

Let us glance briefly at another speech, delivered in Austin, Texas, on May 22, 1948, by Lyndon B. Johnson:

> The civil rights program, about which you have heard so much, is a farce and a sham . . . an effort to set up a police state in the guise of liberty. I am opposed to that program. I fought it in the Congress. It is the province of the state to run its own elections.

Both men were right the first time. They sinned with knowledge and against knowledge. And this is not surprising. When men are without

Christian character, they will choose the way of power rather than of truth and integrity. Where there is a moral disintegration, there is no assurance that an elected candidate will maintain a professed position. The number of elected conservatives who have switched sides is legion; they crumbled under pressure and under the temptations of power. There is thus little assurance that an election will gain any results, if there is no assured faith and character in the elected man. *And politics cannot produce character: Christianity must.* The decline of faith is a decline of character, and a decline of character is the forerunner of political decay and collapse. Christianity has an obligation to train a people in the fundamentals of God's grace *and* law, and to make them active and able champions of true political liberty and order.

In 1776, in a letter to John Scollay, Samuel Adams wrote, "I have long been convinced that our Enemies have made it an Object, to eradicate from the Minds of the People in general a Sense of true Religion and Virtue, in hopes thereby the more easily to carry their Point of enslaving them." How much more true this is now of every subversive agency, and how tragic and desperately wicked that the churches are themselves a major force in working for this eradication of faith and character. And this eradication is basic to man's enslavement.

Am I advocating political preaching by the clergy, and is not this position too close to the social-gospel attitude of political involvement? The answer on both counts is no.

Two similar questions have been received: What is the relation of clergy and politics? Should men in the pulpit speak out on social and political questions, and, if so, under what circumstances? Answer: The clergy cannot faithfully expound the Word of God without dealing with virtually every social and political question. The Bible speaks not only about salvation but about God's law with respect to the state, money, land, natural resources, just weights and measures, criminal law, and a variety of other subjects. The clergy are not to intermeddle in politics, but they must proclaim the Word of God. There is a difference: political intermeddling is a concern over partisan issues: preaching should be concerned with Biblical doctrines irrespective of persons and parties.

Too many clergymen are operating with a "shorter Bible," one limited to a fairly few passages and pages. One class of "shorter Bible" preachers are the modernists, who refuse to believe most of the Bible and limit themselves mainly to a few chapters, such as those that talk about love. The other class of "shorter Bible" preachers claim to believe all the Bible, but they drop almost everything except passages dealing with the saving of souls. These men are too spiritually minded to be of much earthly good.

The excuse of this second group, who are pietists, is that the law has been done away with by grace, and so there is no reason to preach the law of God. This is false doctrine. The law is done away with only as an indictment against us; it stands as the righteousness of God which we must uphold. Every aspect of the Old Testament law still stands, except those aspects of the ceremonial and priestly law specifically fulfilled by the coming of Christ, and those laws specifically reinterpreted in the New Testament. We are saved from the law as an indictment *but* not to break the law freely. Is the law done away with and the Christian "free" to kill, commit adultery, or steal? Rather the Christian is saved to be able to live in and under God's law, and the law now is written on the tables of his heart.

We are used to talking about the apostasy of the modernist clergy. Equally serious, if not more so, is the apostasy of the clergy who claim to believe the Bible but surrender the world to the devil, who refuse to proclaim the whole counsel of God to man.

The Bible is totally relevant to our world, and it must be so preached. Men are not given grace to despise the law but to enable them to keep the law. We have a lawless land because we have lawless preachers. The Bible speaks plainly in many passages on debt, theft (by individuals or by the state), justice, and other matters. Is it not a contempt of God's Word to neglect these passages? Salvation must be the starting point of all preaching, but, if our preaching be limited to this only, we are doing two things. *First*, we are, like the modernists, tossing out more of the Bible. *Second*, we are limiting God's Word only to what concerns our own souls, a very humanistic emphasis.

An interesting aspect of colonial Puritan preaching was the election sermon, sermons on fundamental moral issues preached before every election to instruct people in the Biblical mandate. Modernistic social gospel preaching is relevant to our world, but it is anti-Biblical in its perspective. What we need is relevant Biblical preaching of the *whole* Bible, not only on doctrines or social issues of interest to us, but on *all* that the Bible teaches.

56

TRUE PREACHING

Chalcedon Report No. 325, August 1992

The Protestant Reformation began with the attempt to return to the legitimate practices of the early church. Since then, the departure of Protestantism from its professed premises into a late medieval pietistic retreat from the world (or, with many, a lapse into modernism, or unbelief), has been dramatic.

The recent translation of John Calvin's *Sermons on 2 Samuel* (Carlisle, PA: Banner of Truth Trust) by Dr. Douglas F. Kelly of Reformed Seminary, and previously Chalcedon, is dramatic evidence of the gap.

In the early church, as in the synagogue, the preacher sat. This *cathedra*, or chair, was and still is called in the synagogue *the chair of Moses*. The preacher was a *teacher*. As Kenneth W. Stevenson wrote in *The First Rites: Worship in the Early Church*, "The Church didn't trust the clergy just to pick their favorite passages" (p. 49). They were required to preach systematically through the Bible. This was the method of the church fathers, of many preachers well in to the Middle Ages, of the Reformers, and of many Protestant pastors for some generations, but rarely now. The present-day pattern is to select texts in terms of crowd appeal, or some purpose other than the systematic exposition of Scripture. (In some churches, the pattern was to alternate, morning and evening, with a systematic teaching of a book of the Old Testament at one service, the New at the other.)

This is why Calvin's *Sermons on 2 Samuel* are so important. They demonstrate what true church preaching from the synagogue was intended to be, a systematic expounding of the Word of God.

Dr. Kelly's translation has a freshness that does Calvin justice. The lines often crackle with the sharp and incisive insights of Calvin, such as his comment on Abner: "Such insolence cannot be tolerated by God. He

cannot be fooled like men, for he is the one who searches their hearts" (p. 108). Or this: "Therefore, whoever wishes to overthrow God's order is a treacherous imposter and perjurer, and shows himself to be in contempt of God's majesty" (p. 96). And so on and on.

True preaching which is blessed by God is faithful to His Word above all else. It gives the listener a knowledge of what God has to say. It is an exercise in teaching and learning, not in crowd appeal nor emotional arousals. The church is starving for it. The Christian centuries witness to the power of a systematic teaching of Scripture. It is time for the churches to return to it and to abandon the entertainment-preaching of men. By such a step, they may lose with many men, but they will gain with God the Lord.

57

THE TRINITY AND MAN

Chalcedon Report No. 336, July 1993

It cannot be stressed too much that Christians must recognize the distinction between the economical Trinity and the ontological Trinity. The economical Trinity means the *relationship* of the triune God to us in His redemptive work. His providential care, the indwelling Spirit, and more. The ontological Trinity means God in His own being, *as He is*, in His eternal aseity.

Failure to recognize the importance of these two aspects of God's being has led again and again to serious problems in the church, and to decline.

We can better understand this problem with a very simple illustration. Assume for a moment that you are a very wealthy person. People will then show a great deal of interest in you, in what they can get out of you, and in how they can use you. Their concern with you is in *the economical you*, in your relationship to them, and in what they can get out of you. Their relationship with you at first may be a good one, but, in time, as they fail to grow, and as they are disinterested in you except in the ways you can help them, the relationship will cool.

So it is with Christians and with churches. Repeatedly in history, there have been major revivals, times of growth and expansion, and then a steady and sometimes sharp decline. Christians have come into these renewal years with excitement and joy. Like a burst of light, these times and movements have been exhilarating in their immediate effect. They have been like glorious dawns, but they seem all too soon to turn grey and dark.

The reason for this, whether a medieval movement, a Wesleyan revival, or the current charismatic movement, has been to a considerable degree the same. The glorious experience of the power of God in one's life, or the life of the church, is *experience* centered, *self-centered*; it is

a healthy joy in what God has done for us, but it is *not* followed by a greater joy in knowing God as He is.

Over the years, I have had various persons call on me to "straighten" me out for Jesus. When I have inquired about their knowledge of the whole Word of God, they have become impatient: they know Jesus, and they do not need to know Moses, Jeremiah, or anyone else! Not surprisingly, such people often fall by the wayside. They can tell you, in their time of fervency, what Jesus did for them, but, beyond that, their interest is dim. They are religious pragmatists: what works for me? What can Jesus do for me? To try to talk to them about the economical and the ontological approaches to God, using the simplest of language, is futile. They damn such thinking as head knowledge when all one needs is heart knowledge. They wrongly identify faith with a glow, not with total commitment, service, and knowledge.

The life of faith *requires* the economical aspect; it is receiving from God and rejoicing in His gifts. Because we are creatures, this is a necessary aspect of our lives. It is, however, not enough. To receive the gifts while remaining unconcerned with knowing the Giver is *morally wrong.* We need to know God in the totality of His Word, and to enjoy Him fully in all His works and being. It is the ontological Trinity which is the metaphysical basis of the economical Trinity.

There is urgency here. The church has gone over to a "practical" ministry. It stresses psychology, services to the young, to couples, to senior citizens, and so on. Its preaching is tailored to gaining interest on a superficial level, not to solid, doctrinal teachings. Because sin is unpopular, it talks about codependency, victimhood, and other like psychological garbage. The greatest preachers of the centuries would today bore most congregations because their preaching was centered on the triune God, not on the people and their "needs." The modern church has forgotten that the greatest true need of people is to know God, and too much preaching is about what God can do for you. Whether the church be Catholic or Protestant, charismatic or non-charismatic, the emphasis is too often humanistic; it is on emotions, feelings, and, above all, benefits.

I am not calling for pulpit lectures on the economical and ontological approaches to the doctrine of the Trinity, but, rather, teaching, preaching, and writing that centers our faith on the triune God, not on ourselves. The practical trinity of too many people is Me, Myself, and I.

The ontological Trinity is a mystery, beyond the comprehension of men. All the same, this ontological Trinity reveals Himself truly in His holy Word, and He requires us to know Him. When God gives His gifts, it is that then "ye shall know that I am the Lord your God" (Exod. 16:12).

Is it not blasphemy to believe that God's only purpose in our salvation is to make us happy, to give us a glorious glow, and to take away our problems? If someone is interested in you only in terms of what they can get from you, will you not in time be thoroughly angry with them? True enough, God does not need your interest in Him, nor your time, nor your money, but will He not despise your profession of faith when it proves to be no more than a sanctimonious self-interest?

We have too many happy-happy Christians who do not fear God, and they should. The adoration of God is gone in too many churches. Too many despise God's law-word and still expect His blessings. The results are all around us, a numerically strong church and a weak people and witness.

As a start towards a true revival, "Fear God, and keep his commandments" (Eccl. 12:13).

58

THE MAJOR MEDIA

Chalcedon Report No. 337, August 1993

After a Sunday dinner recently, during the discussion that followed, Andrea Schwartz asked which one of the media I regarded as the most important. Without hesitation, I said, "the pulpit." No other form of media has exercised more power in history. In the medieval era, rulers favored a silent pulpit because so much unrest and demands for a change could be generated by the pulpit. Usually, if pulpits were silent before the Reformation, it was because princes wanted it so. It was an act of defiant freedom when the Puritans endowed special sermons and lectures in churches and colleges. Even to our own time, some such lecture series, whether we agree with them or not, have started major movements, as witness Reinhold Niebuhr's lectures on "The Nature and Destiny of Man," the 1939 Gifford Lectures at the University of Edinburgh, Scotland.

Our problem today is that Christians, having the major form of media in their hands, fail to use it properly. There are two reasons for this. *First*, congregations have replaced the rulers of old in demanding a harmless, pleasing pulpit. They are like the congregation of whom Isaiah spoke, who say, "Prophesy not unto us right things, speak unto us smooth things, prophesy deceits" (Isa. 30:10). (I know that two pastors who read this were asked to leave after preaching unequivocally yet graciously the plain Word of God: it had offended too many people!) It requires a congregation with willing ears for God's Word to make the pulpit again a media power.

Each week, the congregations in the U.S. churches *outnumber* the voters in any national election. These listeners are the working people of America of all classes; they are the property owners, the great providers for a variety of causes, and the doers in the community. If aroused, these people can shake the nation and the world. They must, however, be ready

to listen to the non-sugar coated Word of God; they must be ready to hear and to obey — and to give.

The *second* problem is the preacher of the Word. He is indeed vulnerable to the whims of the congregation, but, while his calling is not to be offensive, it is to be fearless. The Word of God goes against the grain with fallen men, and the redeemed, not being perfectly sanctified in this life, are often lazy and unwilling to grow. (Many years ago, I had a man of importance in that small city attend our services. He expressed his pleasure at hearing an "intelligent" sermon, and he returned with enthusiasm for four or five Sundays more. He then quit coming and avoided me. A close relative of his told me that he realized that my Biblical sermons would alter his thinking, and "he didn't want anyone messing with his mind!")

It is not easy to be a preacher to a congregation of critics rather than worshippers. Too many come to church to keep intact their fire and life insurance policy with Jesus. But this is not faith! Faith leads to works, to action; it is inseparable from growth, or sanctification.

So, here we are, with history's major form of the media, and we fail to use it properly. Are you not reminded of our Lord's parable of the talents (Matt. 25:14–30)? Our Lord said to the man who buried his talents, "Thou wicked and slothful servant, thou knewest that I reap where I sowed not, and gather where I have not strawed" (Matt. 25:26). His judgment on that servant followed.

The true power of the pulpit is in the Word of God faithfully and unequivocally preached. It has then more than a human power, and it is accompanied by the working of God the Spirit. That power is not available to a hesitant pulpit nor to a critical and unyielding people, not because they govern God's power, but because the Lord passes them by.

The world is deeply in trouble. We have in our hands the major media, the only one with supernatural power promised to it (Isa. 55:11). Will we continue to slumber, like the foolish virgins (Matt. 25:1–13)?

59

THE PASTOR AND HIS DUTIES

Chalcedon Report No. 387, October 1997

The pastorate has changed more than a little in my lifetime, both for better and for worse. One area of improvement is preaching. Granted that too much preaching is still shallow and more fluff than food, a growing segment of the clergy is more dedicated to solid study and preaching. The silly, shallow, and embarrassing cheap sermon can still be heard, but it is losing ground to solid Biblical preaching. We do need more of the approach of the church fathers, who went through entire books of the Bible week after week, and who gave to the church a very sound knowledge of Scripture.

An area of decline has been pastoral visitation, the regular calls on all families and on shut-ins. Some pastors do almost no visitation. Granted, this is time-consuming work, but it is necessary. In one church, I had a happy solution, elderly women who did excellent calling, and an old and very wonderful former Scottish elder and his wife, who called faithfully and told me of any person or family needing my attention.

Clearly, if all the work is left to the pastor, he will be overworked and at times pushed into a premature retirement. Churches need to examine the pastor's duties and to see how the work can be best accomplished.

One value of the participation of others in such tasks is that it carries weight for people to see members actively involved in the church's work.

The congregation should be encouraged to pray for the pastor and the volunteer helpers. The church should provide all with some training, certainly beginning with Sunday school teachers.

In one church, we had excellent results with monthly written tests for all Sunday school students. We made it clear that we were not simply babysitting the children!

I do believe that the pastor should be relieved of most administrative

duties. In some young churches, he is the secretary, the treasurer, the janitor, and the groundskeeper! Little time is left for his main duties. It is time to rethink some of these things.

60

PRECISIONISM

Chalcedon Report No. 409, August 1999

One of the marks of the twentieth century has been the insistence on precision. The modern era has required such a view. Computers, mechanization, and urban culture have required an adherence to the clock, to accuracy, to a mechanical precision, and more.

The reverse has been true in the world of ideas, and especially religion. Two movements and attitudes have marked the twentieth century where religion is concerned, Christianity in particular. The *first* has been *agnosticism*. Previously, the atheist openly professed his faith that there is no God. This, by the twentieth century, was superseded by the ostensibly more thoughtful position of agnosticism, meaning, in essence, "I do not know whether God exists, nor is it really possible to know." This supposedly more modest stand than open atheism in effect held that it is not possible to know, and it eliminated religion as an area or source of knowledge. By a show of modesty, it ruled out religion, Christianity in particular, as a source of knowledge, certainly not the source of knowledge.

The *second* perspective has been *relativism*. With this attitude, we cannot make moral judgments, nor can we determine what truth is. Relativism has been used to eliminate the Biblical doctrine of man as a sinner, as a fallen creature in need of salvation. It has been used to vindicate once-forbidden sexual practices, to undermine God's law, and to create a society essentially open to lawlessness and godlessness while open to every evil. Its logical conclusion is that of the Marquis de Sade, that the only evil is the Biblical God and His law.

Popular culture today, its entertainment and religion, is based on agnosticism and relativism. Because of this, with each year it descends further into the abyss of a world whose foundation is the fall, and its premise that every man is his own god and the determiner for himself of what is

good and evil. Our education and politics are increasingly based on agnosticism and relativism. We are now far from Augustine and Calvin and very close to Wagner, Marx, and Darwin.

Our state schools are temples to agnosticism and relativism, as are our laws. We have adopted with Nietzsche a philosophy of death, and our culture is a dying one. We are increasingly disrupted by violence and by hatred and murder.

Sadly, the church has become widely infected by these influences. Precision in theology has given way to pietistic fuzziness, and truth, to feeling. The pulpit gives voice to imprecision, and it replaces truth with feelings. Sound and precise preaching is condemned as having no heart, and emotional outbursts have replaced sound faith.

We need a return to sound theology and to an emphasis on understanding the Word of God. As of now, a lifelong churchgoer is often as ignorant of the Bible as a novice in the faith.

It is interesting to note that Calvin, a precise and clear thinker and writer, is commonly spoken of as "difficult" reading and too theological. Such judgments tell us more about the critic than about Calvin.

The church should surpass the world in the clarity and precision of its faith. This is what the Bible gives us, a clear and precise account of our faith. There is no excuse for fuzziness. The word "fuzzy" is not a synonym for *faith*.

61

"THIS IS THE VICTORY"

Chalcedon Report No. 339, October 1993

I believe it was my first sermon after ordination. It was at a lovely mountain town, and the congregation was interested. Happiest of all for me was the pleasure of a newly converted member, an artist. He gave me a small oil painting which I long enjoyed, until, in a move, it was lost.

I preached on Matthew 7:24–29, the two foundations. If our lives had a false foundation, times of judgment would shatter us and sweep us away, whereas, if our lives are established on Christ the Rock, we would withstand such storms and triumph.

A month later, an angry letter came from the artist. I had beguiled and tricked him in an "optimistic" view when all good Bible scholars said the rapture and Last Judgment were *very* close. This was half a century ago.

Our correspondence brought out his sharp complaint. If my interpretation were correct, then, instead of simply waiting quietly, like the wise virgins, until the Lord came, we would have to be *working*!

I cited many texts to him, including our Lord's words, "Occupy till I come" (Luke 19:13), but he ended the exchange by accusing me of buying into the social gospel.

Is it any wonder that, in the half a century since then, the church, then still America's most powerful voice, has become irrelevant? The world is not to blame for this. The church did it to itself. I believe that the Lord will hold this to the church's account.

Our Lord *is* as He has been since His resurrection, "the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords" (1 Tim. 6:15). The word *potentate* is *dunastes*, the only authority, the only power. "All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made" (John 1:3). My Bible has no appendix informing me of this King's abdication! His plan remains the same: before the end comes, He

shall put down all rule, all authority, and all power. All His enemies shall be put under His feet (1 Cor. 15:23–26). To believe anything less is not to believe in Him. "This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith" (1 John 5:4).

Think about it. What does God want His church to be? An army of losers?

62

PSYCHOBABBLE IN STATE AND BUSINESS

Chalcedon Report No. 343, February 1994

It was in the 1960s when friends began to report to me on the special training sessions and seminars they were required to attend as state or federal employees, or as workers for businesses and corporations. These sessions have had a variety of names. Early groups were called "sensitivity training" classes. Now the names are many, but the goals are similar.

Among the main emphases are, *first*, a desire to make participants sensitive to racial minorities. In time, this came to mean women's liberation, homosexual "rights," and other such causes. *Second*, in business seminars, there has been a stress on salesmanship, gaining public approval for industrial policies, and so on. Such seminars, going back to Dale Carnegie's classes on *How to Win Friends and Influence People*, have stressed "Positive thinking" in the Norman Vincent Peale tradition. All this has been amplified by various strands of New Age thinking, so that the business community is awash with what the Bobgans (Dr. Martin Bobgan and Mrs. Deidre Bobgan) have in other contexts called "psycho-babble."

In recent weeks, I have heard of seminars where Christ's thinking was termed "too negative," and original sin denied in favor of man's natural goodness; where people are taught to regard themselves as a power centers, living dynamos for great achievements, because they carry in them whatever divinity this world has; and so on.

If a corporation allowed a seminar to teach Christianity, or if a federal agency did so, there would be protests from coast to coast, but open anti-Christianity can be taught, and any man protesting this is expendable.

Psychobabble can prevail in business, state, and school as acceptable and valid, although it commonly takes forms as absurd as astrology and necromancy. Why has this happened?

We cannot reduce this to a plot nor a conspiracy because *at heart*

there is something very important at stake. In spite of all the talk to the contrary, man needs religion, a faith to live by. There must be a rationale undergirding his daily life, his work, education, civil and personal government, and all things else. He cannot live in a vacuum of meaning. Man needs religion, and he must have it. If the church does not provide it, he will look elsewhere.

To begin with, man has a predilection to look elsewhere than to Christ for his answers. As a sinner, he does not want inspiration from his judge; in fact, he wants to escape from Him. Man's sin predisposes him against Christ, and the Bible is for him not only uninspired but definitely "unfriendly" reading: it tells him he is a sinner, which is, definitely, not positive thinking.

The churches have aggravated the problem. They have abandoned sound theology for efficient churchmanship. Some years ago, I was told of a man who rejected an attempt by a church to recruit him, saying, I don't smoke, drink, dance, gamble, or fornicate, so why should I need you? Particular sins are manifestations of an inner fact, sin, rebellion against God and His government and law. Sin is at heart *anomia*, antilaw (1 John 3:4).

Superficial teaching and preaching overlooks the root of the matter, man's will to be his own god and the source of his own law and morality (Gen. 3:5).

Civil and corporate training seminars represent a major new development in the twentieth-century history of cults. Such cults represent major errors and heresies, and their basic influence is deadly. (They are also very costly to corporations and profitable to the promoters.)

But errors proliferate for two main reasons. *First*, man the sinner prefers a lie to the truth. Revelation 22:15 describes the reprobate as those who love and manufacture lies. Of such, we have many. *Second*, given the natural predisposition of all men to a lie, if the institution established to propagate the truth fails in its task, the lie flourishes. There are many excellent churchmen and churches, but there are more which are an impediment to Christ, our truth.

And so we have psychobabble in church, state, school, business, and society. We have the solemn proclamation of "positive" thinking. If I were a god, positive thinking might work, but, since I am a man, positive thinking *cannot* replace hard work, sound and honest thinking, and a firm grasp on reality, knowing who God is, what we are, and what He requires of us. "He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the LORD require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" (Mic. 6:8).

63

"SHOWING THE LORD'S DEATH"

Chalcedon Report No. 320, March 1992

NOTE: following is the text of a communion sermon on January 12, 1992

> "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come." (1 Cor. 11:26)

THIS is a sentence that needs particular attention, because it tells us that the celebration of the Lord's Supper has a meaning to the end of time. It is witness to His atonement, and to His victory over sin and death. It is a rite which tells men and nations that the Lord who conquered sin and death rules all history. He has made us His people and heirs together with Him of His eternal Kingdom.

Charles Hodge's comment is excellent:

> What Paul had received of the Lord is recorded in the preceding verses. Here and in what follows we have his own inferences from the account which the Lord had given him. The first of those inferences is, that the Lord's supper is, and was designed to be, a proclamation of the death of Christ to continue until his second advent. Those who come to it therefore, should come, not to satisfy hunger, nor for the gratification of social feelings, but for the definite purpose of bearing their testimony to the great fact of redemption, and to contribute their portion of influence to the preservation and propagation of the knowledge of that fact. *For* indicates the connection with what precedes. "It is a commemoration of his death, *for* it is in its very nature a proclamation of that great fact." And it was not a temporary institution, but one designed to continue until the consummation. As the Passover was a perpetual commemoration of the deliverance out of Egypt, and a prediction of the coming and death of the Lamb of God, who was to bear the sins of the world; so the Lord's supper is at once the commemoration of the death of Christ and a pledge of his coming the second time without sin unto salvation.[1]

1. Charles Hodge, *An Exposition of the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Grand

The words, "ye do show," imply an action on our part, and also a public confession. By partaking of the elements, we confess ourselves to be Christ's people and possession, and that we are members of a Kingdom which shall encompass all peoples in its victory.

The victory is over sin and death. It is the triumph of the new human race being recreated in Jesus Christ, who shall subdue to Himself all principalities and powers, all rule and authority, and then, at the end of time, shall destroy death itself (1 Cor. 15:24–27; Eph. 1:17–23).

According to F. W. Grosheide:

> He that comes to the Lord's table declares that he not only believes that Christ died to pay for the sins of His people, but that he also believes that Christ lives and that His death has significance for all time.[2]

Our presence at the table is an expression of faith and a belief in victory.

It is sad that too many churchmen know less about the meaning of their faith than do the enemies of Christianity. Our enemies often have an inspired awareness which is evil and even demonic. For example, Albert Camus, in *The Rebel*, declared, "Since God claims all that is good in man, it is necessary to deride what is good and choose what is evil."[3] He also held, "I rebel (I) therefore we exist."[4] Camus stated openly that which is the spirit of this age, and of fallen men generally.

The Lord's Table has been understood and parodied by His enemies over the centuries in what is called the Black Mass, or the Satanic Mass. Much has been written on the subject, and much reported which is not repeatable. An extensive investigation occurred under Louis XIV, which was suspended when it became apparent that his mistress Francoise-Athenais, Marquise de Montespan, was deeply involved. Other investigations have uncovered similar data. The Black Mass is an obscene parody; homosexuals are often deeply engaged therein. At every point, the meaning of the Lord's Table is exactly reversed. Some aspects of this are, *first*, the performance of illicit and perverse sexual acts; *second*, at times human sacrifice has marked the Black Mass; *third*, instead of celebrating Christ's triumph over sin and death, our empowerment to righteousness, or justice, and our inheritance of eternal life, the Black Mass exalts sin and death. Very tellingly, it enacts Solomon's description of the enemies of God. Wisdom declares, "But he that sinneth against me wrongeth his

Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1950 reprint), pp. 229-230.

2. F. W. Grosheide, *Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1953), p. 273.

3. Albert Camus, *The Rebel* (New York, NY: Vintage Books, 1956), p. 47.

4. ibid., p. 22.

own soul: all they that hate me love death" (Prov. 8:36). A culture which is humanistic and anti-Christian will see, not only the widespread observance of the Black Mass, but a cultural will to death. We today are surrounded by a suicidal generation, men and nations powerfully motivated to courses of action which manifest a death wish.

The world outside the realm of this table is given to self-will. Its motto, often used in the Black Mass, is an ancient one: "Do what thou wilt is the highest law," or, some would say, *the only law.*

It comes down to a matter of Christ, His victory over sin and death, His law, His righteousness and eternal life, as against self-will and death.

By being present in faithfulness at this table, we witness to our faith that Christ's Kingdom shall prevail. We commit ourselves to His service, and to the support of those men and missions which advance His rule. We thereby "show the Lord's death till he come."

Eating and drinking of these elements is thus ordained to be an impetus to faithfulness and to action, to service and to obedience. Our Lord's words, immediately preceding Paul's statement, declare, "this do ye . . . in remembrance of me."

According to Godet, our Lord's words, and then St. Paul's, imply and require *action*. "For the meaning of the action is to *shew His death.*"[5] To show His death is to proclaim the coming death of death, the triumph of His Kingdom, and the great certainty proclaimed in Revelation 11:15:

> The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ: and he shall reign for ever and ever.

5. F. Godet, *Commentary on St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians*, vol. 2 (Edinburgh, Scotland: T. & T. Clark, 1886), p. 161.

HUMANISM

64

CIVILIZATION'S CIVIL WAR

Chalcedon Report No. 99, November 1973

For well over 500 years now, Western civilization has been in a state of civil war, with two aspects thereof in a growing conflict with one another. These two contending forces are humanism and Christianity. Humanism began its rise to power in the medieval era, and its strength was such that it captured the church, much of the academic world, and the state as well. The so-called Renaissance was the victory celebration of the triumphant humanists. While preserving the form of Christendom and the church, the humanists put them to other uses. Lorenzo Valla openly turned to anti-Christian standards as the new yardstick, without bothering to deal with the Bible as a serious source of law. The source of all virtuous action, Lorenzo Valla held, is man's natural bent to pleasure. Ficino held that virtue and love were responses to beauty. However much these and other men disagreed as to the true standards for life, they were agreed that God could not be the source of standards, but that man and man's reason is the yardstick in terms of which all things must be judged. The standard, it was held, is man, and the moment. Ficino's inscription in the Florentine Academy concluded thus: "Flee excesses, flee business, and rejoice in the present." For these men, the church was to be the instrument for a new kind of salvation, a refined Christianity informed and remade by humanism. As Cronin has pointed out, Botticelli's painting of the *Birth of Venus* was an expression of this faith: the symbolism of Venus in this portrayal means that "[n]atural love, purified, is about to become Christian love, *eros* to become *agape*" (Vincent Cronin, *The Florentine Renaissance* [New York, NY: Dutton, 1967], p. 211).

The unnatural union between Biblical faith and humanism was shattered by the Reformation. In the regrouping of forces which followed, it gradually became clear that, more basic than the division between

Protestant and Catholic, was the division between Christendom and humanism. Both branches of the church were quickly infiltrated by humanism, and, with the French and Russian revolutions, two things became clear. *First*, the old attempts at synthesis and union had been discarded. Humanism was now strong enough to stand on its own, to judge and condemn Biblical religion. *Second*, it was also clear that, however much the façade of synthesis has since been offered to Christendom, the real issue is a war to death. In the Marxist world, the persecution of Christians (and orthodox Jews) has not diminished with the years. A very considerable number of the people in the slave labor camps are there for religious reasons, and their persecution is savage and intense. The triumph of statist humanism has been very nearly complete, in that virtually every state in the world is either dominated by or under the influence of this alien faith.

At the same time, however, the growing bankruptcy and imminent collapse of humanism has been increasingly in evidence. By replacing God with man as the new ultimate and absolute, humanism has introduced moral anarchy into the world. If every man is his own god and law, then no order is rationally possible. Humanism, having deified rationality, must now use the irrational and coercive power of the socialist state to hold society together.

Moreover, having denied that there is any truth beyond man, humanism has surrendered the world outside of man to total irrationality. There is no meaning, purpose, or truth in the world: it is held to be mindless, meaningless, brute factuality. But man, once seen as the principle of reason in the universe, has, since Freud, been seen as himself irrational and meaningless, so that man no longer can find truth or meaning anywhere. The world and man are essentially pointless and meaningless. The fact that church, school, and state have all been captured by this bankrupt humanism makes the crisis all the greater.

The bankruptcy of humanism makes all the more urgent a return to a consistent and thorough commitment to Biblical faith, to Biblical law, and to a Biblically governed world and life view. It means, too, that the opportunity for the resurgence of such a faith has never been greater. As the crisis of the twentieth century deepens, the opportunity will become more and more obvious. Men will not long cling to a humanism which cannot provide them with anything to satisfy either their mind or body. One man, speaking of modern humanistic politics, once told me, "Sure, the system is rotten and senseless, but it still gives me a good living." There are millions like him, feeding on the relics of humanistic civilization. Every day, however, the emptiness of humanism becomes more

apparent; its money is progressively bankrupt, its politics corruption, and its education mindlessness. As a result, since nothing has any meaning, bad taste, vulgarity, profanity, and insanity are enthroned as "art" to express total contempt for all things. As one very popular modern "musician" said recently, "Sometimes I think I'm playing for the lunatic fringe. Luckily, it is widening. In fact, I think it is outdistancing the mainstream" ("Kinky and Country Music," *Los Angeles Times Calendar*, September 30, 1973, p. 68). But the cultivation of insanity is the cultivation of irrelevance and death. Such people will not be with us long. The question of importance is, will we stand and move in terms of God's Word and law?

65

HUMANISM IN THE CHURCH

Chalcedon Report No. 52, November 20, 1969

Over the years, I have, on several occasions, talked with some evangelists, and members of "revival teams." The experience has been uniformly the same. Their position has been one of a lowest common denominator theology. They have been vague and general on doctrines such as the sovereignty of God, His eternal decree, creationism, and much more. Moreover, the more concern I showed for Biblical knowledge, the more irritable they became. The discussion was usually terminated by their objection to "fine points of doctrine," and a charge that I lacked "a passion for souls." My feeling in return was that they lacked any concern or passion for God and His Word. The important thing for them was *man,* the conversion of man and the cause of man.

Their position was and is *humanism*. Because of their concern for men, and for "saving" men, they are to that degree unconcerned about God and His Word as far as priority is concerned.

The roots of this humanism go deep in every branch of the church. Pietism in the eighteenth century was humanistic to the core. Its concern was religious experience, the personal experience of the believer rather than God's order and His Word. Pietists like Madame Guyon placed their feelings ahead of all godly authority.

In Protestant circles, humanism led to revivalism, to an insistence that true faith was identical with a form of man's experience rather than a God-given grace which led to an assent to God's Word and authority.

The end result of this humanism in religion is a radical erosion of standards and law, and a progressive insistence that the true test of religion is not the Word of God but service to man. One radio priest has declared that God must be identified with our neighbor. At one Protestant Bible conference in the summer of 1969, high-school youth were taught songs

of civil revolution in the name of evangelism. The goal of Christian activity, according to one chorus, was human unity, and the test of Christianity, "love," all men walking together. In France, Father Cardonnel has written, "From now on, God exists only in downtrodden people; that is what God's transcendence amounts to." For Father Maillard, a French Franciscan and director of *Freres du Monde*, revolution is an absolute value in itself. He has declared, "If I noticed that my faith separated me by however little from other men and diminished my revolutionary violence, I would not hesitate to sacrifice my faith." In the United States, at Notre Dame, a non-Christian layman, Bayard Rustin, has been added to the board of trustees.

The Protestant churches have extensively identified true Christianity with the love of man, and the true Christian tradition with revolution. The church, according to a National Council study guide of 1966, must overcome all "dividing walls" between men in order to create a truly human community. "The church does not exist for itself. It exists for the world, as the part for the whole." But, according to Scripture, the church exists for Christ, *not* the world. The gospel presented by one Protestant church after another is the gospel of the kingdom of man, not the Kingdom of God.

Radical humanism commands every area of the church today. Man is so important, that the supreme offense is any kind of resistance or opposition to man. Jacques Ellul says of America, "Why, in the face of the black violence they provoked, do they not seek peace *at any price*?" He calls for a humanistic "love that is total, without defense, without reservation," as the answer (Jacques Ellul, *Violence*, p. 174). For Ellul, the Christian is not God's man, but man's spokesman: "The Christian must be the spokesman for those who are *really* poor and forgotten" (p. 53). And why not? For Ellul, "Values have no meaning except as they are lived by man! We always come back to man. Everything depends on how man relates to man" (p. 113).

Humanism is the basic revolutionary force of our age. It is not surprising at all that the average European, Canadian, and American is indifferent to the Marxist threat. By his humanism, amoralism, and implicit anti-Christianity, the average man is only removed from Marxism by degree, but alien in kind to Christianity. To condemn Marxism, he must condemn himself. Marxism makes man the absolute; so does humanistic man today. Marxism is environmentalistic; it believes that evil is in the environment, in society, not in man. Again, most people today would agree. Marxism believes that a new politically ordered arrangement of society is the answer to all man's problems. This is precisely the faith of most people

today. Marxism looks to man for salvation, and again most people agree. Is it any wonder that they refuse to see Marxism as a threat? To condemn Marxism, most people must then logically condemn themselves. Instead, they join the humanistic revolution. Billy Graham has said "Amen" to revolutionary-oriented evangelism, and why not? His basic humanism requires that he move in the direction of a more systematic humanism.

Humanism today governs virtually every country, and it is triumphant in virtually every church. Only small pockets of resistance to humanism remain in Christendom. The triumph of humanism seems virtually complete.

But humanism can no more bring about a successful social order than suicide can offer a better life. Humanism is suicidal. It erodes every form of social and religious tie and creates an atomistic man. This atomistic man boasts of his godlike status and yet lives in radical alienation from all other men. "Communication," the most elementary and basic reality of every normal society, becomes a major problem when humanism infects a people. Men lose the ability to communicate, because they have nothing to communicate. In my study of *Intellectual Schizophrenia*, I cited the witness of Georges Simenon's novel, *The Man Who Watched the Trains Go By* (1946). Simenon portrays an empty man in an empty world of meaningless men and events, where "[n]obody obeys the laws if he can help it." The main figure, Kees Popinga, tries to explain the series of events which lands him in trouble, to tell the *truth* about himself. He begins writing an explanation, "The Truth about the Kees Popinga Case," but he can write nothing, because, in a meaningless world, nothing has a truth which can be communicated. Humanism can only corrode and destroy; it is a disintegrating force. Some humanists even boast of it. I have heard some point to the radical disorders of our time as proud evidence that humanism is on the march. An old rabbinic saying stated, "Without law, civilization perishes." Without God's law, civilization dissolves into anarchism.

In the face of all these things, the command of St. Paul remains, "Rejoice evermore" (1 Thess. 5:16). This seems like a strange word from a persecuted saint, but it rests on a basic premise that, "in all these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us" (Rom. 8:37). Since God is on the throne, the inescapable victory is ours in Christ. Life is indeed a battlefield, but a triumphant one for the believer. The faith set forth in all Scripture is a victorious one. Again, an old rabbinic proverb sums up this aspect of Scripture: "The world is a wedding," i.e., a place of rejoicing. Because Jesus Christ is the bridegroom, all friends of the bridegroom rejoice (John 3:29), because they hear His voice.

We are summoned by Scripture to join in God's laughter. The ungodly nations conspire and take counsel together against God and His anointed; their worldwide conspiracy seeks to overthrow God's law order. But "He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh: the Lord shall have them in derision" (Ps. 2:4). The triumphant laughter of God resounds over the fall of Babel, Assyria, Babylon, Rome, and all other empires of the past, and it shall resound over the humanistic tyrannies of today.

We live, therefore, in the last days of humanism. Its suicidal nature brings it to ruin as a result of its very triumph. Our problem today is not the strength of the humanists, for they are weak. It is the absence, laziness, and weakness of Christians.

Meanwhile, God's calling remains. Man was called by God to exercise dominion and to subdue the earth (Gen. 1:26–28). Man fell from his calling in his sin. He was restored into the image of God and his calling by the saving power of Jesus Christ. It is therefore man's duty, now as ever, to exercise dominion. The duty of godly reconstruction is an inescapable one. Nothing else can be a substitute for it.

66

THE DEATH OF AN AGE AND ITS FAITH

Chalcedon Report No. 56, April 2, 1970

The death of an age is a bloody business. Men, disillusioned with the promises of their faith, yet unwilling to surrender them, strike out at everything in rage and in frustration. Like a rudderless ship, the civilization loses its direction and is driven by events instead of driving through them. Today, in the last days of humanism, as men steadily destroy their world, it is important for us to understand the meaning of the times and act in terms of that knowledge. The humanists in their blindness celebrate "the death of God," when it is in fact the death of humanism and their own funeral that they are racing to in their heedless course.

Humanism is dying because its faith is false, and its promises bankrupt. Let us examine that faith in order to understand more clearly its failure. *First* of all, humanism presupposes a faith in man, even to insisting on the basic goodness of man. This idealistic affirmation comes in conjunction with the assumption that evil is not in man but rather in his environment. Change the environment, and you thereby change man, it is held. As a result, humanistic sociology and politics are rigorously environmental: every effort is made to provide better housing, better education, every kind of environmental control, but, in all of this, man's evil only seems to proliferate.

As a result, many humanists have themselves abandoned their faith in man. Nietzsche, ahead of most, proclaimed the need of superman to replace man, and evolutionists and socialists have dedicated themselves to working towards the creation of a new man. Man as he now is, in terms of this hope, is expendable: he is merely the ape who shall produce the man of the future. Lenin, who held this view, could therefore treat with ruthless contempt the apes beneath him as he worked to bring the new man out of them. In every version, this belief is a break with the humanistic faith in man.

A *second* basic concept of the humanistic faith is its affirmation that man is his own god. As I have pointed out, in several of my books (e.g., *This Independent Republic*, pp. 142–143), basic to every sound theology is the doctrine of the unity of the godhead. A schizophrenic god is no god at all. Mankind, humanity, being made up of gods, must be united to avoid a division in this new godhead, man. This means world unity, a one-world order; it means world peace, for the godhead must not be at war with itself.

Ironically, this faith has led to what has been called "perpetual war for perpetual peace." To demand the unity of all men is the essence of total imperialism. The result is total warfare. The peace lovers are history's greatest warmongers. Worldwide interventionism to effect world peace has characterized the policies of late of the Soviet Union, the United States, the United Nations, and others. Granted their presuppositions, all are "sincere," but sincerity does not mean either truth or justice.

Moreover, man without God ends up as man without man, unable and unwilling to live at peace with anyone, and unable to live at peace with himself. The existentialist Sartre has stated the modern mood bluntly: "Hell is other people." If every man is his own god, knowing or determining for himself what constitutes good and evil, then every man is at war with any limitation upon himself imposed by other men or by a state. Hell, then, is logically "other people," and the humanistic faith in man as his own god becomes history's major impulse towards suicide. The satanic temptation (Gen. 3:5) thus becomes the counsel of death to men and nations.

The *third* basic doctrine of the religion of humanism is the belief in equality (see again *This Independent Republic*, p. 140). Equality is a concept of the age of humanism, with its respect for the authority of science, transferred from the realm of mathematics and applied to man. The results have been devastating. Two plus two equals four is a valid concept, and a necessary abstraction. Such abstractions are important tools. In dealing with board feet of lumber, all cut to size, and graded, such abstractions work. But the richness and variety of man cannot be expressed by abstractions. Two Africans and two Englishmen do not equal four Americans, or vice versa: the equation mark now becomes an absurdity. Who are these eight men, and what are their talents? Are they saints of God or are they apostates, criminals, or good citizens? One may be a plumber, and the other a concert violinist; the plumber may be more important to you today, and the violinist tonight. Each has their place, their function, and the term "equality" is irrelevant to it: it imposes an abstract mathematical judgment in an area where a vast variety of considerations must govern.

But we are governed today by the politics of equality. To challenge the doctrine is in bad form, although everyone is troubled, and society in an uproar, over the unrealistic attempts to enforce an abstraction onto the concrete facts of life.

The doctrine is honored in principle and denied in practice. The Marxist world affirms, "From each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs," but this is not an equality of work but of wealth. In practice, even this is abandoned by the Marxists in favor of a variety of rewards and a radically unequal society, one with greater variations of social status than the old Russia had. Both Fabian and Marxist socialisms now favor meritocracy, rigid examinations, state control of all jobs, and positions being assigned (and power) in terms of examinations. The result is the rise of a new privileged class. In Britain, the House of Lords is steadily packed with Labor politicians, who have been made peers, and there are signs that its power may be revived under the leadership of this new elite. The equalitarians end up by asserting, as in Orwell's *Animal Farm*, that some animals are more "equal" than others! Whether it is the peasants of Russia, or the Negroes of America, the most rebellious and angry people, the most disillusioned members of equalitarian society, are those who have been "made equal" by acts of state. They know that they have been defrauded, and their impulse becomes revolutionary.

The *fourth* basic concept of the religion of humanism is its belief in the inevitability of progress. This is a secularized version of the belief in providence. Humanism, by denying God, has depersonalized history. The world and its events are no longer the plan and handiwork of a personal, sovereign God; they are the product of anonymous, impersonal social forces. These impersonal forces, with planning man now guiding his own evolution, are supposed to ensure, not only progress, but more rapid progress. The result is, as Robert L. Heilbroner, in *The Future as History*, has termed it, a "philosophy of expectations." In terms of humanism, mankind should now be moving rapidly into a paradise on earth. In the 1920s and 1930s, teachers and professors often waxed lyrical in portraying the golden age which scientific planning would usher in. Today, the most intelligent of humanism's children are most in revolt against its failure to deliver on its promises. According to Kenneth Keniston, in the November 1969 *Yale Alumni Magazine*, the students involved in campus protests are usually the most intelligent on the campus. "One study finds that the best way to predict whether a college will have antiwar protests is to count the number of National Merit Scholars in the freshman class... Furthermore, protesting students have been shown again and again to be an elite within each college and university more privileged

in background, more academically successful, more socially concerned than their less active classmates . . . It is partly for this reason that student unrest concerns us profoundly. To be sure, if we consider white students (and I will not discuss black militants here), only a minority of America's almost 7,000,000 college students are vocally disaffected. Yet if this minority is selectively drawn from the future leaders of our society, does this fact not threaten the continuity of our culture?" It does indeed, and the continuity of humanistic culture is being destroyed by its own bitter and disillusioned sons.

The destruction is also written into humanistic culture at every turn. Because of this belief in the inevitability of progress, men can believe that progress will come inevitably after destruction. Destroy the past, clear the ground, and progress is inevitable. This is basic to the revolutionary mentality. This scientism is described by Ortega y Gasset, in *The Revolt of the Masses*, as a new form of barbarism. Such a barbarian "believes that civilization is *there* in just the same way as the earth's crust and the forest primeval." As a result, this barbarian destroys in order to advance, because the destruction supposedly speeds up progress. The more revolutionary humanism becomes, the more it is suicidal.

Fifth, the basic saving institutions of humanism, i.e., its church or temple, are state and school. Both today are morally bankrupt. The implicit anarchism in all humanism makes man hostile to the state: it is always a hated establishment to him, a restraint on his freedom to be his own god. Whatever form the state takes, it displeases humanistic man. Very consistently, some leaders on the New Left now call for perpetual revolution as the only answer.

The school is also bankrupt. The mathematical dream of equality is especially absurd when applied to education, which is the process of differentiation, analysis, and understanding, not a massive leveling, of ideas and facts. Education is thus in growing chaos, and it cannot improve on humanistic terms. Nothing is more ridiculous than a "save our public schools" movement. In its origin, the public-school movement was socialistic and humanistic, and it cannot be otherwise. It is a state agency for state purposes, and its basic premise is the state's right to control and educate the child. The public-school movement is bankrupt, and it is dying.

Humanism is dying, if not dead. Living with a corpse is no pleasant matter. It does not require documentation to tell us that a corpse is far gone. The answer to our problem lies elsewhere, not in documentation on death, but in reconstruction for life.

Humanism is dead, but the triune God lives and rules, sovereign over all. There must be reconstruction, godly reconstruction. Let the dead

bury the dead. The living have work to do. All things shall be made new; new schools, new social orders, new institutions, renewed family life, in every area the principle of godly reconstruction must be applied.

Defensive warfare is a mistake: it leaves the initiative to the enemy. Those who are content to protect the past die with it. Our calling is to offensive warfare to subdue the earth and to exercise dominion over it (Gen. 1:26–28). This is what it means to be a man, created in the image of God. Remember: dominion does not belong to a mouse.

Some years ago, J. Allen Smith, by no means a conservative, wrote as follows in *The Growth and Decadence of Constitutional Government* (1930): "The basic conception of the old political order was not the divine right of kings, but the sovereignty of God. The assumed divine right of the temporal ruler was not an essential part of this doctrine. Divine sovereignty, as envisaged in the Christian theory of the world, was simply a conception of God as the ultimate source of authority. Direct human intermediaries, such as pope or king, were purely adventitious features of this belief." This belief in God's sovereignty meant also the rule of law. As Smith continued, "Supreme unlimited power had no place in the political thought of the early constitutionalists. All human authority was conceived to be limited." The "ultimate sovereignty of God precluded the idea that any human authority could be unlimited."

Precisely. And because today the sovereignty of God is denied, the sovereignty of man and the state is affirmed. It is useless to rail against the present trend if we are a part of it, and unless we affirm the sovereignty of God in its every aspect, we are to all practical intent affirming man and his humanistic order. In other words, you have already taken sides, and you had better know it. You are either working for the "crown rights of King Jesus" or for the crown claims of humanistic man. You cannot logically affirm "the rule of law," "moral principles," and "old-fashioned virtues" without affirming the sovereignty of God. The Marxists are right in recognizing God as the basic and ultimate enemy. Unless you stand in terms of the sovereignty of God as your strength, your first and last line of defense, and the ground of all advance, move over and join the enemy: you are a humanist.

67

PEACE AS A RIGHT?

Chalcedon Report No. 177, May 1980

A very common remark made by an angry or distressed husband or wife is this: a man (or, a woman) has a *right* to some peace in his home. This is a routine reaction to marital problems, and also a typically modern one. We would have to call it, in fact, a Kantian reaction.

In 1795, Immanuel Kant wrote *To Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch*. The essay is a classic of humanistic reasoning. Kant began with the admission that war is the natural condition of man, not peace. Step by step, however, he led his readers to the conclusion that peace is a basic human right. Kant was a leader in the shift of Western culture from the emphasis on God's law to human rights. Peace now became a human and public right. With that transition, Western civilization moved into an era of total warfare, perpetual war for perpetual peace, as someone termed it.

Why? What was it in the Kantian perspective which has proven so deadly to peace? The reason is a very simple one. Peace is unattainable when it is regarded as a right rather than a duty, as something which should come to us out of necessity, rather than something we must work for.

Let us return to the illustration we began with, marital discord. Marital problems are built into the modern view of marriage, the expectation that marriage will give us love as our right, and more. People marry expecting to be loved, rather than to love, and, as a result, both are disappointed. Like all things, marriage requires work to further and enhance the relationship. Without work, we are sure only of troubles.

The same is true of social problems. To assume certain things as our human rights ensures that we will demand them rather than work for them. The doctrine of rights thus becomes a major focus for social discontent, warfare, anarchism, and dissolution. Society is then faced with

the maximization of demands and the minimization of work. It becomes a conflict society, and the harmony of interests is ridiculed.

Law and politics are radically deformed by the emphasis on rights. Everything which men must of necessity work for is politicized: the assumption is that rights can be legislated into existence. A tragic and insane example of this mentality was the Kellogg-Briand Pact of Paris, 1928, which outlawed war and proclaimed peace. By August 1932, sixty-two of the sixty-seven nations of the world had signed it. Only Argentina, Bolivia, El Salvador, Uruguay, and Yemen failed to sign it. The spirit of this pact was revived by the United Nations: it was held that the problem had been a lack of instruments for the enforcement of this great human right, world peace. In every country since World War II, political and economic legislation has furthered the abolition of peace by creating massive conflict. We are told by these humanists of human rights at the same time that we are assured that a conflict of interests is basic to human society. This means that only the state can "enforce" the rights! The modern humanistic state, however, is the great enemy of man, and the great disturber of the peace.

Law in the process is made the instrument of rights. Fiat legislation replaces work as the means to legitimate goals, and men who suffer the consequences of the power drives, their hostilities to God and to man, and their wilful lawlessness, cry out that they have been deprived of their rights.

Peace as a right? No, peace is a moral duty (Heb. 12:14). Brotherhood a right? No, brotherly love is a moral duty (Rom. 12:10; 1 Thess. 4:9; Heb. 13:1; 2 Peter 1:7). The language of rights is alien to Scripture; the language of God's law, and our religious duty to hear and obey, is basic to it. No man has a right to peace or brotherly love, but every man has a duty under God to work towards these things, and to live in terms of them.

The doctrine of rights presupposes man as sovereign, and the world and God duty-bound to give "every man" his rights. In a world where every man is demanding his rights from every other man, peace is lost and unattainable, and conflict is inescapable. At the core of humanism is this false doctrine of sovereignty and lordship. Ours is an age of warfare between the humanistic gods, and it has no possible solution other than a different doctrine of sovereignty.

Before God, all men have duties, none have rights, and all have His law to obey.

68

THE HUMANISTIC HERESY OF RIGHTS

Chalcedon Report No. 326, September 1992

It is difficult to write about the humanistic doctrine of rights because critics at once assume that one is against freedom, whereas totalitarian suppressions of freedom have commonly accompanied the exaltation of rights. *"The rights of man" is a political doctrine*, and this is basic to its error. The assumption is that man's freedom depends on and must come from the state. Now, certainly, the state can be a major enemy to man's freedom, but it cannot be seen as *the source* of liberty. In the United States, although the Declaration of Independence spoke of the "right" to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, it did say that men had these things as an endowment from their Creator. The song "America" (1832), in its fourth and last stanzas, speaks of the "Great God, our King," as the "Author of liberty." This was Biblical language.

The Enlightenment, however, saw reason and the state as the authors of liberty. With Rousseau, nature became the source, and the general will became the expression of that freedom in the state. Thomas Paine's *Rights of Man* became a classic expression of this humanistic doctrine. *Rights* were detached from their Christian context and made a product of nature, or of reason; and, in either case, the immediate or essential origin of rights was the state. Thus, "humanistic rights" became a political doctrine, and "rights" and freedom became whatever the state chose to make them. The definer of life was no longer God, but man through the state. Now, a political doctrine depends on the will of the state. Unlike God, who says, "I am the Lord, I change not" (Mal. 3:6), the state changes its direction with or without elections, and anything that depends for its security on the will of the state is very unstable as a result. In 1948, with the United Nations' Universal Declaration of Human Rights, man's "freedom" all over the world was made statist, and tyranny has gained new powers ever since.

Who defines the "rights" now? A century ago, one of the basic "rights" was seen by many as property, but now property is seen as an enemy of human rights. How does one, in a humanistic world, decide which right is real and which is false? Paine and Burke were equally logical and rational, and yet they were thoroughly in disagreement in all save their humanism.

The doctrine of "rights" is essentially related to the question of morality. Who defines right and wrong, good and evil? If man does, then the definition varies dramatically from one generation to the next, and from one political administration to another. If God is the definer by His law-word, then, like Him, good and evil remain the same, yesterday, today, and forever.

This impasse is well known to the humanists. As a result, they have defined God out of the picture. Certainty, or the quest for certainty, is absolutism and evil by definition. Freedom is then redefined as relativism, or situation ethics, or self-created values or morals. Whatever the solution, it is one that eliminates God and declares that only by abandoning Christianity can man be free and the possessor of rights. The rights, of course, are "guaranteed" by the state!

The doctrine of rights leads to the destruction of freedom because it stresses man's anarchistic demands as valid. After the Rodney King decision, few asked what evidence unreported by the media led to a verdict acquitting the police officers. When the brief film sequence was enlarged frame by frame, it revealed a very different picture. In any case, people asserted that they had a right to riot and to kill innocent people, to destroy the properties of innocent shopkeepers, and to rob others at will. All this was asserted as a *right*, and no political leader on the local, state, or federal level damned this evil opinion. On humanistic grounds, they had no reason to.

But worse was yet to come. On Tuesday, June 23, 1992, in New York City, John Gotti was found guilty of masterminding five murders, evading taxes, bribing a police officer, and running an illegal gambling ring. A riot broke out at his sentencing: cars were overturned, with a crowd of almost a thousand chanting, "Justice for John." It was claimed that "racism" had worked against Gotti. One riot leader said of Gotti into a megaphone, "He has constitutional right to be not guilty" (*San Francisco Chronicle*, June 24, 1991, p. 1). With such a statement, the discourse on rights has passed into radical irrationalism. It would appear that for some people the basic ingredients of an appeal to rights is a "minority status" and the commission of evil.

Rights and morality, having been detached from the "Great God, our

King," are now attached to criminality and evil. The appeal to rights is increasingly an appeal made by evil man to cover injustice.

In all this free and promiscuous talk about novel doctrines of rights, the forgotten issue is the one of *duties*. *Duties* were for centuries basic to the life of Christendom. In my own lifetime, books on morals were still published for boys, and the theme of many of these books was the obligation of duty. To be a Christian, and to be a man, meant having a sense of duty.

This did not mean that a belief in duty as an obligation governed everyone, but it did mean that society as a whole recognized the essential character of and the necessity for a sense of duty. Proverbs abounded stressing this fact. "He seen his duty and he done it" comes from the American frontier. "Duty before pleasure" was a familiar proverb: "Do your duty, and leave the rest to heaven" (Pierre Corneille, 1640), and so on.

A "duty" is an obligation we owe to God or man, or to both. A "right" is a claim we make on the world, on men, and even on God, as in Adam's case, who claimed with Eve the "right" to be as God (Gen. 3:5). The two are seriously at odds in our culture because we are at odds with God. A duty can be a legal obligation, but it is also always a moral obligation. Once basic to all moral education, *duty* today is neglected in favor of *rights* even by children.

The heart of the matter is that life is now viewed in essentially political terms, whereas life is a religious matter. Because our perspective is political, the modern advocates of right make claims on the state above all else, and then against other men. The doctrine of rights has created the welfare state, and it has led to a conflict society, because this humanistic doctrine holds that other people *have* what the *have-nots* are entitled to because of their idea of rights and entitlements. The "rights" society means blood in the streets in the name of justice.

The Rights of Man doctrine found expression in a document by that name of August, 1789, a product of the French Revolution. It has since then been an anarchistic and destructive force in the world. The state has proved to be no "Author of liberty" but an author of tyrannies. There can be no return to true freedom without a return to the triune God and His law-word, man's only valid source of justice and freedom.

69

SYNCRETISM

Chalcedon Report No. 22, July 1, 1967

Syncretism is an unfamiliar word for a very familiar and dangerous reality. The first definition in the second edition of *Merriam-Webster's Dictionary* calls it, "The reconciliation or union of conflicting beliefs," and the second definition defines it as "egregious compromise in religion or philosophy."

If a man believes that God and Satan, good and evil, can be reconciled and united, he is a syncretist. If a man holds that we can remain true to the U.S. Constitution and have a welfare state, that man is a syncretist. If a man believes that orthodox Christianity can be reconciled and united, or live in peace with, modernism, humanism, Mohammedanism, or Buddhism, that man is a syncretist, not a Christian. A syncretist has always abandoned his original position, even though he refuses to acknowledge this fact.

Syncretism has a very long history, and a very honorable one, on the whole, unfortunately. Most cultures have been essentially syncretistic. The hostility to syncretism was born with the Biblical revelation and is inseparable from it. The intellectual attitude of antiquity was geared to the absorption of rival doctrines and religions, and syncretism was a matter of basic policy in many cases. In the Biblical revelation, God repeatedly identified Himself, not only as the only true God, but as a "jealous God" (Exod. 20:5), i.e., totally exclusive in His jurisdiction, truth, revelation, and government. Therefore, man can have no other gods before Him; there can be no syncretism. Biblical revelation cannot be mixed with anything else.

Israel, however, was inclined towards syncretism, especially the northern kingdom, Israel, which gave itself more consistently to syncretism, whereas Judah, sometimes faithful, sometimes apostate, was less inclined

to attempts at uniting Biblical religion with Canaanite cults. The ministry of the prophets was largely a denunciation of syncretism and a pronouncement of judgment against it. Ahab has gained particular eminence in history as a great syncretist, but every monarch of the northern kingdom from Jeroboam to the end held the same position. Hence the destruction by God of the northern kingdom in their separate existence.

Now, syncretism is destructive of the human mind, of rationality. To recall earlier illustrations, a man who wants to unite good and evil, Christianity and Buddhism, the United States Constitution and socialism, has lost the capacity for clear thinking. His mind is darkened, clouded, fuzzed over, and incompetent. And, apart from the history of the Biblical faith and its cultures, the intellectual history of the world is a sorry one. The one clear period of eminence, Greek philosophy, perished because of its reconciliation of unreconcilable ideas, i.e., form and matter, change and permanence, etc. The same is true of Chinese, Indian, and Arabic (Muslim) philosophies. Their years of eminence were relatively brief, and their collapse notable. As syncretists, they themselves destroyed the minds of men by attempting to reconcile what they themselves saw as antinomies of reason. Their bent to syncretism, bent on uniting all anti-God aspects into a system, made them finally immune to clear thinking. All non-Biblical thought is essentially humanistic; it is guilty of the basic, the original sin, the attempt to be a god, determining for one's self what constitutes good and evil in relation to purely personal or humanistic standards. Man, by presuming to be god, has by that act destroyed the possibility of true thinking; from so radically false a premise, no valid conclusion can follow.

Syncretism is thus one aspect of the destruction of the mind and evidence of it. Syncretism blinds the mind to the most obvious facts. To cite a painfully obvious example, on Friday, June 23, 1967, President Lyndon B. Johnson and the Soviet dictator, Premier Alexei N. Kosygin, met at Glassboro, New Jersey. The president of the United States happily reported of Kosygin, "He has been a grandfather longer than I have — and he an I agreed that we wanted a world of peace for our grandchildren" (*Oakland Tribune*, June 24, 1967, p. EB, "Grandfather Summit"). For Johnson, peace is peace; as a consummate syncretist, bent on integrating everything (which is what syncretism does to all things), Johnson fails to recognize that there are different kinds of peace. Soviet peace is for a Christian both war and slavery. To negotiate peace with Marxism is to negotiate for war and slavery. As a good humanist, Johnson believes that all men and all religions really want the same thing, and, each in their own way, are all working towards the same goal. Johnson's course, which is America's course, offers no hope whatsoever.

But Kosygin is a syncretist also, not as muddled a one as Johnson, but still a syncretist. Like all Marxists, he assumes that the dictatorship of the proletariat (himself and his associates) is the only god history knows. He assumes that Marxist politics, like God, can *create*; therefore, he believes that politics can legislate economic production. As a result, Marxism pushes its people nearer to famine continually. The Marxist tries to reconcile economic prosperity with a war on economics: this is syncretistic thinking, an attempt to reconcile conflicting things. The Marxist tries also to reconcile the total enslavement of man with the total liberation of man. His thinking is too muddled for him to recognize the chaos he creates.

A central goal of modern syncretists is the union of all religions into a one-world religion as a companion to a one-world state. Some authorities say that the June 1966, eighteenth National Convention of the Communist Party in New York City, in promulgating its "Operation '76," placed high on the list of goals the union of all organized religious bodies in the early 1970s as a universal "Church of World Brotherhood." But this goal is more than a Marxist hope: it is a devout hope with all syncretists, who see man's greatest freedom and peace in the total integration of all religions.

Other syncretists call for racial integration as a means of breaking down "divisive barriers" and "freeing" man. Still others demand a new morality geared to man, one which will bring men together in terms of "peace" and "unity" rather than dividing them in terms of Jesus Christ and His absolute law and His exclusive salvation. Christian chastity and morality will be assaulted by such men, and is being sharply attacked, as neurotic and unhealthy. All who do not unite in the "health" of the world syncretistic order will be treated as mentally disturbed and sick. Already in the name of Christ, man is being worshipped and the Bible denied by the religious leaders of this syncretistic world. The Bible itself is already a banned book in some parts of the world, forbidden as "hate" literature and as subversive to the unity of the syncretistic order.

In the face of this, some humanistic conservatives want us to be syncretistic also, to forget our religious differences and to give priority to a particular project or election, as though the world's salvation rested on the candidacy of Joe Doakes. Elections are important, but truth is more important, and the root reason for the syncretism of our age is that Biblical Christianity has been abandoned by most Americans in favor of humanism.

Make no mistake about it: the American people *want* syncretism, and they are paying good money to get it. They may complain sometimes

because of certain aspects of its program, but they are basically committed to it. Syncretism, remember, tries to reconcile two irreconcilable things, and this is what people want. A prominent, wealthy, conservative, and very influential woman told me, more graciously than it sounds in print, that my religious faith is "barbarous." The only kind of God, she stated, that she can believe in is one who saves everyone from every kind of problem and never sends anyone to hell; in other words, religiously, she wanted to eat her cake and have it too. She was insistent that she is "as good a Christian as anybody," and "a good humanist too." She believed that Buddhists, atheists, Muslims, and others *all* went to heaven also, like herself, on their own terms. She is only unhappy at the socialism she gets from the pulpit, not the humanism, and basically she is content with her church. And there are more than a hundred and fifty million like her. They are syncretists. For them, God's only purpose is to ensure man, the true sovereign, of the best of all possible worlds! They *complain* about some things in their syncretistic churches, but they *hate* Biblical Christianity. They are buying the kind of religion they want in preference to bowing down before the sovereign and triune God. They have cast their vote and their dollar, against the God of Scripture — but the power of God is not dependent on their vote or their dollar. "The word of God is not bound" (2 Tim. 2:9). And their syncretism will have results: it will lead to their integration into death and judgment. God still remains a "jealous" or exclusive God, and truth will forever be exclusive of error, and right will be exclusive of wrong, for, "The earth is the LORD's, and the fullness thereof; the world, and they that dwell therein" (Ps. 24:1).

70

PRAGMATISM

Chalcedon Report No. 102, February 1974

In the early 1850s, Unitarian Boston was horrified and alarmed because of the great influx of Irish Catholic immigrants, and the result was the triumph of the anti-Catholic, antiforeigner political group, the Know-Nothing Party. In 1854, J. V. C. Smith was the Know-Nothing mayor of Boston. Yet Smith continued to maintain close business relations with Irish Catholic friends, including the bishop, John Bernard Fitzpatrick, a close personal friend. As an able amateur sculptor, Smith executed a fine bust of the bishop. Such a relationship between an anti-Catholic mayor and a bishop bothered neither the mayor nor the bishop: the mayor's position was political pragmatism, a belief that success is more important than truth. The Know-Nothing Party was simply a popular tool to be used to disrupt the Whig and the Democratic parties. The same motive led some leaders of the Anti-Masonic Party to join the Masons secretly, and it led some liberals in the 1920s to join the Ku Klux Klan.

It has been said that politics is the art of compromise, of working out a practical means of cooperation between conflicting groups. A principled pragmatism has its place and is by no means immoral. It is simply a recognition that goals can be attained usually only by degrees. The problem in politics is unprincipled pragmatism, the insistence not only that success is more important than truth, but that success is truth. For modern pragmatism, truth is what works, that which succeeds.

Moreover, as the statist schools of the country have steadily trained each generation in turn with a humanistic, relativistic pragmatism, the United States has seen the growth of a purely opportunistic politics to a position of dominance. In virtually every modern state around the world, the same development has taken place in varying degrees. In many European states, for example, lacking the Puritan background of Americans,

the development is much further along. After all, the disciples of Machiavelli very early converted European diplomacy and politics into an unprincipled pragmatism.

In America, it was the philosopher Charles S. Pierce who, between the Grant and Wilson years, formulated the new American faith and defined it as pragmatism. Pierce defined pragmatism thus: "In order to ascertain the meaning of an intellectual conception one should consider what practical consequences might conceivably result by necessity from the truth of that conception; and the sum of these consequences will constitute the entire meaning of the conception." The meaning is the result. Those who followed Pierce pushed the idea much further. For William James and especially for John Dewey, truth became instrumental. In *Reconstruction in Philosophy* (1920), Dewey wrote: "The hypothesis that works is the *true* one; and *truth* is an abstract noun applied to a collection of cases, actual, foreseen and desired, that receive confirmation in their work and consequences." Dewey defined social progress as growth towards the desired community or "Great Society," but he had no standard in terms of which growth could be defined. There was also no objective criterion whereby the "Great Society" could be defined to distinguish it from the "Great Tyranny." Truth being what works, anything that succeeds is therefore the truth. Logically, the historically elect people for these pragmatists are those who succeed. Attempts to define this "Great Society" in terms of traditional liberalism have failed: no principle of definition other than the pragmatic one is logically tenable.

Thus, humanism, by developing pragmatism, has created an antihumanistic doctrine. If man does not "work," if he becomes a polluter and a social roadblock, then away with man. The modern humanistic and pragmatic state has thus become, in the name of man, history's greatest killer of man, by means of wars, slave labor camps, mass murders, and purges.

Pragmatism has led also to a new isolationism. In the older America, isolationism meant a respect for the self-determination of other states: people were free to contribute to the cause of freedom anywhere, but the function of the state had to be non-interventionism. Now the interventionism is pragmatic and Machiavellian, based on the balance of power politics, and the isolationism is personal and immoral. It means "doing your own thing" and rejecting all moral norms which would bind all men and nations.

Unprincipled pragmatism, philosophical pragmatism, erodes the power of judgment. If the truth is what works, everything that works is true, and thus, why get excited about anything? Why condemn anything, or

defend anything? Where the power of judgment is eroded, the ability to act is also eroded, and a moral paralysis results.

No era of history has ever been free of problems, and no era of history has ever been governed by majorities, but only by dedicated minorities who have provided the direction to others. The modern state everywhere has a crisis of authority: its ability to command the people apart from brute force is severely limited. It can at times unite the people in hatred, hatred of an enemy, but this does not eliminate the underlying disunity.

Thus, in a time of great material progress when men should feel most hopeful, hopelessness is very common, for man does not live by bread alone. In a world without truth or meaning, how can a man define hope? This bankruptcy is most apparent where power is the greatest. From *Foreign Affairs* and the CFR to the local supervisors, the pragmatic philosophy of retreat is to vote more money to satisfy the troublemakers in the name of social peace and harmony.

But "man does not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God" (Matt. 4:4). Apart from that King and His *every word*, we end up with *no word* at all. The future can have no other foundation than Christ, because there is none.

71

PELAGIANISM

Chalcedon Report No. 38, October 1, 1968

One of the deadliest errors of our day is the failure of political science. In the teaching of political science, there is no true doctrine of the state; indeed, we can say that there is no theology of the state, but only a pretended science.

In the ancient world, the state was regarded as a divine-human order, and the ruler or his office was divine. The true religion of pagan society was the religion of the state. The word *liturgy* comes from a Greek word meaning "public work"; religion in Greek society was a part of the state's public works to ensure morale. Not the Biblical God, but the state was the sovereign lord over man, and his "true" god. Man, the Greeks held, was a political animal, a creature of the state, not a creature of God.

When Christianity began to spread throughout the Roman Empire, and beyond it, the Biblical doctrine of the state under God went with it. The result was a life and death struggle between the church and the state, between two rival theologies. Christ or Caesar? Who was man's true lord and master?

As the persecutions of the church ended, and the state had to abandon open paganism, they adopted a pseudo-Christian guise to reassert their pagan doctrine of the state: Arianism, and especially Pelagianism. Our concern here is with this Pelagian doctrine of the state, or the politics of Pelagianism.

According to Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield, "the central and formative principle of Pelagianism is the assumption of the plenary ability of man" (B. B. Warfield, *Studies in Tertullian and Augustine* [New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1930], p. 291). Pelagianism believes in the natural goodness of man; it is not man who is evil but his environment. The state also is naturally good and is therefore to be trusted with all the

powers necessary in order to cope with an evil environment.

The Pelagian state believes in a state-created paper money rather than the intrinsic value of precious metals, of gold and silver. The Pelagian state sees itself in every realm as the source of standards and values.

The real and major revolution of the modern age is the revolution from a Biblical to a Pelagian doctrine of the state. This revolution began in the "medieval" period; such figures as Frederick II represented the growing Pelagian doctrine; it flourished in the Renaissance, and it triumphed with the Enlightenment.

The faith of modern man is Pelagianism. As a result, literature abundantly reflects this faith. It shows us the hero as one who stands "for truth or Edenic innocence" and is victimized by society (as in Truman Capote, Jean Stafford, James Purdy, and others). The hero is a lonely youth "exposing the corrupt adult world" (Salinger's *The Catcher in the Rye*). The hero is a well-meaning lover (in Nemerov, Buchner, and Macaulay), or a homosexual (in Vidal and Baldwin) whom evil institutions condemn. "In time of organization, Eros is utterly disorganized." The Negro especially is seen as the poor innocent condemned by an evil society, and so on (see Joseph J. Waldmeir, editor, *Recent American Fiction: Some Critical Views* [Boston, MA: Houghton, Mifflin, 1963], p. 31). In brief, the more evil, or the lower society deems a man to be, the better he must be in the eyes of the Pelagian! It is the debased, the pervert, the criminal, and the shiftless who ipso facto represent the most oppressed and downtrodden, the most naturally good of society. As a result, the hero for modern fiction, and, increasingly, the hero for modern life and politics, is increasingly the lowest kind of man. The worst elements are subsidized, lionized, and catered to, because, in the eyes of Pelagians, they are really the best. The law-abiding and orderly people become a part of the evil environment; if they were good, they would revolt. To revolt is a sign of natural goodness. Thus, the more Negroes riot and revolt, the better they are in the eyes of the Pelagians; if they are godly, they are overlooked.

Pelagian churches hold to a similar anthropology or doctrine of man, and, because virtually all churches are Pelagian today, they attack God (the Supreme Environment), and glorify revolutionary man, the innocent and holy victim.

For the Pelagians the "normal" man, i.e., the godly, law-abiding citizen, is vicious, perverted, and insane. This is the thesis of the student revolutionists, and of Herbert Marcuse. Ronald D. Laing, a British physician and psychiatrist, in a book highly praised by the *Los Angeles Free Press*, writes:

> The condition of alienation, of being asleep, of being unconscious, of being out of one's mind, is the condition of the normal man.
>
> Society highly values its normal man. It educates children to lose themselves and to become absurd, and thus to be normal.
>
> Normal men have killed perhaps 100,000,000 of their fellow normal men in the last fifty years. (Dr. R. D. Laing, *The Politics of Experience* [New York, NY: Ballantine Books, 1967], p. 28)

If you are a Pelagian and believe this, you will then believe that it is the duty of all good men to revolt against the society of normal man and to work for its destruction. This is the faith of the New Left as well as the Old Left. Staughton Lynd, in the *Intellectual Origins of American Radicalism*, makes it clear that he has an unqualified trust in the natural goodness and perfectibility of man.

This same Pelagian faith governs present political action. The rioters are subsidized and catered to; the welfare recipients are treated with increasing favor. Welfare recipients are encouraged to act as though the state owes them a living. In New York City, one out of seven receives welfare, and one out of six babies born is illegitimate. The law-abiding are penalized; they are taxed heavily to subsidize all this.

Pelagianism, being sympathetic with evil, cannot cope with violence, because it provides a justification for violence. Abbie Hoffman, thirty-one, a Yippie leader in the Chicago disturbances, declared to the liberal *New York Post*, "They call us hard-core anarchists with plots to overthrow the government. Well, that's not a secret. That's always been the case, so what's the big deal? So far as I'm concerned we totally won the Battle of Chicago. I have just written a book about it. It's [*sic*] title is *Revolution for the Hell of It*" ("Meet Abbie Hoffman," *Los Angeles Herald-Examiner*, September 10, 1968, p. B-2). How can a Pelagian cope with an attitude which he creates and justifies?

In foreign affairs, a Pelagian state will believe that, because men and nations are naturally good, the response to goodness will be goodness also. Include the enemy as a friend and a coworker, and all will ultimately be well, because he is not really evil. Thus, on Monday, September 9, 1968, a thirty-one-nation committee of the United Nations convened to draft a new international agreement aimed at defining principles for "friendly relations and cooperation" among U.N. member countries. Committee members included the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia ("Ultimate Irony," *Los Angeles Herald-Examiner*, September 9, 1968, p. A-17)!

Meanwhile, a Pelagian, a retired Supreme Court justice, Tom C. Clark, insists that society is to be blamed for the increasing crime rate

("Why the Crime Rise?," *Parade*, June 2, 1968, p. 4).

This Pelagian trust in the goodness of man goes deeply into our culture, into the modern mind everywhere. Police report that a sizable proportion of rape victims invited trouble by being too trusting. One of the most startling things I ever encountered was the report of a woman in the rape of Shanghai in the 1930s. Her reaction was almost beyond belief. Repeatedly raped by the soldiers, her one thought was that she could hardly believe it was really happening, and that men could actually act that way!

A generation so blind, so deeply devoted to a Pelagian faith, is incapable of coping with evil, because it cannot recognize evil in itself or in other men. Its inability to see evil leads to a radical trust in man and in the state. Evil is continually projected on the environment. If the state becomes so evil that its evil must be cited, then somehow the state has become a part of the corrupt environment; it is the establishment, and it must be overthrown and replaced with a pure regime.

The New Left regards the establishment as a part of the evil, oppressing order of the past, of priestcraft and religion. It insists that we have evil rulers but a good, misguided people. Many pseudo-conservatives share this opinion, and they tell us also that the church has evil leaders but good, misguided members. This is the Pelagian theme of moral man and immoral society.

On the contrary, however, it can with justice be said that our leaders in church and state are better than we deserve. In neither church nor state do we find men of moral courage, that is, the courage of their convictions. They are pushed by the mob rather than leaders of it, whatever their position. We have today the fruit of generations of statist education, arrogant Pelagian man.

The statistics of our world, and of the United States, are interesting. *All* elements, i.e., the various age groups, are Pelagian on the whole; they differ only in their intensity and dedication. In the closing years of the last century, and the early years of this century, there was a high birth rate: there is thus today a sizable element of the population of retirement age. The generation between the wars represents a lower birth rate. From World War II to the later 1950s, there was again a high birth rate. In terms of the death rate, by 1970, the great majority of Americans (and this will be true in other countries also) will be under twenty-five. The erosion into permissiveness and radical Pelagianism has meanwhile been rapid. Our more astute politicians, the Kennedys, McCarthy, and others, have had their eye on this rising power, and they are more governed by it than able to govern it.

The Pelagian state, by its philosophy and education, creates a mass man, a mob. It begets the new barbarians and scientists. The new barbarians assume that all the heritage of the past is simply a natural resource which simply exists: what is not desired can be destroyed, and the rest will remain. The new barbarian refuses to believe that each generation must accept and develop a tradition to retain it.

Recently, I have encountered a number of cases of hippies from excellent families who despised and rejected the establishment, including education. Apart from reading revolutionary writings and demonstrating, their education gave them no competence whatsoever. (Many received good grades, also, from sympathetic professors.) Faced suddenly with a girl and a baby to provide for, a licit or illicit family, they found themselves incompetent for any kind of work. The reaction is either a mental tailspin, or wilder revolutionary involvement. And why not? More and more have come to believe that *work* is obsolete, that man can now provide total security and welfare by means of a truly human social order. Failure to do so is an ugly plot by reactionaries.

The Pelagian mentality is a departure from reality, and the Pelagian state inescapably pursues a suicidal course.

The desperate need is for Christian, for Biblical, statecraft. This means establishing our concept of the state, among other things, on the Biblical anthropology, on the doctrine of the fall. Neither man nor the state is to be trusted. Sovereignty is essentially an attribute of God alone. The state and man can only handle limited power and limited liberty. The supremacy of law, God's law, must govern every sphere of human activity, nor can any sphere be divorced from God. Church, state, school, work, art, science, agriculture, society, and all things else must be under God, or else they are under judgment.

This, then, is obviously a time of judgment. Equally obviously, we must make it a time for reconstruction.

72

LOCATING OUR PROBLEM

Chalcedon Report No. 89, January 1973

DESPERATE men take desperate measures. Very often, the most bitter and costly battles of a war are fought when the end is in sight, and the losing side is aware of its impending defeat. Then men often take reckless and extreme measures, gambling on a breakthrough to victory.

The end of an era sees a similar desperation. Men work intensely and savagely to destroy everything in sight, hating the culture which had promised so much and delivered so little, according to their judgment. Similarly, men who value the good in the dying culture fight with intense zeal to preserve it at all costs. There is a polarization of ideas and issues, and an intensification of ideas. As a result, in these last days of the age of the state, a humanistic culture in which the state has replaced the church as the key institution and has presented itself as man's savior, there is a fanatical will to believe in man. Not surprisingly, in the 1972 U.S. presidential election, there was on all sides an intense populism in evidence. Eric F. Goldman saw this as the triumph of populism (Eric F. Goldman, "Just Plain Folks," *American Heritage*, 23 no. 4 [June: 1972]: pp. 4–8, 90–91). It could also be called its last stand before its collapse into disaster.

Every U.S. political party of 1972 was in varying degrees populist. John Lindsay, George McGovern, George Wallace, Richard M. Nixon, Frank Rizzo, John D. Rockefeller IV, and many, many others made a populist appeal. Goldman reports that McGovern, in the primary, denounced Lindsay as a "Park Avenue populist" (i.e., not the real thing), and Lindsay denounced Wallace as a "phony populist," and so on.

The term "populist" comes from the old People's Party of the last century. According to Goldman, "The heart of populism has been a glorification of 'the people', defined in a way that permitted them to also be

called 'ordinary folks' or 'the average man'." A study of the old People's Party platforms reveals the strong faith that salvation for society means a "people's state" in which the state controls "big business," agriculture, and also issues money in quantities sufficient to supply the needs of the people. The state is seen as the controlling power to aid the working man; it has a duty to maintain full employment with public works projects, and the state should own and control the railroads and most public utilities. The populist movement has infiltrated into and captured the thinking of all political parties. Its triumph was correctly predicted in 1901 by the *Harper's Encyclopedia of United States History*.

It has triumphed indeed, but it has also gone to seed. The "reform" measures advocated in the 1890s are now law, and, instead of furthering the power and freedom of "the common man" or "the people," they have steadily whittled away at his liberties. Moreover, instead of seeing the evil in the statist repressions they advocated, the populists, unwilling to see the sin of the people, have insisted instead that the problem is not sin (the people are good at heart, only misled, the populists hold) but conspiracy. The conspirators have robbed them, the innocent and pure people, of their victory. This is the thesis of the New Leftist underground press and some conservatives.

Let us examine the triumph of Hitler and National Socialism in Germany in terms of this thesis. Supposedly, the people were betrayed by the wealthy capitalists, who ostensibly financed Hitler's rise to power. Of course, the common people who followed Hitler did so because they had been supposedly betrayed in 1918 by the Jews and others. Did the German industrialists finance Hitler? In reality, the attitude of German industrialists was pragmatic. According to Pritchard, "most industrialists preferred pragmatism to ideological doctrine." The same pragmatic self-interest marked the military and the great estate-owners. "The contributions of German industry to the Nazi Party equalled only a small percentage of the amount they gave to Hitler's opponents until he became chancellor. There is no basis for the fiction that the industrial cartels financed Hitler's way to power." The Nazis were chronically short of funds until they took power. The majority of the people, high and low, were motivated by pragmatic self-interest, and their political voice was diffused, whereas the Nazi voice was organized and united (R. John Pritchard, *Reichstag Fire: Ashes of Democracy* [New York, NY: Ballantine, 1972]).

Some German industrialists did give to Hitler as a part of a policy of giving to all major parties as a matter of political pragmatism. The same is true in the United States and elsewhere: play safe, and contribute to all possible winners. One reporter has remarked that sometimes the same

faces appear at $100-a-plate dinners for rival candidates. Both industrialists and workers were pragmatic; but why are the industrialists alone made the scapegoats and conspirators? The reason is that the workers are the innocent and heroic victims in this myth, and politicians, industrialists, churchmen, large landowners and others are the oppressors by definition. Every gnat must be strained and every camel swallowed in order to sustain the thesis that the innocent people were misled and betrayed.

The problem is instead sin. Humanism in all its forms, from monarchism to democracy, has refused to admit this fact. They have readily seen the mote in another person's eye and failed to admit the mote in their own. Thomas Babington Macaulay had some telling comments to make on the future of the United States. Writing in a letter of May 23, 1857, Macaulay said:

> "The day will come when in the State of New York a multitude of people, none of whom has had more than half a breakfast, or expects to have more than half a dinner, will choose a Legislature. Is it possible to doubt what sort of a Legislature will be chosen? On one side is a statesman preaching patience, respect for vested rights, strict observance of public faith. On the other is a demagogue ranting about the tyranny of capitalists and usurers, and asking why any body should be permitted to drink Champagne and ride in a carriage, while thousands of honest folks are in want of necessaries. Which of the two candidates is likely to be preferred by a workingman who hears his children cry for more bread? I seriously apprehend that you (Americans) will, in some such season of adversity as I have described, do things which will prevent prosperity from returning; that you will act like people who should in a year of scarcity devour all the seed-corn, and thus make the next a year not of scarcity, but of absolute famine. There will be, I fear, spoliation. The spoliation will increase the distress. The distress will produce fresh spoliation. There is nothing to stop you. Your Constitution is all sail and no anchor. As I said before, when a society has entered on this downward progress, either civilization or liberty must perish. Either some Caesar or Napoleon will seize the reins of government with a strong hand, or your republic will be as fearfully plundered and laid waste by barbarians in the twentieth century as the Roman Empire was in the fifth; with this difference, that the Huns and Vandals who ravaged the Roman Empire came from without, and that your Huns and Vandals will have been engendered within your own country by your own institutions." (G. Otto Trevelyan, *The Life and Letters of Lord Macaulay*, vol. 2 [New York, NY: Harper, 1875], pp. 409–410)

What Macaulay failed to see was that the leaven of humanism worked to the same end in the monarchies, autocracies, and principalities of Europe as in America, and often more rapidly. Faith in man and the savior state, "the people's state," leads to the same goal everywhere, to

the destruction of freedom, the rise of statism, and the progressive enslavement of man. The problem for Macaulay was the common man; the problem for the populists, then and now, was and is the evil big people who oppress the little people. Both are right about each other: neither is to be trusted, because man is a sinner.

Man is free to the proportion that he sees himself as the problem and takes steps to remedy himself by the grace of God. Man is doomed to slavery if he insists on projecting the sin of man on to a particular class or group of men, as though the world's evils come from a special group rather than a general condition of sin and apostasy.

In 1791, Edmund Burke observed, "Men are qualified for civil liberty in exact proportion to their disposition to put moral chains upon their own appetites... society cannot exist unless a controlling power upon will and appetite be placed somewhere, and the less of it there is within, the more there is without. It is ordained in the eternal constitution of things that men of intemperate minds cannot be free. Their passions forge their fetters." The usually astute Macaulay was wrong: it has not been the Constitution and the "institutions" of the United States which have been at fault, whatever their imperfections, but the people of the United States, as well as the peoples of Europe and the world over. The problem is man: he is a sinner who will not admit to the nature of his problem, nor recognize his remedy. The result is a desperation of action, a readiness to try every extreme measure to demonstrate that sinful man can build a good society if only he has time and power enough to do so. Has the state failed in some measure aimed at changing man and society? It will try a more extreme measure next. The results are always assured failure and less freedom.

"But we *must* believe in man," someone insisted to me after a lecture; by man, he meant statist man, working with sovereign power in and through the state to remake man and society. Why *must* we believe in man, I objected. "Because there is nothing else to believe in." That was a few years ago, a very short time ago. Now, more often, I encounter another attitude, "there is *nothing* to believe in." The false gods go, and they leave behind them shattered youth and a divided culture. The will to destroy everything is very great in these bitter and disillusioned youth. The children of the age of the state are increasingly the self-appointed gravediggers of the state, determined to bury the present order and bitter with hatred against it.

The will to rebuild is basic to those who see sin as the problem, and God and His law-word as the answer. They are concerned with rebuilding in their own lives, to exercise dominion over themselves and the

earth, and they are thus the forerunners of reconstruction in every realm. To them all things are possible under God. Thus, William Carey and his associates were not discouraged by the bleak prospects of missionary work in India, declaring almost two centuries ago, "He who raised the Scottish and brutalized Britons to sit in heavenly places in Christ Jesus, can raise these slaves of superstition, purify their hearts by faith, and make them worshippers of the one God in spirit and in truth. The promises are fully sufficient to remove our doubts, and make us anticipate that not very distant period when He will famish all the gods of India, and cause these very idolaters to cast their idols to the moles and to the bats, and renounce for ever the work of their own hands."

More such men are needed now, in every sphere of endeavor, who will, under God, work to further His Kingdom, establish His law order, and bring all things under the dominion of man as God's vicegerent.

The basic problem is in man, not in his environment. Man's freedom begins within, and man's dominion begins within. We are not in the twilight of man and his history, but rather closer to the dawn. This is still God's world; He has not abdicated. Have you?

73

INHUMANISM

Chalcedon Report No. 333, April 1993

The poet Robinson Jeffers was a humanist whose goals were antihumanist. Sigmund Freud had held that the three great humanists were Copernicus, Darwin, and himself, Freud, and all three he saw as destroyers of humanism. Copernicus attacked the centrality of the earth in God's plan and thereby belittled man, Freud said. Darwin made man into a higher ape, and Freud undercut the mind and place of man, the higher ape. Jeffers affirmed a thorough-going pantheism in which "people and races and rocks and stars, none of them seems to me important in itself, but only the whole" (James Karman, *Robinson Jeffers: Poet of California*, pp. 70–71).

The basic premise of humanism as well as antihumanism is anti-Christianity. This leads inevitably to the debasement of and the contempt for man. Certainly, this marked Darwin, Freud, and Jeffers. Because man is the bearer of God's image (knowledge, righteousness, holiness, and dominion), everything is done to debase God's image bearer; with some people in mental institutions this means defiling God's image in them by eating feces in a self-conscious anti-God act.

As inhumanism, the continuing development of humanism, matures and develops, the hatred of God will be manifested by an increasing attack on men. All around us we see the accelerating criminality of men and women, one against the other, against the elderly, and against children. Humanism and inhumanism mean a war against humanity.

We see this war in effect in the form of abortion, war against the unborn. We see it in euthanasia, war against the elderly. At the same time, the hatred of man is manifested in the defense of supposedly endangered animals, like the spotted owl. With all too many people, life's main purpose is to limit and destroy human life.

None of this should surprise us. We live in a murderous and suicidal generation. We are told in Proverbs 8:36, "But he that sinneth against me wrongeth his own soul: all they that hate me love death."

The love of life begins with the love of God (John 14:6). According to Karman, "Jeffers looked forward to the time when humanity would cease to exist." In his "De Rerum Virtute," he saw humanity as "a sick microbe" (p. 58). The circle he moved in believed that they were damned, and seemed to relish it (p. 71). Art for them seemed to be a self-conscious means for cultivating damnation. One means of expressing inhumanism was for Jeffers environmentalism. In August 2, 1948, *Time* (pp. 79–80) saw Jeffers celebrating "from man to non-man," i.e., death. This is indeed the goal of humanism-inhumanism: death. It is imperative to separate ourselves from this ugly philosophy of death. It governs the state and the state school, the media and the arts. But we are the people of life.

74

THE AGE OF CONFISCATION

Chalcedon Report No. 340, November 1993

We live in an age of confiscation. Thieves indeed take much from their victims, but thieves are a small factor when compared to the modern state. Taxes have become more and more confiscatory, but that is not all. Under the pretext of enforcing drug laws, money, properties, and homes are routinely *seized, and never returned*, from innocent people. Politicians by a variety of laws steal jobs from the people, and they have made almost each and every modern state the people's most dangerous enemy. Whether in the name of Marxism, the environment, equality, drug control, or anything else, the goal is the same: *confiscation*.

Modern man has looked to the state as its god and savior, and the state has relished that role. It has acted as god walking on earth, and it does not take kindly to those who question its role. Its power grows daily, and, like a juggernaut, it crushes all before it. The modern state trusts only itself. It does not believe that parents are capable of being good to their children, nor farmers good for their land, nor anyone in any sphere capable of self-government.

Surprisingly, an earlier humanist, however idealistic, saw the fallacy of trusting in the state. Friedrich Schiller wrote: "...the state as conceived in the idea, instead of being able to establish this more perfect humanity, ought to be based upon it" (Friedrich Schiller, *Aesthetical and Philosophical Essays*, vol. 1, p. 25). In other words, there cannot be a good state based on people who are not good!

Now, Schiller did not plan to reach his goal on Biblical grounds. Christians know that man is a fallen and depraved creature. As the old proverb has it, "You can't make a good omelette with rotten eggs." But this is exactly the premise of modern statism. Criminal gangs of youths wage war in our streets; depravity is becoming part of the street scene,

and yet people continue to trust in caesar, even as the modern state devours its own children.

"Where there is no vision [no belief in God's revelation], the people perish [or, run wild, or naked]" (Prov. 29:18). There can be no change in the devouring state until the people are again ruled by God and His law-word. There is no true faith where there is no obedience to the Lord.

Schiller, like the modern educators, believed in the "plastic nature of man" (p. 184). This faith holds that education will change man, make him a good citizen, and provide the basis for a new world order. This statist education has, however, sought to model children into post-Christian humanity. The result, instead of a new person, is the old barbarian.

The goal of humanism, especially since Hegel, has been to incarnate the absolute into history in the form of the state. Against this new god, the state, there is no higher law to appeal to, because the state is the incarnation of the spirit of nature in history. This means that, ugly as the confiscations of our time are, even uglier is the theology of the state.

The state has supplanted the church as the *necessary* institution. It has in effect ruled that Christianity is simply *a personal option*, not the witness to the cosmic Christ and His absolute rule over all things. The state as the necessary institution is a jealous god: it tolerates no rival allegiances and no area of freedom from the state. The state is in every sphere the first and last authority, and the state's government provides the authoritative word and law.

More than man's self-government, his family, his property, and his income are at stake, and more than his freedom. The very definition of man is at stake. The Westminster Shorter Catechism (Q. 10) summarizes the Biblical definition of man thus:

> Q. How did God create man?
>
> A. God created man, male and female, after his own image, in knowledge, righteousness, and holiness, with dominion over the creatures. (Gen. 1:26–28; Eph. 4:24; Col. 3:10)

The modern world has redefined man as a higher animal, and the state regards man as something to be controlled together with everything else in the world environment. God's law gives man the freedom of His justice, but the modern state seeks to be *scientific* and *planning* in its actions. In a scientific experiment or society, there can be no free agents, only differing controls. As a school teacher told me in the early 1960s, "In the modern world, freedom is obsolete." How, with freedom, can a scientific social order exist?

More than our persons, possessions, and freedom are thus confiscated.

Our right to be God's free people is denied, and the redefinition of life and history *excludes God*. He is barred from our schools, and from the state.

Even worse, He is most of all barred from most churches by their modernism and their antinomianism. Others, by their eschatology, limit God and Christ to taking us out of this world.

This age of confiscation has its roots in false faith, in bad theology. We cannot end this evil without restoring the full priority of God's law-word. Too often, the root of our problems looks back at us in the mirror.

Too often, we retreat from our problems as too great for individuals or groups to handle. The fact remains that all the solutions we see are the works of men of faith who saw the problem and looked to the power of God.

"Except the LORD build the house, they labour in vain that build it" (Ps. 127:1). Scripture tells us that the vain or useless efforts of our time are those done on alien premises, however earnest they may be. That which endures represents the work of men who see the power of the confiscatory state as nothing before the power of God.

Remember, God will confiscate all useless churches and peoples. He has been at this longer than the modern state.

75

BUREAUCRACY

Chalcedon Report No. 126, February 1976

In recent years, there has been a parallel growth of the idea of human rights and bureaucracy. This common growth has been a closely related fact, so much so that Peter Berger, Brigitte Berger, and Hansfried Kellner, in *The Homeless Mind* (1973), speak of "bureaucratically identifiable rights." There must, they point out, be some bureaucracy to complain to (the humanist version of prayer), and bureaucratic procedures to enforce rights. "Thus there is a progression from the notion of universal human rights to the notion of a necessary universal bureaucracy. The United Nations may be seen as a somewhat ironic anticipation of this cosmological vision of bureaucracy" (p. 115). In brief, humanism's emphasis on human rights leads to the nightmare world of a totalitarian bureaucracy and George Orwell's *1984*. Why? It is important for us to understand this relationship, because our future depends on it.

There must be, and is, in every system of thought and social order, a sovereign power, a determiner, a central, controlling agency, or else there is no cosmos, unity, or order possible, only chaos and confusion. If that power is the triune God, then, while man can flounder in evil, confusion, and disorder because of his sin, he is still able, on the human level, in history, to assert himself against all other powers. The history of Christendom has often been marred by great evils, but it has been, to a degree unequalled elsewhere, volatile, rich in struggle, contention, and growth. It has resisted stratification and petrifaction. We can disagree strongly with the medieval English rebels, and still must recognize the intensely Christian framework of their revolt, when they opposed the lords of the realm with their battle cry,

> When Adam delved, and Eve span,
> Who was then the gentleman?

To defend themselves against tyranny, they had God's yardstick to apply to all man-made orders. Moreover, even in defeat, they had the assurance of faith that, since God is the Lord of history, in time their cause would triumph. God's Word and law gave them a court of appeals against man, and a freedom from any total claim by man.

In humanism, man is his own god, and the state exercises the deity as the general will of man. Therefore, human rights require man, i.e., collective man as the state, to assure them. God is omnipotent, and, in time, His purposes shall prevail in history. The state as the new god, in order to assure the triumph of the human rights it proclaims, must gain greater power over man; it must become omnipotent. As a result, in the name of human rights, man is obliterated. The more fully the state and its bureaucracy become man's champion, as in Marxism, the greater the oppression of man.

In the Christian scheme of things, man's progress depends on his struggle with sin, in himself and in the world, so that, by the grace of God, he grows in freedom and dominion and his ability to exercise knowledge, righteousness, and holiness. In the humanistic scheme of things, human rights requires that a bureaucracy control man for his welfare and "freedom," so that, as Orwell saw, slavery becomes freedom.

We may therefore rail as much as we choose against the growth of bureaucracy. But it will only continue to grow as long as man remains a humanist. There must be a center to and a governing power in life, and, for humanism, the choice is between anarchism, every man is his own god, and the bureaucratic state. Human rights require the state as god to assure them. As a result, complaints against the inefficiency of the bureaucracy usually lead to the creation of more bureaucracy, because more power must be handed to this new god to make him function. But this is not all. Just as the God of Scripture is all-knowing, so the new god must have a total knowledge of his subjects, and must build up a data bank on all of them. The kind of bureaucracy envisioned by some would require the state to expand more than is humanly possible in order to have the knowledge for full planning power. The future of all bureaucracies headed in that direction is a growing incompetence rather than power.

The Biblical answer is not bureaucracy but God, man under God, stumbling, growing, developing in history, knowing that his essential bill of rights is the word of God. It is not the state but the word of God which has the binding word. The purpose of the stumbling, painful growth which freedom under God makes possible is the development of dominion man. A bureaucracy reduces man to the status of disposable man, something to be used to create the supposedly glorious future. Stalin

callously held that it was necessary to scramble some eggs, i.e., liquidate millions, in order to make an omelet, to create the socialist paradise. This is the grim irony of humanism: its doctrine of human rights becomes an instrument for the destruction of man. The more vocal the cry for human rights becomes in our day, the more fearful modern man rightly is, because each legal "gain" in his battle increases the powers of the bureaucracy over him. The bureaucracy grows, but not his freedom, his safety, or his "rights." Disposable man has no rights.

76

SOCIALISM

Chalcedon Report No. 11, August 1, 1966

The August 1966 *Farm Journal* has an important article entitled, "The Wheat Shortage is Here," by Karl Hobson. Hobson begins by warning:

> The world shortage of wheat that I warned about in *Farm Journal* 2 1/2 years ago is now here and it will likely last a good many years. For seven years the world has been using more wheat than it has been raising. This has reduced world carryover stocks by more than half. A year from now, these stocks will be small—and wheat prices will be still higher unless the government uses price controls.

The world production of wheat this year will be 6,000 million bushels less than the needed amount for world consumption.

> This is not a good year for wheat production. Drought is reducing output sharply in the U.S., North Africa, India, China and Australia. Poor seeding weather last fall held wheat acreage down in Europe.

But this is not all. Other reports indicate the serious nature of the feed-grain shortage. More feed grains are now being used to feed cattle than has been previously raised in one year. Thus, cattle production is faced with a feed-grain shortage, and, with the drought, a hay and water shortage. Cattle are being sold heavily, oversold, because many ranchers are unable to carry them through the year. The drought in Australia is in its fifth year; the situation in China and Russia is very critical: food is a major problem.

But the nearly worldwide dry year and hot climatic conditions are not the cause: the crisis was coming already, and the hot, dry weather has only accentuated it. Hobson claims that "the population explosion is the

chief cause," but this is hardly the case. The *population explosion is a myth*. Russia has not had a population explosion, for example, but it is in serious trouble. The Ukraine was, in the days of the tsars, "the breadbasket of Europe"; today, it is producing poorly, and in some years has not fed itself. *The real problem is socialism*.

The correlation between hunger and socialism has been very well traced by E. Parmalee Prentice in *Hunger and History*. In an earlier work, *Farming for Famine*, Prentice in 1936 cited the four causes of famine:

1. The prevention of cultivation or the willful destruction of crops.
2. Defective agriculture caused by communistic control of land.
3. Governmental interference by regulation or taxation.
4. Currency restrictions, including debasing the coin.

All of these add up to one thing, *socialism*, and the root of all socialism and communism is *money management*, a managed currency replacing the free coinage of gold and silver. Long ago, Montesquieu, in *The Spirit of the Laws* (bk. 18, chap. 3), wrote: "Countries are not cultivated in proportion to their fertility, but to their liberty." Today, as *Barron's* front-page story on "The Third Horseman," December 20, 1965, stated, "Thanks to socialism, famine again stalks the earth . . . Like a horse and carriage, 'socialism and hunger' inevitably go together." The picture is a grim one.

Regardless of climate and soil, socialism throughout the world has yielded bitter fruit. "Since 1961, when the Soviet Union suffered the first of a series of 'non-recurring' crop failures, wheat shipments from West to East have increased from 165 million bushels to 750 million . . . Mao's agrarian reformers have brought Red China to the brink of starvation. Much of Eastern Europe, once a granary in its own right, lives off United States surpluses, while the fertile farmlands of Algeria, which produced so bountifully for the hardworking colons, have turned barren. Now the blight has spread to India. Starvation has already claimed its first victims . . . If present trends of population growth and farm output persist, concluded the USDA experts, India by 1970 will require fully one-half the U.S. wheat crop to feed its teeming masses." The situation is now far worse than when these words were written last December. And it will get far, far worse before it ends.

Repeatedly in history, socialists (as far back as Plato!) have talked about birth control. The population explosion is an ancient *excuse* for socialist failure and a means of establishing total control over life, including birth itself. The persistent consequence of socialism has been *depopulation*, depopulation by two central methods. *First*, there is depopulation

by the socialist terror, by mass liquidations. *Second*, there is depopulation by famine. We have seen, are seeing, and shall see more of both.

Will anything be done to prevent this? The answer is clearly *no*. Our humanistic education has geared our generation to think in terms of a revolutionary doctrine of love, and to think well of all men, so it is impossible to shake the faith of the majority in the goodness of all men and especially of our elite planners, the philosopher-kings who will remake the world.

A telling account of our spiritual idiocy and susceptibility to evil was analyzed in the *Review of the News*, August 3, 1966, pp. 17–24. On July 13, 1966, a criminal entered an apartment inhabited by nine student nurses. Although he later displayed a revolver, he did not have it in his hand when he entered, nor when he tied up the girls one by one. Nine girls, screaming and clawing, could have routed him. The four Filipino nurses favored ganging up on the intruder (they had time for a debate!), but the American nurses favored appeasement and won. They argued, "Maybe if we are quiet and calm, he will remain quiet and calm . . . We more or less have to trust him . . ."

Here, in brief, is the religion of love preached from our pulpits and the philosophy of appeasement practiced by our civil governments. As the *Review of the News* commented:

> Apparently, appeasement of criminals has now become a national characteristic of Americans, not only in dealing with the mass-killers of international Communism, but in dealing with criminals within our own society. The country has been so brainwashed, so conditioned to believe that all a criminal needs is a little love and understanding, that it has lost all sight of what the criminal mentality is all about.

Our problems are an outgrowth of humanism. Humanism is a philosophy or perspective which is dominant in our day. According to the *Dictionary of Philosophy*, humanism is "any view in which interest in human welfare is central." This is the *basic* definition, and humanitarianism is "any view in which interest in human values are central." The *Merriam-Webster International Dictionary*, second edition, defines "humanitarianism" in full as follows;

> 1. Theol. and Ch. Hist. The distinctive tenet denying the divinity of Christ; also, the system of doctrine based upon this view of Christ.
>
> 2. Ethics, a. The doctrine that man's obligations are limited to, and dependent alone on, man and human relations, b. The doctrine of Saint-Simon that man's nature is perfectible through his own efforts without divine grace.
>
> 3. Regard for the interests of mankind; benevolence.

In all these definitions, one thing is obvious: *man* is central; man's welfare is the highest law and the only real law. Moreover, *socialism* (not only with Saint-Simon) is basically and essentially humanism applied to economics. Socialism denies economic laws; it plans to remake the world in terms of man's welfare as seen by the planners. It is a government of men, not of laws, by men, not by law, and society is placed under man, not under God.

A generation reared in humanism is bent on sacrificing law to suit the criminal, giving food to subsidize socialism; paying men not to work, appeasing criminals and Communists, and on pouring out its pity on the degenerates. Listen to this: J. Edgar Hoover wrote in *The Week* magazine, August 25, 1957:

> Recently many of you must have joined me in my feeling of sympathy for the Detroit father whose six-year old daughter was brutally slain by a sex pervert. This bereaved father said, "I can't blame the man as much as the society that produced him. It's a society that allows its young people to read and distribute the worst sort of pornography!" ("Let's Wipe Out the Schoolyard Sex Racket!")

With all due respect to Mr. Hoover for his great services to all Americans, he is here *dead wrong*. I have no sympathy for this father: he was as degenerate as that pervert. Instead of righteous indignation against a criminal who, according to God's law, deserved to die, he said, "I can't blame the man as much as the society which produced him." This is simply environmentalism, economic determinism, Marxism — humanism. Man is not to blame — his world must be remade to remake man. How can we defeat Marxism when fathers are so degenerate, and when the chief agent of anti-communism for the United States of America expresses sympathy for such a perspective? *We are far gone indeed*.

Will people ever wake up? Yes, when famine and death, economic collapse and anarchy, and the triumph of criminal anarchy drain every drop of stupid humanism and pity for evildoers out of their veins, and *only* when they stand in terms of a world under God's law, for the rule of justice, not sentimentality.

Don't expect miracles, unless you believe in God. And if you believe in God, don't offend Him by expecting Him to bail out the very people who despise Him and war against His law and order: "Ye that love the Lord, hate evil" (Ps. 97:10). More serious than the wheat shortage is the shortage of true faith.

But, because the world is under God's law, the coming and growing economic crisis is a judgment upon world socialism and also its destruction.

77

PLANNING

Chalcedon Report No. 12, September 1966

One of the things we shall hear more and more about these days is planning. Master plans are either being developed for every community, county, state, business, and group, or else are slated for development. Hand in hand with this go plans for data banks, master files giving full information on every individual, organization, or group. Some of the statements made by the planners are alarming. Thus, Mel Scott, in proposing a metropolitan area government for Southern California, said, "One of these days there will be brought into being in this metropolitan region an urban resettlement agency . . . It should be the most unorthodox agency ever conceived and should be free to experiment with a great variety of services, projects, methods and legal powers." On the other hand, some planners are themselves alarmed at the potential menace in planning. Whether liberals or socialists, they believe that their planning is for the good of man, and the dangerous overtones of planning frighten them. Thus, planner Albert Mindlin has asked, "In marching courageously forward to a 1984 utopia, are we not also blindly paving the way for a possible 1984 Big Brother?"

The answer is obviously yes. Socialism rests on two foundations: *First*, managed money, counterfeit money, or paper money. Since money is the lifeblood of economics, control of an economy requires control of money. When money controls begin, socialism ensues, whether it is intended or not. *Second*, planning is the next requirement. To manage an economy, it is necessary to increase the controls over the economy, and this calls for ever-increasing planning and finally total planning. To manage the economy, you must control and plan it, and the control begins with money and spreads to every aspect of every man's life.

Planning means several things. *First*, its goal is total control over man

in order to provide man all the benefits socialism offers. For socialism to function, total control is necessary. *Second*, this means that there must be a *total plan* for man. We shall hear more and more about total planning. It is impossible to go to any corner of the United States and escape a master plan for the area, and for yourself. Socialism wants to save man, and to save man it must plan and control his life. *Third*, to plan and control man, it is necessary to have *total knowledge* about man. As a result, data banks and master files are being accumulated to provide that total knowledge about every man, community, group, vocation, and all things else.

A Marxist, Maurice Cornforth, in an important work, *Marxism and the Linguistic Philosophy* (International Publishers, 1965) has written, "The goal of socialist politics and socialist planning is, obviously, to produce an absolute abundance of goods and services, so that all that anyone can need is available to him. And, apart from obstacles of external interference, natural calamities and errors of planning, all of which are surmountable, there is no reason why this goal should not be reached" (p. 327).

In total planning, the state takes the place of God, and it gives us predestination by man, predestination by the socialist state, as the substitute for God's predestination. But, as Cornforth said, to accomplish this, the state must be free from opposition, natural disasters (which are unplanned, as droughts and floods always are), and also free from human errors. This is quite an order!

What happens in reality when the state begins to plan? The stronger the state becomes, the more extensive becomes its planning, and the more serious its penalties for nonconformity. The statistics of a state decline in accuracy to the same ratio as the state increases in power. A powerful state demands success of its bureaucracy, and it demands conformity. It gets conformity but not success. Every Five-Year Plan in the Soviet Union was planned on the basis of statistics provided by every division of state and industry, and agriculture as well. The statistics were dishonest. Men were afraid to report the chaos which existed in their area, and they provided doctored statistics as a result. The Soviet planning rested therefore on erroneous statistics. When the plan ended, who wanted to report failure and go to Siberia? Everyone reported success. Thus the plan was a success; the Soviet Union was gaining on the United States — and people were starving when statistics reported a good harvest!

It is not necessary, however, to go to the Soviet Union for dishonest statistics. They exist everywhere and in all states. When the European powers took over Africa, they worked to civilize it. Cannibalism was

outlawed. Now every good colonial administrator wanted to report success and gain promotion, and so they reported a steady decline in cannibalism and a rise in civilization. Thus they went on to a higher post after claiming a 30 percent decline in cannibalism. Their successors followed a similar practice, until cannibalism was statistically abolished and civilization reigned in Africa! But the difference between statistics and reality appeared when the colonies gained independence and cannibalism revived. Nigeria was regarded as a showplace of African statehood, with extensive education, British degrees from distinguished universities abounding, and the prime minister, Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa, knighted by Queen Elizabeth. Unfortunately, on January 15, 1966, Sir Abubaker, Sir Ahmadu Bello, and other dignitaries proved to be the main course at a dinner held "by local democrats and humanitarians."

United States statistics, as provided by the federal, state, county, and city governments, are little better, and the higher up one goes, the worse they get. Statistics are *economic data*; but, when collected for state usage, they become *political facts*, and they are therefore bent, twisted, and altered to suit political purposes. A business firm must have accurate statistical data on sales, cost, and production, or it will go out of business. From start to finish, business statistics are economic facts and are governed by hard economic realities. But, from start to finish, under socialism, statistics are political facts and are governed by political realities; as a result, economic reality is suppressed, and the result is continued political power for a time, together with economic chaos.

This is a nemesis of socialism. Socialism cannot work, because, *first*, it tries to assume the role and prerogative of God, which is impossible. And, *second*, socialism destroys economic order by giving politics primacy and power over economics. And since political management of the economic sphere is a basic tenet of socialism, socialism is by nature involved in a contradiction and an impossibility.

How, then, does socialism survive at all? There are two roads for socialist survival: *First*, socialism is parasitic. It must feed on a healthy body to survive. A parasite can only live as long as it has a healthy or living body to feed on. When the host body dies, the parasite either finds another host or dies also. Today, the United States is the host body for the world parasites, and it is bleeding to death. *Second*, because socialism is parasitic, it is imperialistic. Every socialist state must capture ever-fresh countries in order to gut their economies and survive a little longer. Whether military or otherwise, imperialism becomes a necessity for socialism. We need not be surprised, then, at the continual aggression of a socialistic era.

Master planning thus ends in a masterpiece of anarchy, lawlessness, and confusion. Man's plan is failing everywhere, as it of necessity must. God's plan alone remains assured, and we must move in terms of it.

78

CONFISCATION

Chalcedon Report No. 7, April 1, 1966

It is important for us to face up to the growing problem of *confiscation*, since it is an ever-threatening fact on the modern scene.

In London, England, a ten-year-old girl was taken from her mother by a juvenile court. According to the *Santa Barbara News-Press,* March 4, 1966, "The child's only offense is to wipe her knife and fork with a table napkin before meals." Because the girl persisted, and the headmaster barred her from "the school canteen," the mother "refused to send her to school." The child was then taken at once from the mother. Whether the child or mother were right or wrong is irrelevant: the central issue is the destruction of a family by the state. The normal procedure in such cases has been "a small fine." In this case, the state asserted its power to declare implicitly that any resistance to its will constitutes delinquency, and therefore the home must be broken. The state thus becomes the "true" parent of the child. The authority of the family is abolished by the authority of the state.

Another case: As a *Los Angeles Times* editorial for Wednesday morning, March 9, 1966, noted, "Last July the Department of Interior announced plans to offer recordable contracts to Imperial Valley farmers served by the All American Canal under which they would be required to dispose of holdings in excess of 160 acres. Now the department has asked the Department of Justice to file court action to enforce that limitation." This is the most recent development in a federal program which began in 1902. Its legal history is a tangled one. Even in terms of its own laws, the federal action is illegal. The purpose of this action is in effect "agrarian reform," the socialistic confiscation of private lands. Supposedly, the action is to favor small holdings, but no small farm is secure if the federal power to confiscate is admitted. If this step is morally valid, then the

federal government also has the right to declare that a house with more than three bedrooms, or more than six rooms, cannot receive power until it is "shared" with someone else. The principle is exactly the same: it is theft by socialistic confiscation. The fact that the "law" is used to steal only makes the act more immoral.

In the *Los Angeles Times* for Thursday, March 1, 1966, President Johnson's call for "gun control" is reported. This attempt is to limit further the constitutional right to bear arms and an attack also on the right of self-defense. It is a step towards confiscation of rights as well as of arms.

The *Whitter Daily News,* March 9, 1966, reports Martin Luther King's confiscation or seizure of a building in Chicago. Assuming that the eighty-one-year-old landlord, John B. Bender, who has been legally served notice to correct twenty-three building code violations, was in the wrong, King's act is still immoral. To seize a building and collect its rents is theft; what would happen if a John Birch Society leader tried to do the same? Would he be free to continue lecturing and granting interviews? But King has over one hundred union leaders assisting him in his programs, and the "law" today is a respecter of persons: it discriminates against property and property owners.

The *Santa Ana Register*, January 22, 1966, notes, "the federal government has used $188,000 of the taxpayers' money to set up a subsidized newspaper in Willow Run, Michigan, which, in the subsidized newspapers' own words, was to provide 'honest and true reporting (which) the government feels of interest.'" Other plans have been announced for a federal-government press. Public funds are thus being used to further statist control of communications. Freedom of the press is thus being destroyed.

Taxation is increasingly becoming confiscation. Many people who own their homes are paying what almost amounts to a rental fee in taxes. And the end is not yet near.

Confiscation, in a variety of other ways, is a political and economic fact or threat. It is inescapably so. Socialism offers people the promise of paradise on earth, but socialism cannot deliver on its promises because it is economically a bankrupt system. Instead of plenty, it leads to poverty. The Ukraine under the tsars was "the breadbasket of Europe"; today, Russia must import grain to avoid starvation. Great Britain was once a center of world commerce and a prosperous people; socialism has made the life of the average Englishman a poor one. Socialism is a parasitic economy. It must rob, it must confiscate, in order to give; it cannot create new wealth, but it destroys existing wealth.

As a result, socialism steadily begins to founder and falter and move towards total collapse. When this happens, socialism is faced with a choice: who shall survive, the people or the state? Socialism claims to seek the people's welfare, but, faced with the question of survival, it sacrifices the people. For example, inflation develops, and the state has a decision: sacrifice socialism and its money management, or sacrifice the people? Stop deficit spending, or control private spending by inflation, taxation, and regulation? The socialist choice has always been to sacrifice the people.

But no sacrifice helps to prop up socialism more than briefly. More sacrifices are needed. Instead of admitting gross error and going out of business, socialism puts the citizens out of business. It confiscates by inflation, taxation, regulation, and finally seizure. The citizens, private property, civil liberties, all things are steadily sacrificed to make the continuation of socialism possible. The promise of plenty, which seemed possible in the earlier stages of welfarism, begins to give way to the certainties of disaster. As long as it can confiscate and live, socialism will confiscate and live. This is socialism's historic answer to its economic problems: *progressive confiscation*.

According to Psalm 24:1, "The earth is the LORD's, and the fulness thereof; the world, and they that dwell therein." Socialism confiscates not only man's possessions, but it strikes also at God's sovereignty over the earth. It is an attempt of men to be gods, to be the re-creators of man and the earth. And God is jealous of His honor and power. The law of God's creation is thus totally against the socialist planners, and they are therefore doomed to fail. Their "new order of the ages" is the repeated failure of the ages and the condemned order. Because socialism cannot confiscate God's sovereignty, it is inescapably doomed to failure and destined to collapse.

We are therefore clearly living at the end of an era. Socialism is finished, and no desperate remedies will keep it alive indefinitely. It has taken the world's economy past the point of no return and is thus headed for total disaster. What we face is the worst phase of socialist desperation to keep its failing order alive. There will thus be a difficult period of survival, and then the fresh air of God's free world. We must prepare for survival *and* for reconstruction. Important to such a preparation is a sound Christian faith, a trust in His grace and mercy and His providential care, a use of godly wisdom and common sense, and the confidence that, although the times are difficult, we are on God's side, the winning side. Basic to such a preparation is the creation of Christian institutions, godly schools and colleges, and a deepening of our faith. The socialistic

revolutionaries of today shout, "We shall overcome!" but God, according to David, laughs and has them in derision, for the victory is God's (Ps. 2). Martin Luther commented on Psalm 2:

> What a great measure of faith is necessary in order truly to believe this word: For who could have imagined that God laughed as Christ was suffering and the Jews exulting? So, too, when we are oppressed, how often do we still believe that those who oppose us are being derided by God, especially since it seems as if we were being oppressed and trodden under foot both by God and men?
>
> . . . We should . . . fortify our hearts and look toward the invisible things and into the depths of the Word . . . I also shall laugh with my God.

79

EVOLUTION, OR PROVIDENCE?

Chalcedon Report No. 130, June 1976

In 1951, a group of prominent Americans wrote on *The Fabulous Future: America in 1980*. The writers included David Sarnoff, George Meany, Nathan M. Pusey, Earl Warren, Adlai Stevenson, Charles P. Taft, Henry R. Luce, and others of note. They saw as likely by 1980 the global control of climate, a sharing of wealth, and George M. Humphrey, then secretary of the treasury, wrote of things to come under the title, "The Future: Sound as a Dollar." This glorious future is possible because "the management of government is in the hands of men of integrity and high moral purpose." Henry R. Luce said that by 1980 World War III "will have happened or been bypassed," but, if it had happened, men would have moved ahead into greater progress.

Luce saw a great change coming in man himself. He saw a "new human nature" ahead, a "new mutation," in man's evolution. This great change would be engineered by man himself. Man would control his own evolution in collaboration with God. The key word for Luce was "evolution." As he pointed out, "The American word, before evolution, was Providence." Precisely. Now, however, a new word, a new gospel, had replaced the old. While man was now a "collaborator" with God, to all practical intent, the new man and his new world would be the handiwork of man.

Earlier, the providence of God had been naturalized into laissez-faire; providence had been retained in its workings, but had been disassociated from God. God remained in the system of Adam Smith as the very necessary insurance agency and foundation, indispensable but best left invisible and unmentioned. Darwin's faith in the omnipotence of chance left God unnecessary. In this new worldview, all things are held possible, given enough time, for chance to accomplish, and nothing is impossible

for chance. Now omnipotence was taken from God and given to chance, or to whatever person or agency could control chance. Man immediately set out, by means of the scientific socialist state, to be that agency, and the result in the twentieth century has been the epiphany of the new god, statist man.

With this in mind, it is easy to understand the confidence of the authors of *The Fabulous Future*. They knew the new god well, meeting him as they did daily in their mirrors. They had unlimited confidence in him. The new god has all the benefits the old God lacks, i.e., science, sociology, state-controlled education, and much, much more. The new god is not afraid to intervene directly and thoroughly into human affairs, into every sphere of life by means of superimposed controls. Slow, painful trial and error ways are thus obsolete, as well as the necessity for moral decision; a superior agency provides man with the government he needs. The only question in the minds of these new gods is with respect to the people: will they become "a new man . . . a new mutation," soon enough?

The target date, 1980, is approaching, but the hope set forth gets dimmer. [John von Neumann of the Atomic Energy Commission had predicted in 1955 that in "a few decades hence energy may be free — just like the unmetered air — with coal and oil used mainly as raw materials for organic chemical synthesis."] The new gods have not lacked power: they have governed in almost every nation on earth; they have applied their plan, or their decree of predestination, to one sphere after another. Instead of being content with a mere tithe, as the old God is, the gods have taxed from 40 to 110 percent of a man's income, and their paradise only becomes more remote, rather than nearer.

Man's plan has replaced God's providence as the governing principle of men and nations, and it is Man's plan that is failing. Surprisingly, however, the very eloquent praise-singers of man's plan come from the churches. Man's plan seems to all such to be humane; it shows "concern" for humanity and is a logical outgrowth of their "Christian" faith, and so on. Laissez-faire is a dirty word to them and its root doctrine, providence, a forgotten faith. A city in colonial America was named "Providence," and men once felt secure, not because tax money was available to them, but because providence undergirded their total being. Now the word is rarely heard, in or out of church. When the church ceases to speak of providence, it ceases to speak of God.

Why? Providence is the superintendence and care which God exercises over creation; it is God's continuous government over all things in terms of His sovereign lordship, decree, and purpose. Where men trust instead in man's plan rather than God's providence, they are of necessity

antinomian: they substitute man's law for God's law. The government is then upon man's shoulders and in man's hands.

In almost all churches today, God is God Emeritus, while man reigns instead. God is honored by lip service even as He is relegated to the oblivion of retirement. After all, why should the old God interfere with things, when the new god is doing so well? If the new god is failing, it is because the people are not yet new mutations, or are clinging too much to their remnants of the old faith. Besides, the new god has only been at the job for a short time; give me more time, he says, and I will remake all things.

In brief, the new god has his own doctrine of laissez-faire. Leave me alone, he says to the old God and His people. Do not interfere with or sabotage my plan. To work, it must have no extraneous impediments. Given that freedom from "outside" control (anything from God and man which might distress the planners), and paradise will surely come on schedule.

In fact, the authors of *The Fabulous Future* could all but hear the footsteps of paradise approaching. Now, of course, their spiritual sons hear them too, but they suspect that it is the beast and hell which approaches. And, as long a man's plan operates, nothing else can result.

Providence, anyone?

80

EDUCATION AND RIGHTS

Chalcedon Report No. 15, December 1, 1966

Concern about the Bill of Rights is greatly in evidence these days, and in many quarters. The Bill of Rights should particularly concern Christians, since it is a product of Biblical Christianity; the idea of a Bill of Rights is unknown in other religions and civilizations.

The state of California has now issued a book, the first printing in mimeographed form, of a "Source Book for Teachers" entitled *The Bill of Rights*. The book, copyrighted in 1966 by the California State Department of Education, has a favorable introduction by Max Rafferty, superintendent of public instruction. The cover of the book bears this notice: "Preliminary Printing by California Teachers Association." On page x, we are told, that "The State Board of Education acknowledges with gratitude the gift of thirty thousand dollars from the Constitutional Rights Foundation of Los Angeles. This gift, used for payment of operational expenses, has made this publication possible." Two years ago Dr. Rafferty refused to help judge a Bill of Rights essay contest sponsored by this rights foundation because three directors of the foundation had been named as supporters of Communist fronts in reports from the State Senate Committee on Un-American Activities. No authors are listed for the source book, but an advisory panel is given.

The source book is very carefully researched, and very carefully written. A summary of the major sections of the table of contents best gives a perspective on the work:

Part One: Judicial Review, the Fourteenth Amendment and Federalism
Section A: Judicial Review
Section B: The Fourteenth Amendment and Federalism

Part Two: Equal Protection of the Law

Section A: Voting
Section B: Education
Section C: Housing
Section D: Employment

Part Three: Criminal Due Process
Section A: The Criminal Trial
Section B: Law Enforcement

Part Four: Freedom of Expression
Section A: Seditious Speech
Section B: Obscenity
Section C: Modes of Regulation of Speech

Part Five: Freedom of Religion
Section A: History
Section B: The Free Exercise of Religion
Section C: The Establishment Clause

In terms of its given purpose, the source book is an excellent summary of the present legal state of the Bill of Rights, as far as the Supreme Court is concerned, and as far as the Great Society is concerned. We are given a careful statement of the civil rights position with respect to voting, integration, education, federal aid, housing, and so on. But we are given very little about the Bill of Rights as such. Instead of being a study, as the title would indicate, of the Bill of Rights, it is rather a study of the progress in law of the civil-rights revolution. Had the book been titled something like, *The Present Legal Status of the Civil Rights Movement*, it would have been an able and acceptable work.

But it is mistitled. It is not a study of the Bill of Rights. The Bill of Rights and the Supreme Court interpretations are two different things. A former assistant attorney general of the United States, Charles Warren, wrote in *The Supreme Court in United States History*, volume 3, pages 470–471: "However the Court may interpret the provisions of the Constitution, it is still the Constitution which is the law and not the decision of the Court." Another writer stated some time ago, "Any citizen whose liberty or property is at stake has an absolute constitutional right to appear before the Court and challenge its interpretation of the Constitution, no matter how often they have been promulgated, upon the ground that they are repugnant to its provisions... When the Bar of the country understands this, and respectfully but inexorably requires of the Supreme Court that it shall continually justify its decisions by the Constitution, and not by its own precedents, we shall gain a new conception of the power of our constitutional guarantees" (Everett V. Abbott, *Justice and the Modern Law*, 1913).

It is important to know what the Court has said about the Bill of Rights, and how is has interpreted it, but it is even more important to know what the Bill of Rights has to say, and what it meant to the framers of it.

Unfortunately, however, besides giving basically a modernistic interpretation to portions of the Bill of Rights, other portions are simply bypassed as though they were nonexistent. Thus, Amendment 2 states: "A well-regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed." This right is simply dropped out of consideration. The same is true of Amendment 3, concerning the quartering of soldiers in private homes. Amendments 4 through 8 are treated in part 3, as a piece. Amendment 9, "The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage other rights retained by the people," a very basic provision, is also bypassed. The same is true of Amendment 10, "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." Amendments 13, 14 and 15 are included as part of "The Expanded Bill of Rights," and they are apparently regarded as invalidating Amendments 9 and 10. The source book admits, however, that the intention of these amendments had exclusive reference to the ex-slaves.

The original purpose of the Bill of Rights was to protect the citizens and the states from the power of the federal government. This is obliquely noted by the source book: "One of the goals of the framers of the Constitution was to establish a government which was strong enough to enforce the law, yet not so strong as to threaten individual liberty" (p. 31). This is true, but, more than that, the purpose of the Bill of Rights was to impose restraints on the federal government and to protect the citizenry in its God-given immunities. The fear was of *federal* power. The citizens of the several states were expected to protect themselves from the states through state constitutions and state bills of rights: the first ten amendments of the U.S. Constitution were imposed on the federal government by the people to protect themselves from that particular form of civil government. The one thing neither the Constitution nor the Bill of Rights even remotely envisioned was that the federal government and its Supreme Court would become the protectors of the people from the states and from each other. What was once the feared Big Bad Wolf has now been made the Big Good Protector. The American people in 1787 were not afraid of each other. They knew one another's frailties and injustices. Thus, civil and criminal laws were designed to keep the people in check. But who could protect the people from Big Government? The object of

the Constitution was to provide sufficiently strong civil government without creating too big a power. The Constitution and the Bill of Rights strictly limited the scope of the federal union by checks and balances, divisions of powers, separation of powers, the express powers doctrine, and prohibitions placed on civil government.

But now the "Great Society" declares that the best guardian of our liberties is the very power the Bill of Rights distrusted, and the source book expounds this new doctrine. "Rights" now mean equality, integration fair housing, and whatever else the "Great Society" tells us our rights are. What *are* our rights now? They are whatever the federal government decides is man's necessary fulfillment. And all man's "rights" in "the Great Society's" definition are things which do not interfere with the state's interest and necessity. For an example of this, notice what Justice Goldberg had to say in *Griswold v. Connecticut* (1965), when the Court, by a seven-to-two majority, invalidated a law prohibiting the use of contraceptives by married people. Goldberg defended the right of marital privacy, but at the same time limited it by saying, "Surely the Government, absent a showing of compelling state interest, could not decree that all husbands and wives must be sterilized after two children have been born to them." But what this implies is that, if there is "a showing of a compelling state interest," the state could decree such a sterilization. Is this what the source book calls "the Court's function in protecting individual liberty under the Constitution"? (p. 115). Is this expressive of "the very nature of the Court's role in protecting individual liberty from government encroachment"? (ibid).

The Bill of Rights was written because the states and citizens of the newly formed United States pointed the finger at that federal government as the threat to their liberties. Today, the federal government and the U.S. Supreme Court, far bigger than the people of 1787 ever imagined it could be, point the finger at landlords, private associations, individuals, and various small organizations as the threat. Conservatives in particular are denounced by politicians as a menace to liberty. In other words, the wolves are insisting that the Bill of Rights was written to protect them from the assault of lambs, and that it therefore cannot be used by lambs.

The new textbook *Land of the Free*, by John Caughey, John Hope Franklin, and Ernest R. May, is written from this same perspective. The meaning of American history is seen as fulfilled in the civil rights movement. The heroes of American history are therefore people like these: Edward Hicks, Quock Walker, George Guess, Harriet Tubman, Mary Ann Hafen, Anthony Burns, Frederick Douglass, Kate Shelley, Arthur Goldberg, Ishi, Jacob Riis, Jane Addams, Nicola Sacco and Bartolomeo

Vanzetti, Charles Drew, Linda Brown, and others. But more than these persons, the real meaning of American history is in the drive towards equality and the civil rights revolution.

What is the answer to these things? Shall we continue to hope in the public schools to protect us? The state schools are socialist schools; can we expect them to teach anything other than socialism? Socialism in education means the state control of education, just as socialism in business is the state control of business, either by regulation or takeover. Can you expect the wolves to protect you against themselves?

The course of action with respect to creeping socialism is to destroy it where it can be destroyed, and to restrain it, if no more can be done at the moment.

The only logical conclusion of the present concept of civil rights is communism. It demands "full equality." And where does equality stop? Economic, political, cultural, racial, personal, and every other kind of equality is demanded. One of the logical outcomes of the demand for economic equality is socialization of industry and "agrarian reform." There are major steps in this direction already. The acreage limitation on irrigated farms, the Delta Ministry of the NCC, various federal policies, all point to "agrarian reform," towards the communization of agriculture. And increasing socialist controls over industry are already in evidence.

"Full equality" means that no differences can be tolerated with respect to race, color, creed, economics, and all things else. This means the planned destruction of the very elements of society who have made our civilization. The reduction of the Bill of Rights to a program of equalitarianism is to interpret the Bill of Rights as an instrument of socialistic revolution.

But the Bill of Rights rests on a Biblical foundation. Its origin is in the demand for the respect for other men's life ("Thou shalt not kill"), home ("Thou shalt not commit adultery"), property ("Thou shalt not steal"), and reputation ("Thou shalt not bear false witness"). (In newsletter no. 6, we discussed the origins of various other laws, including legal procedure and the Fifth Amendment, in the Mosaic law.)

Can we expect water to come out of a faucet when the reservoir is bone dry? Will a new faucet do the trick for us? To imagine such a possibility is ridiculous, but in essence this is what people are demanding today. The American reservoir *is* dry. Spiritually, we are bankrupt. The overwhelming majority of Americans are content, with occasional grumblings, to remain in churches which are clearly apostate. They sit under pastors who know less Bible and doctrine than they do, which isn't much, and whose politics is the politics of revolution. Is our hope to be in such a people,

whose presence in such churches has the condemnation of Scripture?

True, the American people are capable of getting angry now and then at election time. They don't like riots, obvious corruption, and other things, but a protest vote is not a reviving power. Even the criminal syndicates resent corruption in their own ranks and liquidate thieves. Victory at election time is *very* important, but it is not the answer. Good plumbing is necessary in any building at any time, but it cannot take the place of a reservoir. We need both the reservoir and the right kind of plumbing, religious, political, and educational. To place our hope in plumbing alone is both foolish and disastrous.

The basic error of liberalism and socialism is *environmentalism*. Environmentalism holds that it is not man who is responsible for evil but his environment, his family, school, culture, and economic condition. Change the environment and you will change man. As a result, environmentalists are very eager to win elections, change laws, and thereby remake man. To try to answer environmentalism by changing the environment is a surrender to their position. To believe that this can be done means that we belong in the environmentalist camp.

Our problem is this: the plumbing is in *very* bad shape. We do need new plumbing, i.e., new politics, new churches, new schools, and so on, and we need these things urgently. But all these things are useless without the reservoir, the triune God. We need more faith, and real faith, not the compromising position of men like Billy Graham, nor the wicked standpattism of people who feel that if they grumble occasionally, God will bless their membership in apostate churches. Real faith makes a stand first and foremost in terms of the faith.

Is there much of this? On the contrary, there is very little real faith. Even in the few separated and faithful churches, members move in terms of trifles, not in terms of faith. They leave because of a spat with Mrs. Jones, or because they have found a church with a better choir, or a better youth group. They move in terms of everything except faith. And they, too, shall be judged.

The prospect, then, is one of judgment. But is that all? On the contrary, every time of judgment is also one of salvation, because when God judges the ungodly, He also moves to deliver His faithful saints.

But, most of all, the future is a glorious one because it is in the hands of God, *not* in the hands of men. Man proposes, but God disposes. As far back as the days of the Flood, and then the Tower of Babel, man planned a world of tyranny under man's humanistic world order. But God has confounded every plan of man to establish his humanistic world order, and His power is unchanged still.

In this blessed season, therefore, as we look forward to the celebration of our Lord's nativity, we can rejoice that the government of the universe is upon His shoulder who, is the "Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace" (Isa. 9:6). Let us stand in confidence, because it is He who governs us and is our Lord.

81

HOLY POVERTY?

Chalcedon Report No. 342, January 1994

A few years ago, J. N. Hillgarth called attention, as have others, to the remarkable shift in the attitude towards the poor which Christianity created in the Roman Empire. The Greco-Roman world regarded the poor as barely human, as "semivocal stock," whereas the church proclaimed a King-Redeemer who was concerned with their salvation and advancement. The faith stressed, as Gregory the Great emphasized, that "God has chosen those the world despised" (J. N. Hillgarth, ed., *Christianity and Paganism, 350–750*, p. 4). To call this emphasis revolutionary is to state it mildly. The poor were members of the church now, and of society. It is easy for some scholars to write that great social differences marked the rich and the poor during the centuries preceding the Renaissance. They did indeed, but the poor were now members of the society around them who could only be neglected at the peril of one's soul (Matt. 25:31–46). It was a common form of penance for the rich and mighty to abase themselves to serve the poor. St. Francis of Assisi simply enacted in his life and order what was already a social ideal.

This doctrine of the poor had Biblical roots but also Neoplatonic influences. Both Old and New Testaments stress the care of the poor and needy. Such care was basic to the New Testament Church. At the same time, many Biblical texts stress the dangers of riches: they can, like thorns, choke out the good (Matt. 13:22). Wealth in the hands of godly men, from Abraham to Priscilla and Aquila, can also be a great means of good. There is no virtue as such in poverty or wealth; virtue is a moral attribute of men.

Under the influence of Neoplatonism, a doctrine of holy poverty developed. The implicit dualism in Platonic thought came to mean that the material world is not good, whereas the spiritual realm is holy. In terms

of Scripture, holiness does not imply the spiritual, nor does evil imply the physical. The totality of our being is fallen and needs redemption. Satan is a purely spiritual being and totally evil. All things are God's creation, and sin and evil are moral, not physical, facts.

Holy poverty, however, became a popular belief in the medieval era. Although many churchmen held the idea, it never had official sanction. Men like Aquinas held that there could be no intrinsic good in poverty nor in wealth; only if the removal of wealth were required to bring men to their moral senses could we speak of poverty as *instrumentally* good.

The popular belief in "holy poverty" was shattered by the Reformation, which, while stressing charity, required also thrift and industry, and created thereby a culture dedicated to a holy dominion.

With the rise of socialism, especially Marxism, there was a return to the concept of "holy poverty," but in a secular form. The socialists held, *first*, that the poor are the good people of the world as against the rich "exploiters," the evil ones of history. This meant sanctifying the one class and demonizing others. Sin and evil now became properties of the non-poor.

Secondly, logically, the poor were viewed as victims, not as failures, sinners, or anything else that would be derogatory of their status. As a result, whether they be failing students, failing or nonworking workers, all such men are now commonly viewed as *victims*. The "system" did it to them.

Third, this means a denial of personal responsibility. Racial bigotry, capitalism, the middle class, the churches, and a variety of other things are blamed for the poverty of "the people."

Fourth, we have thus an identification of "the poor" with the people, and an identification of Christians, capitalists, and the successful generally with the demonic forces in society.

Never before have we seen in the Western tradition so radical a demonization of a major strata of society and the sanctification of another! In effect, what this means is, in secular terms, the less you have, the more you are as a person! Being poor, even criminal, makes you an oppressed, down-trodden person! Unless you are an intellectual, an entertainment or sports figure, or a civil officeholder, wealth makes you a member of the depraved and evil class! To be productive becomes a sin.

A truly Biblical perspective does not despise wealth and possessions. They are an aspect of our personhood. I recently was reminded of the experiences of a man who was imprisoned in a Marxist hell. He was stripped of his possessions and made quickly into an unshaven, dirty, and foul-smelling thing. He was taken into an interrogation room stripped

of all clothing. The room was chilly, with a cement floor. The interrogation officer was smoking a cigarette between sips of a hot cup of coffee. He treated the prisoner's Christian faith and calling with contemptuous amusement. As the prisoner later said, he felt less a person; he had been stripped of all dignity. Only his faith enabled him to survive.

The depersonalization of man can also be accomplished by other forms of stripping — by taxation, confiscation, socialistic controls, and by a general deprecation of his freedom. It is also done by making him feel guilty for what he has when millions are poor and hungry. Such propaganda is no incentive to personal concern and charity but to guilt feelings which make people more controllable.

The political doctrine of holy poverty is a very evil one. Its dangerous consequences can only be nullified by a strong Christian faith and by the revitalization of godly charity. It is time to concern ourselves with the answers as Scripture provides them.

82

GOD'S LAW AND OUR WORLD

Chalcedon Report No. 13, October 1, 1966

One of the most important things for us to know, in understanding our world, is that it is a world under God's law. At every point in our lives, we are governed by law. The laws of physiology, the laws of our body, are very real laws, as are laws of digestion, rest, exercise, sleep, and so on: we despise or break them at our peril. The physical world has its laws, and we live in terms of them: we cannot annul gravity because we have decided on an impulse to float upward instead of falling down. We have laws in every realm, biological, sociological, chemical, economic, religious, and so on.

In some areas, the laws are no less certain but not so quick in their consequences. Taking arsenic has a quick effect; taking narcotics is somewhat slower, and being an alcoholic is slower yet, but each course involves a violation of God's laws for the body, and the pursued course is death.

In the world of human affairs, God's laws are, as everywhere else, operative, but, by the providence of God, man is given more rope in some areas than in others, and these areas become significant therefore in human history.

Politics is one such area. God's basic requirement of the political order is the recognition that sovereignty belongs, not to man, nor to the state, but to God alone. The state *cannot* be neutral towards the triune God. It *must* recognize that the triune God is the basic and ultimate lawgiver, and it *must* seek to further godly law and order.

But politics is also a realm where man can assert and has repeatedly asserted his maximum defiance of God. The state has claimed sovereignty and set itself up as God and as man's savior. The state has made man's law supreme and has despised God's law. It has claimed the right to govern other law spheres, such as religion and economics, and the

state has acted as though there were no absolute law in the universe, only man-made law.

This attitude is, of course, basic to *socialism* in its *every* form, Fabian, Marxist, "Christian," and so on. And many, many people are socialist without knowing it, because they either put their trust in politics, or ascribe fearfully impossible powers to politics, which are impossible in God's world.

Economics is a law sphere. The economists have named the laws, but they operated before they were named. Gresham's law has been true in all history: "bad money drives out good money"; no man will trade real silver and gold for counterfeit if he can avoid it, and, in the long run, the silver and gold are hoarded, and the counterfeit or debased coinage alone circulates until it collapses. Gresham did not invent this law: he simply observed a reality in God's universe.

The socialist believes that politics can successfully control economics: "Washington won't let it happen; they can't afford to politically." But Washington is not God, and Washington, D.C., having set aside economic law, will suffer the consequences of violating economic law: *economic disaster. If man can avert the consequences of God's law, then man has dethroned God*. If Washington, D.C., can make its own economic laws as it goes along, and, by legislation and by administrative action, avert the consequences of its action, then causality has been abolished, law has been abolished, and the political managers are the new gods of the universe.

This, of course, is their very claim: "God is dead; long live the welfare state." They are very religious about it. One prominent scientist, in his book entitled *Man's Means to His End*, concludes with a chapter entitled "Godliness Without a God." According to Sir Robert Watson-Watt, "Man's Chief End is to glorify Man and to enjoy him forever." Man is his own god, and therefore man is his own lawgiver, making his own laws as he goes along.

Now it is unpleasant to think about troubles ahead. We all tend to like our life as it is. We want the world to change without anyone's hair being mussed. But the fact of economic crisis and collapse is the certainty of God's government. Man is not permitted to remake the world or himself after his own image. God's judgment and God's laws prevail. To believe in a *political* answer to *economic* problems is to desert belief in law for a belief in man. To hope that we can solve economic problems by political action is to succumb to the socialist temptation. Politics has a very important part in man's life *as politics*. The Founding Fathers and the colonial leaders of America were active in politics to limit politics, to keep its role as limited as possible. They were fearful of any politics which claimed

too much ability or power for the political order.

The essential meaning of the political hope is *humanism*. The humanist worships man. His faith is in man's capacity to remake the world and man through political action, and this political action is the province of a scientific elite, a managerial and planning elite who feel no need to conform to any law beyond themselves, because they believe that no law exists outside of man.

Humanism has captured the American scene, and the real religion of the United States is no longer Christianity but humanism. The courts have replaced Christianity in education with the new established religion, humanism. Humanism has also captured the churches and is preached from the pulpit by men who are sometimes unaware of their capture. Love, man's humanistic love, is the new savior, replacing Jesus Christ, the second person of the Trinity.

The basic temptation of Satan in Eden was, "Ye shall be as God, knowing good and evil," i.e., every man will be his own god, knowing or determining what is good and evil for himself. This is the essence of humanism in its every form, pragmatism, existentialism, Marxism, Fabianism, etc. But law, God's law, is the habitat of man. The law sphere of a fish, physiologically, is water; take him out of water and put him on a table, and he dies. Man's physiological law sphere is air; place him in water, and he dies. The total law sphere of man and the universe is God: "in Him we live and move and have our being." Take man out of God's law sphere, and man dies. And this is exactly what humanistic politics has done and continues to do. The result will be death. Humanistic politics can solve no problems and prevent no economic collapse: it is itself responsible for the evils which plague it.

The Dictionary of Philosophy defines "Political Philosophy" as, "That branch of philosophy which deals with political life, especially with the essence, origin and value of the state. In ancient philosophy politics also embraced what we call ethics." This is an extremely important point. As Christians, we believe that our ethics, our morality, must be derived from the only true source of law, the triune God. Our ethics are theocentric, God-centered, having reference to His Word and to His judgment. But, outside of Biblical morality, all morality has been *political*, being derived from the political order and having reference to political judgment. We cannot understand what is happening in our courts, schools, and pulpits unless we recognize that American morality has been leaving Christianity for humanism, for a political orientation. We are becoming group-oriented, and the Supreme Court is defining morality for us.

A very interesting work on the new statist morality and congenial to it,

is edited by Peter B. Neubauer, M.D., director of the Child Development Center in New York, and entitled *Children in Collectives: Child-Rearing Aims and Practices in the Kibbutz* (Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas, Publisher, 1965). Children in Israel's kibbutzim are given a thoroughly socialistic, humanistic training. The kibbutzim is their real parent. Boys and girls sleep together, four to a room, until they are eighteen; family ties are downgraded for the social tie. The children are really experimental animals. According to one of the writers, "The basically different character of the kibbutz offers uniquely rich possibilities for research activities; beyond this, the existence of a real striving for *new conditions of life* demands from all of us the study of differences, in order that we may broaden our own views" (p. 321).

Unless God is the source of all law, including moral law, man and the state will be the source of law and of morality. And this we are seeing at an accelerated rate. But God remains the only true lawgiver, and Scripture declares that God is a very jealous God, and He does not take lightly man's usurpation of God's prerogatives. Men may dream that they control the world, that they have abolished economic law and the possibility of economic disaster, but God laughs, as He laughs at all would-be gods and lawmakers: "the Lord shall have them in derision . . . Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel" (Ps. 2:4, 9).

There's a war going on, and wars hurt. Either way, either side, there will be some losses and some hurt. Pick your side: God or the state? God cannot lose, and He makes "all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose" (Rom. 8:28). The politicians of the world may say, "We will not let economic disaster happen," and God laughs. "All the nations are as nothing before Him; they are accounted as less than nothing and worthlessness" (Isa. 40:17, Berkeley Version). This God is our God, and He is our hope.

83

THEOLOGY AND RECOVERY

Chalcedon Report No. 119, July 1975

Marxism succeeded in spite of Karl Marx. A man of remarkable stupidity, he had an annual income of a very well-to-do gentleman, but he consistently lost a large portion of it on get-rich-quick schemes. His economic and political ideas were as bad as his investments. Incidentally, one of his absurd ideas for instant revolution in 1849 is still with us, now used by unknowing conservatives: the tax revolt.

Marxism succeeded because it ceased to be merely a politico-economic theory and became a religious faith. It offered a total faith, an explanation for all of life, and it succeeded because the world was busy becoming relativistic and pragmatic and uninterested in truth. Theologians became less and less concerned with God and more and more pragmatic and existential. Meanwhile, Marxist theologians, who call themselves theoreticians, have provided a total philosophy of life for a world hungry for a faith. Khrushchev saw the weakness of the purely pragmatic interests of the West. True, he recognized, "theory must be tied to life. Theory, my friends, is gray, but the eternal tree of life is evergreen." However, he pointed out, practice without theory is "doomed to wander in the dark." This was his ground for believing "we will bury you." Western man moved purely in terms of self-interest and practical concerns, not in terms of principle, or faith.

While Khrushchev did not see any strength in the Christian West, he saw the weakness of the humanistic West clearly. Its pragmatism and its contempt of principles ran deep. Palmerston, Bismarck, and others had governed in terms of it. In the United States, it was adopted tardily and with fervor by President Theodore Roosevelt, whose unprincipled foreign policy was based on the premise "Speak softly and carry a big stick." Since World War II, the United States has apparently, as Griffith noted,

rephrased Roosevelt's maxim into, "Speak loudly and carry a big wallet." (Thomas Griffith, *The Waist-High Culture* [New York, NY: Harper, 1959], p. 114). The belief that dollars will save the world is now perishing in an international glut of Euro-dollars.

Our Lord declared, "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God" (Matt. 4:4). The heart of modern humanistic politics is the belief that man can live by bread alone, that the religious issues, and God Himself, are irrelevant, and that bread and security are alone essential. The Marxists are in agreement, but they have made the "bread alone" idea into a world and life philosophy and faith. They are thus more consistent in their materialism and as a result more successful to a degree.

Everywhere, however, humanism is collapsing; Marxism promises bread and delivers hunger: inflation in the Marxist world has led to unrest and riots. The West gives bread but with it spiritual hunger, and Western man is also discontented and rebellious. Man cannot live by bread alone, and every attempt to reduce man to a bread-consuming animal, to an economic creature, is doomed to fail.

Man is a religious creature, inescapably so, created in the image of God, and having no peace apart from the service of the Lord. Sooner or later, every society which denies man's essentially religious being, and his theological *estate* and *calling*, is doomed to collapse. The modern humanistic state, both Marxist and democratic, denies its own theological estate and calling, and it denies the theological estate and calling of man. It is thus making itself more and more irrelevant to God and to man, more and more irrelevant to life's basic problems.

In a time of crisis, irrelevant institutions, no matter how powerful outwardly, begin to crumble, because they are unable to cope with life's basic problems. Even more, they have *become* the problem. The medieval order collapsed when the church became the problem instead of a channel for the answer. The modern order, the state, everywhere is creaking and faltering with decay, and it too has become the problem, not a channel for answers. As a result, the modern state and its world are headed for dissolution.

This, then, is a time of decay and dissolution, but also a time of reconstruction. Only as men regain a theological sense of *estate* and *calling* will they regain a command of their world and its problems, because they will then, under God, have a command of themselves. Under God, the good life does mean material progress, but when it is reduced to that it ceases to be a good life and becomes frustration and emptiness. Because man cannot live by bread alone, the destruction of all "bread only" societies is

inescapable, and because the world is God's creation and totally governed by His Word and law, the triumph of God's purposes is also inevitable.

One meaning of the Lord's Supper is that Christ our Passover, having been sacrificed for our redemption, is now our Lord who feeds our total being. As we walk in faith and obedience, all the material things which men seek after are given to us. "But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you" (Matt. 6:33). This requires more than merely saying, Lord, Lord. It means knowing our estate and calling in Him and under Him.

84

CONSPIRACIES

Chalcedon Report No. 44, April 2, 1969

The question of conspiracies is often discussed and seldom understood. Usually, the term "conspiracy" is reserved for the hated opposition. Communists refuse to regard their movement as a conspiracy because they believe in its historical inevitability; only the enemies of the proletariat are conspirators. Similarly, in the 1880s, the bomb-throwing anarchists of the day actually held that "anarchy is the negation of force"; their reasoning was that capitalism was using violence (the police power) to block the historically inevitable death of the state, so that anarchist action was simply an attempt to nullify force. Again, South American military regimes hold that they seized power to block radical conspiracies: they themselves were not conspirators but patriots. While one of the dictionary definitions of conspiracy is that it is a "combination of men for an evil purpose," another meaning is a "combination of men for a single end." Conspiracies thus are more than enemy action: they are any and all plans to gain a particular goal through more or less covert action.

The important question to ask is this: what makes a conspiracy work? Let us suppose that a number of us conspired together to turn the United States into a monarchy, and ourselves into its nobility; let us further suppose that we could command millions from our own circle to achieve this goal. Or, let us suppose that, with equal numbers and money, we conspired to enforce Hindu vegetarianism on the country. In either case, we would have then, not a conspiracy, but a joke. A successful conspiracy is one which is so in tune with the faith and aspirations of its day that it offers to men the fulfillment of the ideals of the age. It is an illusion to believe that dangerous or successful conspiracies represent no more than a small, hidden circle of diabolical men who are manipulating the world into ruin. Such groups often exist, but they only exist and succeed

because their plan and hope is closely tied to the public dream and the faith of the age. If the threat were only from small circles of hidden men, then our problem would be easy. Then, as Burton Blumert has observed, "if we only unmasked the conspiracy, all our problems would be solved, but if the trouble is in all of us, then we really are in trouble."

He is right: we really are in trouble. The Enlightenment dream, as Louis I. Bredvold pointed out in *The Brave New World of the Enlightenment*, has five basic tenets in its faith: 1) there is a rejection of the past and of history; man makes himself and his world, and the past is a hindrance; 2) there is a rejection of institutions and "customs," in particular, Christian institutions and standards; 3) evil is not in man but in his environment; 4) "by changing human institutions human nature itself will be born again"; and 5) those who should manage human affairs are the scientific planners, the educators, and the statesmen. These are the men who best represent the will of man in terms of man's potential and future.

Man today believes this with all his heart. All over the world, the reigning faith is in this democratic, humanistic faith in the scientifically guided order. The Communists affirm democracy and the ballot box: they hold elections even though there is no choice on the ballot. Men who have started private or Christian schools all too often subscribe to democracy to the point that they insist on giving teachers and parents a voice in a school which represents only their funds and planning; the result is democratic chaos or failure.

The myths of the Enlightenment infect all of us. In church, state, school, press, in every area, the myths are held with earnest faith and zealous endeavor. The conservative in most cases simply holds to an earlier version of the myth.

Recently, I heard a number of conservative candidates for a city school board speak, and almost all simply repeated the basic humanistic faith. Within the first few minutes, I jotted down these sentences: "The proper education can cure all our ills." "The right to vote is the most precious right man has won." "We need representation from every ethnic group in order to be just." "You can do without everything else in the world, but you can't do without an education." And so on.

If tomorrow the secrecy were stripped from all conspiracies, and their goals revealed, most people would merely say, "Well, isn't that what we all believe?" and go on with their daily lives.

A conspiracy has power to the degree that it speaks to the prevailing beliefs and hopes of the day. And our age, as a humanistic one, dedicated to "man's fulfillment" in a humanistic sense, is ripe for every conspiracy which promises to deliver on those dreams. Man believes that he can

make a new start, create a paradise on earth, without God and without regeneration. We have for some time been in process of revolution against Christianity, and we have been moving towards this "Great Community" of man. Our establishment, political and educational, represents the older phase of the revolution, and youth is in part in rebellion against the older phase of the revolution in favor of a faster fulfillment of the dream. The more radical the conspiracy, the greater its appeal, because it is then all the closer to the dream.

The basic myths of the day are so much a part of the age that most conservatives simply want to return to an earlier phase of humanism; they believe in statist schools, in the priority of politics to religion, economics, the family, and all things else.

But, meanwhile, some people are losing faith in the dream: they are *dropping out*. They are dropping out, because the humanistic dream has failed them. No new faith has taken its place. As a result, their attitude is one of total negation. They hate the dreamers of the dream, the men who make promises, and they hate the society and social order which surrounds them. As dropouts, whose faith is negation, their only action is to destroy, to burn, loot, kill, and bring down the old order.

There is thus a double revolution and conspiracy at work today. *First*, there is the humanistic revolution against the whole world of Christian order; this revolution is well entrenched and nearly successful. *Second*, there is the revolt against the new humanistic establishment by its own sons, who are bent on destroying everything in sight. This is a revolt within the revolution and against the revolution, and it is present in the Marxist states as well as in the West.

Thus, we are in trouble. As Arnold Rosin observed, in *The Age of Crisis* (1962), "Only dreamers believe there is a peaceful way out." Communism is dedicated to the total destruction of Christian order and the conquest of the Western and Eastern non-Marxist states. The democracies are steadily moving into dictatorships. The student generation is disillusioned with the whole of the present era and is readily led into hostile and destructive action. And the economic crisis is steadily pushing the world towards a total monetary collapse.

Our crisis goes deeper than a circle of conspirators. The conspirators themselves are creations of our faith, called in part into being by our own apostasy. When men forsake God's law order, they must inescapably resort to a man-made order, and this is what men have done. The answer is not simply to unmask the conspirators but to unmask ourselves, to know that we are sinners in rebellion against God and His law order. Ours is a total problem, a religious problem. It cannot be solved on any other level.

It is thus distressing to see a man who denounces Marx turn then to Emerson and write glowingly of him: he has not gone far from Marx! After all, before Marx, Emerson had renounced Christianity: he was a high-level leader of the Secret Six conspiracy which worked to bring about the Civil War and financed John Brown. Members of the Secret Six helped Horace Mann bring in the state-school system. One of Emerson's closest associates and a top Six leader, Thomas Wentworth Higginson, founded the League for Industrial Democracy and the Intercollegiate Society of Socialists. The distance between Marx, Comte, Emerson, Stalin, Whitman, Hitler, F. D. Roosevelt, John Dewey, and others is a short one: they were all humanists who offered variations of a humanistic dream.

Their dreams and their world are under God's judgment and shall perish. If we are not to perish with them, we must move in terms of another order and rebuild in terms of it. The duties are ours; the results are in God's hands.

85

MORE ON CONSPIRACY THINKING

Chalcedon Report No. 45, May 1, 1969

As was pointed out in our last report, working conspiracies are more than a small circle of hidden men. The conspiratorial men are there, but they are able to work successfully because they bring to focus the basic trends of their day.

As a classic example of a conspirator who was also the man who brought to focus the currents of his age we cited Ralph Waldo Emerson. Ralph Waldo Emerson was a member of the "Secret Six," a powerful group of men who conspired to bring about Civil War, and financed John Brown, a hoodlum pretending to be a religious prophet, to incite that war. The men of the Secret Six were "no muttering little clique of nonentities." They were Theodore Parker, Dr. Samuel Gridley Howe, Gerrit Smith, Thomas Wentworth Higginson, George Luther Stearns, and Franklin Benjamin Sanborn. The second echelon, or second six, included Emerson, Henry David Thoreau, John Murray Forbes, Thaddeus Hyatt, and, briefly, Amos A. Lawrence (see J. C. Furnas, *The Road to Harpers Ferry* [New York, NY: William Sloane Associates, 1959]). Earlier, some of these men had worked to bring about state control of education. Higginson, who had been a zealous supporter of Horace Mann, and of course of John Brown (Higginson once wrote Brown, "I am always ready to invest money in treason," but regretted he was out of funds at the moment), lived long enough to join Clarence S. Darrow, Jack London, Upton Sinclair, and others in issuing the September 12, 1905, "call" which started the Intercollegiate Socialist Society! Are you interested in conspiracies? Then why "patronize" foreign groups? Emerson and his circle accomplished as much in American history as any!

When I was a university student, one of my professors was a brilliant but unstable man who was romantically inclined towards anything

subversive. The list of subversive "front" organizations which carried his name on their letterheads was over a page long. He was a nudist, a champion of every rebellious cause, *and* a great admirer of Emerson. Emerson, he declared, was America's great social revolutionary leader. He led the way in denouncing Christianity and shifting issues from a theological to a sociological orientation. He replaced communion with God with communion with one's own soul. He shifted the interest of Unitarianism from church reform to social reform. After Emerson, American society lost its orientation to the Kingdom of God and moved towards the Kingdom of Man. And, most of all, Emerson made his revolution popular because he restated all the old truisms of Puritan morality in a humanistic framework. People could now read Emerson's replay of good, old-fashioned Christian moralisms without any tie to the triune God: it was now good humanism, ready to give man a moral glow without God. With Emerson, the revolution became respectable.

All this is true, too true. Emerson shifted society from a God-centered to a man-centered orientation, from the conversion of men by God's grace to the conversion of the state and society by laws. But Emerson was only able to succeed in this task because the older, God-centered orientation had lost its vigor and vitality, and a creeping humanism had already infected much of American life. Emerson and the Secret Six were thus logical developments of American intellectual history. Just as the earlier tradition had its evangelical fervor, its movements to establish schools, seminaries, and missionary societies, so the new tradition had a like evangelical fervor to change the social order by statist action. As a result, it organized to promote that action.

Let us suppose, now, that we, stepping back in time, uncovered and exposed the conspiratorial work of the Secret Six. What would have happened? Some would have been alerted and forewarned, but as many others would have hailed Emerson and his associates as forward-looking and thinking men and mailed their checks to indicate their support.

Our present-day conspiracies have been exposed again and again and again. If people do not know, it is because they do not want to know. As religious humanists, the people of today are far more congenial to socialism in its every form than they are to Biblical faith. The Bible today is accepted by many only if they can reinterpret it in terms of their humanistic presuppositions. At the root of our impotence in stemming the present tide of evil is a spiritual impotence.

Under normal circumstances, a political revolution is long preceded by a moral revolution. Before the Red Reign of Terror in Hungary in 1918 and 1919, there was a moral collapse. The sense of property, for example,

had eroded, and soldiers were casually seizing what they wanted from their own people. From such a working attitude, it was a short step to a theoretical and political faith which said, "Now that there is a republic, everything belongs to everybody." As Cecile Tormay, an eyewitness, reported, "well-to-do farmers go with their carts to the manors to carry off other people's property." These farmers were not communists, but they made communism possible. The general moral collapse meant that law in its historic Christian sense had at least temporarily disappeared.

Let us turn to the present. Man today is creating a world ruled by violence because of his false premises. Consider the Harvard faculty statement of April 1969, which read in part, "As members of a community committed to rationality and freedom, we also deplore the entry of the police into any university. Some of us believe the decision to use force to vacate the building was wrong. Some of us believe it was unwise. Some of us consider it unavoidable though regrettable" ("Harvard Faculty Rebukes Both Sides," *Los Angeles Times*, April 13, 1969, p. 1). This is clearly a schizophrenic view of man. The whole man goes to Harvard, with his reason as well as his will to violence. To assume at any point or in any area of life that one is coping only with a fragment of man is a dangerous illusion. But the humanist dream of rational man leads to a progressive inability to cope with reality. Like the Marxist dreamers, the liberal humanists will turn to total terror and violence to cope with the monsters they unleash. From the Christian perspective, man at every point is the whole man, and unredeemed man is a sinner whose reason and every other aspect is governed by violence and hatred against God and His law order. Man's only freedom is under law; his only possible power and liberty are limited liberty and limited power. At every point, we deal with man's reason, man's love, man's violence, man's total being, and to assume that a particular sphere has a monopoly on reason is to neglect the whole man and find to one's destruction that man is more than reason.

Because of the university's anarchistic concepts of reason and freedom, it cannot cope with lawless man except schizophrenically, by finally abandoning reason in favor of violence. Cornell's pathetic incompetence in coping with revolutionary students who gave the university only three hours to live ended in a surrender. When the liberal god, reason, fails, another humanistic god, man's revolutionary violence, takes over. Violence is the order of the day. The only question is: who will exercise it, the establishment or the rebels? Neither has any alternative to violence, since both have abandoned transcendental law, *God's law*. The new god is man, and, in the war of gods, the rational man-god loses to the violent man-god.

Concerning the new god, listen to Ann Landers (*Los Angeles Herald-Examiner*, April 24, 1969, p. C5):

> Dear Ann Landers: Your cavalier treatment of the question from "that nut" who asked if it was true that God is a Catholic, a Negro and a Democrat, was, in my opinion, undeserved.
>
> You should have told the inquirer that God is indeed a Catholic, a Negro and a Democrat. He is also a Hindu, a Jew, a Protestant, Chinese, Japanese and Indian — a Republican, a Socialist and an Independent. He speaks Spanish, Portuguese, Swahili, Russian, German, French, Italian and Thai. God is a priest, a rabbi, a minister, a merchant, a miner, a farmer, a truck driver, a physician, a lawyer, an architect, an engineer, a musician, a bootblack and a bank president. He is Everyman.
>
> *One Who Reads Often*
>
> Dear One: I'm pleased that you read me often. I wish you'd write often. Thanks for a superb letter.

Most people find this very beautiful. As humanists, they worship his new god, "Everyman," and deny the triune God of Scripture. As a result, they believe in a totally man-made order, in the Kingdom of Man. And Fabianism and Marxism are classic examples of the Kingdom of Man. Exposing their conspirators means also exposing the seeds of humanism in modern man's heart. Modern man is not greatly concerned about the conspiracy. After all, he is a part of it. If the threat is only from a small circle of hidden men (and such circles did and do exist, before and after Emerson), then, to quote Burton Blumert again, "If we only unmask the conspiracy, all our problems would be solved, but if the trouble is in all of us, then we really are in trouble."

Well, we really are in trouble. And our problem is educational, political, economic, scientific, and much, much more. Above all, it is religious. If God be God, then serve Him. But if man is your god, then this is your revolution, mister, and you are a real "soul brother."

86

STILL MORE ON CONSPIRACY THINKING

Chalcedon Report No. 47, July 1, 1969

In reports 44 and 45, we discussed the fact of working conspiracies as expressions of a moral and spiritual failure in a people. Wherever there is a decline and shift in the basic faith of a culture, there various conspiratorial groups can and do develop the implications of the changing standards into a new social order.

The case of Emerson and the "Secret Six" was cited, as significant a group as any in American history. Certain facts characterized this group: They were Unitarians; they hated the old New England Calvinism and its social order, and they hated the newer Calvinism of the South; their answers to man's problems were statist and sociological not Christian and theological. The responsibility of these men was very real: they wanted armed conflict as the means of changing the Union and the entire social order.

But, lest we make the mistake of seeing the South only as a victim, let us remember that the South succumbed to the tactics because it too was in moral and spiritual decline. A generation earlier, every Southern state save South Carolina had been against slavery; the one question had been, what to do with the slaves after liberation. After all, only a very small minority of Southerners owned slaves, and the others were especially hostile to the institution of slavery. Why, then, did the South allow itself to be pushed into a stand alien to its best interests? Why did the Southern states secede when its best men opposed secession? The Senate debates of the era reveal the radical Unitarian self-righteousness of Sumner, but they also reveal the failure of the Southerners (except Andrew Johnson) to do more than react: they too often lacked a moral perspective to assess their situation. When South Carolina seceded and proclaimed itself a sovereign and independent nation, a very prominent citizen of Charleston,

James Louis Petigru, said sadly: "It won't work. South Carolina is too small for a nation and too large for a lunatic asylum."

The "Reconstruction" which followed the war was a vicious and unconstitutional order, and E. Merton Coulter's *The South During Reconstruction, 1865–1877* (a book disliked by our liberals today), is a good account of those ugly years. The liberals, in their moral bankruptcy, try to justify Reconstruction, and the conservatives condemn it. Both tend to overlook the fact that Reconstruction was first applied by the Confederacy to Tennessee at the beginning of the war, and with all the ugliness which later marked, over a longer span of time, the Southern Reconstruction. Neither one justifies the other. Both indicate the moral climate of the day. A change in the religious and moral climate had made both possible.

Ideas not only have consequences, they have roots. The roots of ideas that govern an age are deeply imbedded in the faith of that age.

To cite another example, in recent years the U.S. Supreme Court has radically altered the Constitution by legislative interpretations. Certainly, the judges have exceeded their authority, but their actions have deep roots in the popular mind. Recently, one of our *Chalcedon Report* family reported a statement made in Southern California, by a teacher of a large, ultra-fundamentalistic women's Bible class: "Human needs come before God's law." She was almost alone in her protest. If fundamentalist Bible teachers hold this position, need we be surprised that the Supreme Court holds that human needs come before man's law? Remember, the Constitution forbad the use of militia, i.e., drafted men, for any purposes save (1) to repel invasion, (2) to suppress insurrection, and (3) to enforce the laws of the Union. President Wilson set this aside, and the Court backed him. Two world wars, the Korean War, and the Vietnam War are clearly illegal in terms of Article 1, Section 8, Pararaph 6. If this provision of the Constitution is bad, it should be amended, but, if it is not (and I believe it to be one of the best safeguards of the Constitution), then why not work to reestablish it? If we let it stand as a dead letter, then nothing in the Constitution can stand against "need" and expediency.

Because there is now no sense of, or respect for, higher law, God's law, how can men be expected to respect man's law? A generation which treats God's law-word lightly will most certainly treat man's law even more lightly.

The roots of our problem, and our vulnerability to subversion, are in our moral and religious decay. Nothing is more foolish than the attempt by many to say that only a small minority of people are involved in the violence and disorder of our day, and that "the silent majority" is against

all this disorder. The reality is otherwise. Some polls show very happy results: almost everyone is against higher taxes, violence, riots, etc.; well, everyone, or almost everyone, may be against sin, but they are still sinners. Most people, as one legislator has remarked, ask for lower taxes in theory, but in practice call for measure after measure which will only raise taxes.

The fact is that most colleges see radical students voted into student body offices. The fact is that, according to a variety of authorities, from one-third to two-thirds of all college students experiment with drugs and narcotics. The fact is that, with each year, our situation grows worse, and even now high school students reveal a greater degree of lawlessness than do college students. Moreover, it is feared that soon junior high schools will reveal still worse anarchy and contempt of law. The moral collapse grows deeper yearly.

Are the big cities the only trouble spots? Recently, *Life* called attention to the problem at Fort Bragg, California, where perhaps three out of four high-school students were on narcotics. And a recent news note stated that, in Greenland, 6,191 out of its 40,000 inhabitants contracted gonorrhea *last year alone*. The moral collapse is worldwide, on every side of the Iron and Bamboo curtains.

Everywhere, the sources of legitimacy, of the right to govern and command, are under challenge and attack. The ideas of legitimacy and authority are basically religious ideas. When the faith behind the idea is gone, the idea is soon gone. Today, the orthodox Christian faith which undergirded our doctrines of authority is being fast replaced with humanism, the religion of humanity, and, as a result, the old authority is rapidly disappearing. It cannot be preserved by a rootless conservatism which wants to preserve the fruits without the roots. Every rootless tree is soon dead. The result is lawlessness, anarchy, and violence.

But the humanism which is replacing orthodox Christianity is unable to formulate a doctrine of authority which can give order and stability to society. Recently, the head of a major university, shown on television addressing a convocation, deplored the use of force on his campus by both police and students. The university, he said, is a place for reason, and coercion has no place in the academic community. Everyone applauded; in fact, it was a standing ovation at this point. No place for coercion? Today, taxes are basic to "private" and state colleges and universities. (Private universities and colleges are *virtually all* heavily subsidized by federal funds.) Taxes represent an aspect of coercion; without this coercion, the schools would soon close. Compulsory education into the teens in every state is a form of coercion, as is testing. Without police protection

around the borders of our colleges and universities, the existence of these schools would soon cease.

Because the humanist has no valid doctrine of authority, he creates a world of anarchy and coercion and soon must invoke total coercion as his only answer. Marxism proclaimed a world without tyranny, without oppression, and without coercion (not even a state, finally), and it instituted the world's most oppressive coercion. Its doctrine was pure reason, and the inevitability of those forces established by pure reason, but it made brutal coercion inevitable, because man is not pure reason but rather a sinner who needs not only grace but God's law-order. *At every point, man is and must be under God's law order, and he is either under it by grace or by judgment*. To dream of a domain of reason removed from authority and coercion is to be living in terms of an illusion. The whole man meets us at every point, whether in the academy, the marketplace, the church, or the street, and to reckon without that reality is to court suicide.

But we are asking for trouble. We are denying doctrines of responsibility. Dr. Efren E. Ramirez, M.D., in *Science Digest* ("Drug Addiction is Not Physiologic," May 1969), states that the typical drug addict "has a weak sense of responsibility, little commitment to anyone or anything. His life is dismally disorganized and he can't seem to learn from his failures. He shows poor motivation to be cured, and the current belief that addiction is physiologic just gives the drug addict another excuse for saying, 'I can't help myself.'" This is not only a good description of the addict but of most people in varying degrees. In varying degrees, all, like the addict, want to blame their problems on someone else, their biology, their inheritance, the capitalistic system, the leftist conspiracy, and so on. There may be elements of truth in some of these things, but the basic problem is man's moral and religious failure.

No addict cures himself with excuses, or by documenting his problem. No society heals itself of subversion by blaming anyone or by documenting its problems, but only by changing its ways. Our revolution today is everyman's revolution; in country after country, the people are voting in favor of it, at the ballot box and in their everyday lives. The world's vote is for man and revolution, not for Christ and God's law-order. People are getting what they asked for. And, in the sight of God, they have no right to complain at what they shall get. And, brother, they *will* get it. By the way, according to the daily papers, they are already beginning to get it.

87

ORIGINAL SIN

Chalcedon Report No. 149, January 1978

The essence of original sin is its declaration of independence from God and its claim to autonomy (Gen. 3:5). Man denies all superior authority and declares that, as his own god and final court of appeal, he will decide or "know" what constitutes good and evil.

However, because man is a creature, his life is one of radical dependence, dependence on the physical world and air, on his family and friends, his social environment, on institutions and society, and much, much more, but, supremely, he is dependent upon the God who creates and orders all things. In particular, the family and marriage are strong areas of dependence and interdependence. For this reason, the family and marriage are savagely attacked by humanists, because they so eloquently witness to this fact. Modern philosophy has a long history of hostility to marriage and women, of which Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, and Sartre are only more conspicuous examples. Men may dominate their wives unjustly, but even in their sin they cannot hide from themselves their deep dependence upon them. As a result, sinful men have always either ridiculed marriage, or sought to suppress their natural dependence on their wives by an unwarranted domination to conceal their dependence and need.

In the Biblical sense, authority does not diminish dependence. The greater a person's authority, the greater his dependence upon all who are under that authority. The increase of human authority and power means an increase of dependence; the refusal of man to face that fact means tyranny. The dependence of a head of state on those around and under him is a very great one, whereas the dependence of a minor clerk on others is not as critical or extensive. Both the growth of civilization and of authority increase dependency and interdependency.

Humanism, however, has sought autonomy together with power and

authority, an impossible union for the creature. One aspect of this quest is the steady assault on women and marriage in the thought of ancient and modern humanism. How can a man safely assert his autonomy when he needs a woman as his helpmeet? One way of "resolving" this problem has been prostitution: the man "satisfies" a physical need without any responsibility; promiscuity has the same appeal. It meets the need for autonomy, which, practically, means irresponsibility. The prostitute and the promiscuous girl or woman seek the same goal, a sense of power in exploiting a person without any responsibility towards that person. Another "resolution" has been to turn marriage into an arena for the fiat will of man without allowing the woman any voice or authority.

First, man declared himself autonomous from God and man. *Second*, he declared that the universe is autonomous from God also and represents merely the blind product of evolutionary chance. This view made autonomy a constituent and basic aspect of reality. Newtonian science began the enthronement of a cosmos on its own. Later, the very idea of a first cause, long held as a limiting concept, was dropped. The universe needs no cause in the newer view: it is itself whatever cause may be. *Third*, this doctrine of cosmic autonomy began to affect all men, not philosophers only. It became the doctrine of revolution, and, finally, the doctrine of women's rights, children's rights, homosexual rights, and more. Every segment of society began to claim "rights" divorced from all responsibility and from God's law.

The philosophy of humanism came home to the bedroom; original sin, with its claim to total autonomy, became the justification for every group and class in its revolt against all moral authority.

Thus, the various "rights" movements represent no new social order: they are humanism come to flower. Some of them call attention to legitimate claims and to actual wrongs; they fail to see that these are the products of the very humanism they themselves are embracing. Modern man has been irresponsible; all that the liberation movements usually say is, we too want the privilege or irresponsibility.

The idea of autonomy begins with the revolution of irresponsibility from God; it ends with a world of warring and irresponsible peoples, each of whom is god in his own eyes and seeks his or her own advantage in contempt of all others. Humanism becomes logically the philosophy of a well-educated prostitute, who has declared: "I don't believe in having a relationship with expectations and requirements . . . Anything that breaks down inhibitions is good . . . I've experienced myself as infinite, and as God, and as the universe" (Peter Whittaker, *The American Way of Sex* [New York, NY: Putnam, 1974], pp. 147, 153, 156). Not surprisingly,

best-selling books now regularly promote, in fiction and nonfiction, this whorish faith of looking after number one, and number one is not God but the individual. A world of millions of number ones is a world of lawlessness and total warfare.

And why should not women and children buy this faith when schools, pulpits, politicians, courts, films, and television promote it? Autonomous man is the man of the fall. He will only change when he is regenerated by the power of God through Christ. Either every man is king, or Christ is king. These are the two logical alternatives. The end result of autonomy is hell, the realm of total isolation and of no communication, where every person is his own universe, and man is in everlasting self-communion; the borders of his life are forever closed to God and to other men. The end result of the life of faith in God and obedience to Christ the King is full communion with God and man, the perfection of interdependence and love.

The borders of the lives of men and nations are closing, and all hell rejoices as more men embrace the prisonhouse of autonomy. But we need not "fear, though the earth be removed, and though the mountains be carried into the midst of the sea" (Ps. 46:2). Not even the gates of hell can stand against our conquering King (Matt. 16:18). This is a time of decay and defeat for the enemy, but a time of opportunity and conquest for us through Christ our King.

88

THE RIGHT TO RAPE AND MURDER?

Chalcedon Report No. 375, October 1996

For some generations now, there has been a major movement to separate law and morality. The two were long seen as essentially alike, derived from the triune God and inseparable. Law and morality were alike given by God and expressions of His nature.

The first major departure from this came with the Marquis de Sade, who expressed openly what his generation believed, namely, that supernatural law, i.e., all law derived from God, was evil because it was against nature. Only what expressed man's fallen and natural being was valid law. Hence, for Sade, the only crime was Christianity; abortion, murder, rape, homosexuality, bestiality, incest, theft, all such moral offenses, were really natural acts and had to be permitted.

The direction of our courts today is Sadean. We have seen abortion and homosexuality made legal, euthanasia in process of becoming so, and groups now promoting man-boy love, bestiality, and other perversions. (I was told of one person who said, "What is wrong with bestiality if it is *my* dog?")

Major religious groups, against the plain words of Scripture, now oppose capital punishment. We are told by many that morality is purely a matter of personal values, not of universally valid laws. Victims of crimes are sometimes treated with less respect than the criminals.

Why the surprise? We have denied God as our Lawgiver. Emile Durkheim's thesis that the criminal might be an evolutionary pioneer, exploring a new way of "moral" behavior, has entered deeply into our culture.

Meanwhile, we treat God and His law gingerly, and with an evolutionary point of view. Supposedly the Bible represents some lower level of morality! And we are bewildered that our youth, products of anti-Christian schooling and popular culture, are more and more simply the

new barbarians in the streets, dismantling civilization at every turn. We forget that our state schools and our courts of law did the pioneering work, and our youth are simply following their direction.

Before Hitler there came legal positivism in Germany which reduced law to the will of the state and morality to myth. The first victim of tyranny (rule without God) is morality, and our present legal trend is towards the radical separation of Biblical law and morality from the laws of the modern state. Freedom has never existed apart from a Biblical faith, and, in waging a war against Biblical law and morality, the modern state and its courts are working to abolish freedom.

In the 1960s, in Palo Alto, California, I heard a state school teacher insist that, in the modern world, freedom is obsolete because a scientific society cannot exist with the random freedom of individuals. She was more honest than most who use the language of liberty to work against it.

The antinomianism of the churches feeds this destruction of law and morality. Having rejected God's law, they have only state law. In the stead of morality, they offer pious gush. 1 Peter 4:17 tells us that "judgment must begin at the house of God." Have these antinomian churches no fear of God?

If we fail to be faithful, God will raise up other peoples to carry on His triumphant conquest of the nations. If we are ashamed of our Lord and of the Scriptures, God will be ashamed of us. "Choose you this day whom ye will serve" (Josh. 24:15).

89

ACCIDENTAL MAN

Chalcedon Report No. 346, May 1994

A change of culture means a change of language. The languages of Christendom have been more shaped by the Bible than people realize. Language reveals how we think, or do not think. One can see, in the dramatic changes in the language of youth from 1900 to the 1990s, how the faith and culture of the United States has been altered.

Western languages, well into the twentieth century, reflected also the Greco-Roman heritage. The vocabulary of thought was often classical, or an attempted fusion of the Christian and the classical. In fact, there is a philosophy of language, and the discipline has a variety of emphases. What is language in essence, and what does grammar tell us about thinking? These and like questions are not our concern here, other than to point out the complexity of the subject.

A related subject is vocabulary. Our vocabulary reveals the perimeters, the boundaries, of our mind and of our thinking. Man has always been speaking man, from Eden to the present, never the primitive grunter of evolutionary fiction. However much some youth today seem to be imitating the fictional grunters, they remain human beings, persons, albeit sinful ones.

The old vocabulary of Christendom spoke of *substance* and *accident*. *Substance* (Latin *sub* plus *stare*, and the Greek *hypo* plus *stasis*, to stand under) refers to the basic reality in, under, or behind things. The *accident* of things is that which changes, is on the surface. It is related to our idea of the *accidental*. The word comes from the Latin *accidens*, *accidere*, to happen, chance, a befalling, any fortuitous or nonessential property. The idea of *chance* was important in Greek thought; in Christian thought the word accident came to mean nonessential. Aquinas summarized it clearly in two statements: "That which is outside the substance of a thing,

and yet is belonging to the thing, is called an accident of it." Again, an accident is, "That whose nature is to exist in another." The language of substance and accident was very important to Western thought until the rise of Darwinism. What Darwin insisted on was the sole "reality" and the triumph of chance. All things developed out of nothing through chance. Now, the older scientific thinking did not even view *accidents* as chance. Under the influence of the Reformation view of predestination, even the *accidents* of things were aspects of a cosmic plan and purpose. They were not *substance*, but they were not chance. But with Darwin *substance* was leached out of the universe and replaced with the omnipresence of chance. It was at this point that much criticism was leveled against Darwin. The world was ready to accept evolution as against God, but Darwin's theory, despite a slight bow to "design," actually stressed chance variations. Thomas Huxley tried to defend Darwin at this point, declaring,

> But probably the best answer to those who talk of Darwinism meaning the reign of "chance," is to ask them what they themselves understand by "chance?" Do they believe that anything in this universe happens without reason or without cause? Do they really conceive that any event has no cause, and could not have been predicted by any one who had a sufficient insight into the order of Nature? If they do, it is they who are the inheritors of antique superstition and ignorance, and whose minds have never been illumined by a ray of scientific thought. The one act of faith in the convert to science, is validity in all times and under all circumstances, of the law of causation. This confession is an act of faith, because by the nature of the case, the truth of such propositions is not susceptible of proof. But such faith is not blind, but reasonable; because it is invariably confirmed by experience, and constitutes the sole trustworthy foundation for all action. (Thomas Huxley, "On the Reception of the 'Origin of Species,'" in Francis Darwin, ed., *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, vol. 1 [New York, NY: Basic Books, 1959], p. 553)

Huxley knew better. He used a strategy commonplace to scientists since then of accusing critics of superstition and ignorance. With great condescension, the critic is treated as a man too ignorant to know what he is criticizing and as one who is painfully uncomprehending. The plain fact was that chance was basic to Darwin's perspective and to evolution.

It still is. Hudson Hoagland, the executive director of the Worcester Foundation for Experimental Biology, wrote that there are "only two answers to the question of how life began. It must either have risen spontaneously from nonliving material or have been created by supernatural means." For Hoagland, the second alternative means that "science has nothing to contribute, since the question cannot be resolved by the

operational approaches of science" (Hudson Hoagland, "The Elements of Life," in Lyman Bryson, ed., *An Outline of Man's Knowledge of the Modern World* [Garden City, NY: Nelson Doubleday, 1960], p. 152). For Hoagland, chance can explain everything (ibid., pp. 152–153). For him, "Evolution is creative, but its creativity is independent of purpose or design" (ibid., p. 139).

R. W. Gerard, M.S., then of the University of Michigan, held that men's morals are accidents of his time and place (ibid., pp. 73–89). This is a logical conclusion. The universe and all things within it have been stripped of substance. The existence of God is more than denied: it is dismissed as an unscientific and irrelevant question. Is it any wonder that all that remains of man is *accidental man*? He is not a being created in the image of God (Gen. 1:28–31). Rather, he is a struggling product of evolution, lacking in definition by substance. He is a product of *chance*.

Emile Durkheim (1858–1917), in his *Rules of Sociological Method* (1895), viewed criminals as evolutionary pioneers, exploring by their activities the next step in the evolution of man. Man for Durkheim had no fixed nature nor morality. He was an *accident* of an evolutionary process, and his accidental nature would change and develop with time. For those in this tradition, the criminal is an interesting figure and an important one. It was altogether logical for Jean-Paul Sartre to take a homosexual criminal and hail him as *Saint Genet: Actor and Martyr* (1963). Precisely because for Sartre and Genet, God was denied, the new idea of the sacred was transferred to evil. The dedication to pure evil made Genet sacred in Sartre's eyes (ibid., pp. 215–216, 261). God having been denied, there is no longer any true substance in all the universe. The accidental man, by his total dedication to an anti-God faith, affirms thereby the validity of the *accident* only, and the *accident* without *substance* has no point of reference and no meaning. Time in this framework has no meaning. "Sacred time is cyclical: it is the time of Eternal Recurrence" (ibid., p. 130). The sacred has thus become the meaningless, the evil, not the good. This is the triumph of the *accident*, and hence of accidental man.

Let us consider the meaning of this *pure* evil, this triumph of the *accident* over *substance*. One of the characteristics of life in the Western world since at least 1960 has been the rise of mindless crime. Drive-by shootings, the random killing of innocent people, the ready indulgence and torture of people who have done nothing, such things are examples of mindless crime, uncaused evil. Now, the Christian ethics has sought to further good for good's sake, not a self-serving virtue but one motivated by gratitude toward God for His goodness. Rather than a man-centered cause for self-promotion, Christian virtue is required to be goodness for

goodness' sake, virtue is required for virtue's sake. The Christian must not avoid murder, adultery, or theft out of fear of the consequence, but out of a love of God and His moral law, out of a love for virtue. Virginity and chastity are not to be adhered to out of a desire to gain a better spouse, a better reputation, or to avoid disease, but out of a regard for virginity and chastity as the true way of life, for virtue's sake, for the Lord's sake, because He requires it.

Now, evil seeks the same purity of dedication to evil. The purely professional criminal is in crime for the money, for profit. He has no desire to do more than steal or kill as necessary. The perpetrators of mindless crime *may* steal or kill, but their basic objective is evil. A young man who enjoyed seducing and then leaving girls who were virgins responded, when someone asked him why he went after some girls who had no special appeal. His response was, he wanted them because they were virgins. The appeal was evil for evil's sake; it was despoiling virtue. The accidental man hates the substantive life, and he wants to prove that it is a fraud by destroying it.

In an interview with Fareed Zakaria, managing editor of *Foreign Affairs*, Lee Kuan Yew, prime minister of Singapore, except for an interlude, from 1959 to 1990, when he allowed his deputy to succeed him, spoke of the change in the United States (and elsewhere) that had lessened his admiration and respect. "Westerners have abandoned an ethical basis for society, believing that all problems are solvable by a good government, which we in the East never believed possible" (Fareed Zakaria, "Culture is Destiny," *Foreign Affairs*, March–April 1994, p. 112).

Centuries ago, the East was wealthy and powerful, but certain ideas it held had evil consequences. Buddha's belief in ultimate nothingness was destructive of cultural strength and morality. In China, philosophy preceded Hume by many centuries in its epistemological skepticism. One philosopher questioned the real world; he held that it was difficult to say whether or not the "dream" world or the "waking" world was real. Such thinking meant cultural paralysis, because in its own way, it reduced humanity to the level of the accidental man.

As reported by the *Lofton Letter*,

> According to the George Barna Research Group, four out of 10 people who call themselves *evangelicals* don't believe there is such a thing as absolute truth. Says Barna, "It's pretty frightening." Of all U.S. adults, 71 percent reject the idea of *absolute truth*. (*Lofton Letter*, March 1994, p. 19)

To reject absolute truth is to reject Christianity. The only god possible in such a universe, and the only logical Christ, comes out of the cosmic

accident. God and Christ then, if existing, are simply struggling in a cosmic accident to gain some kind of relevance. There can then be no absolute god, no decree of predestination, and no substance to law and morality, nor to man. Because the Western world has become the realm of accidental man, it is in danger of becoming the realm of fading men and fading cultures and nations.

Accidental man is oblivious to all this. He believes God to be dead, and, because of this absurdity, he is himself dying.

90

"THE CRUCIFIXION OF THE GUILTY"

Chalcedon Report No. 178, June 1980

THE writer, Frank Harris (1856–1931), had a number of great passions which commanded his time and energies. One was a continuing desire to enslave women sexually; another was the right to insult and cut down men, especially all waiters. A third was his concern over what he called "The Crucifixion of the Guilty." In his prospectus on his biography of Oscar Wilde, he wrote in part, "The Crucifixion of the guilty is still more awe-inspiring than the crucifixion of the innocent. What do we know of innocence?" Life for Harris was the perpetual crucifixion of the guilty because they were more honest than the supposedly innocent. As a result, Harris was determined to be "honestly" guilty: in his often fictional autobiography, the impotent old man happily and romantically confessed to endless adulteries which were at best greatly romanticized and extensively fictional. Because he believed that Jesus was a guilty lecher like himself, he identified himself with Jesus, whom he believed to have been crucified by the same "hypocrites" who assailed Harris. As biographer Philippa Pullar states it, in *Frank Harris: A Biography* (1976), when Harris, at the age of seventy-one, married his mistress Nellie, "The belief that he was Jesus was by now so embedded that he recorded in the register that his mother's name was Mary Vernon, confused no doubt with Mary the Virgin" (pp. 395–396).

Frank Harris, editor, writer, and member of Parliament, was a noisy but minor figure in his day, but he did give focus more clearly than others to certain major strands of thought, one of which was the vindication of the guilty. With far more sophistication, Emile Durkheim had developed the same philosophy. Durkheim (1858–1917), in *The Rules of Sociological Method* (1895), saw crime as a normal part of society, because no society is exempt from it: "it is to affirm that it is a factor in public health,

an integral part of all healthy societies." The criminal is a necessary part of social evolution: his lawlessness may be social pioneering; it may indicate the next step in social development. "Crime is, then, necessary; it is bound up with the fundamental conditions of all social life, and by that very fact it is useful, because these conditions of which it is a part are themselves indispensable to the normal evolution of morality and law" (p. 70; 1938 ed.).

With such thinking, guilt began to appear as a social asset. True, the influence of Christian thought continued to weigh guilt as a liability, but "liberal" thought saw guilt as a cause to champion. About ten years ago, a student reported to me that a speaker had declared that it was the presence of lesbians in the women's liberation movement which made it a worthy cause; feminism in itself he saw as a middle-class matter and nothing to get excited about.

As Harris saw it, innocence is a myth. All men are guilty (Freud would have agreed), but not because of the Biblical doctrine of sin. Guilt was a product of social hostility by the social cowards against all free spirits. Hence, the crucifixion of the guilty.

Clearly, this concept has had a very powerful and pervasive influence on contemporary law. The protection of the guilty is a major cause, whereas the growing persecution of Christian schools and churches gets almost no attention from the press. The "rights" of parents are diminished, and the "rights" of the guilty are stressed and broadened. Going back at least to Lord Byron, literature has shown a morbid interest in the guilty, and an impassioned defense of all such.

It is a serious mistake to content ourselves with bewailing this doctrine of "the crucifixion of the guilty." It is a product of the loss of faith. If Nietzsche is right, and God is dead, then good and evil are both myths, and "the guilty" are wrongfully "crucified." Nietzsche, Freud, Dewey, Holmes, and others have acted as though God were dead. The same is true of the church: it has acted as though God were dead in relation to education, economics, politics, law, and more. As a result, the Word of God has been "dead" to these areas.

If Harris was right, then the so-called guilty are wrongfully "crucified," and the rightfully guilty are those who apply the outmoded Biblical doctrines of good and evil to man.

But God is not dead, and the world of Frank Harris, and the derelict churches, is becoming a growing nightmare. Unless men repent, the Lord who declares, "it is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail" (Luke 16:17), will have His time of judgment come upon us.

91

THE ARROGANCE OF EVIL

Chalcedon Report No. 179, July 1980

The police rarely have much to laugh about these days, but one of them did recently. A big and heavy-set purse snatcher grabbed my daughter Rebecca's handbag. Her instinctive reaction was to double up her fist and hit him in the stomach with all her might. Shocked, and almost doubled-up by the unexpected pain, the thief immediately screamed for the police! One was unexpectedly near, and hence his laughter, as he saw the thief, with my daughter's handbag on his shoulder, demanding protection from the "assault"!

No doubt the thief was outraged at what the world is coming to: *first*, civilian "brutality," i.e., resistance to theft, and, *second*, police "brutality," an arrest!

This arrogance of evil should not surprise us. It is a lesson well learned from much of the press, from many newscasters, and from some judges. While there are many fine and conscientious judges on the bench, we have all too many who are very protective of criminal rights, and indifferent to the courtroom harassment of police and witnesses.

The result is the growing arrogance of evil. Thus, more than a few cases exist where homosexuals are demanding that churches and Christian schools be denied the right to pass moral judgment on them, or to refuse them employment. Such demands ask for the "right" to deny freedom of judgment and action to all who disagree with them. When law concerns itself with "human rights" rather than God's law, it soon seeks to defend all human practices in the name of man's freedom or autonomy from God's law.

We then have not only the arrogance of evil but the new Phariseeism, the Phariseeism of evil. The reasoning behind it is simple: there is no God, and hence God's law is obsolete and evil. All human practices are

therefore to be permitted. The cause of freedom is best represented by those who practice the once-condemned things. Therefore, the true heroes and social pioneers are the practitioners of homosexuality, bestiality, and incest. This, then, makes them the new moral elite.

An example of this sense of a new moral destiny is Hefner, of *Playboy*. His Phariseeism is notable: he is filled with a sense of self-righteousness, and a feeling that the trivia of his mind and life are important. A few years ago, there were one or more *Playboy* television shows. They were largely empty of content other than a parade of self-importance and self-righteousness.

In this they mirrored our times, and were somewhat in advance of it. The watchwords of the new consciousness from the 1960s on have been, "Do your own thing," "Find yourself," and "I want to be ME." This quest for self-realization means a contempt for others, for the family, for unborn babies, and for God's law. Not surprisingly, even a purse snatcher's reaction to resistance is to demand police help: his "right" to self-fulfillment has been denied.

Men approach the church with the same self-centered and pharisaic concern. It was with some dismay that I came to realize that for many people involved in some of the recent church divisions and formations of new church bodies, the real problem with the "old" church was not wrong belief but too much belief. These people want no commitment either to modernism or to orthodoxy: they want a church which does not "rock the boat" nor make any moral and theological demands of them. Instead of representing a revival of faith, too many represent a preference for a studied lukewarmness. Modernism and orthodoxy are zealous faiths; the lukewarm want neither. Instead, with the new Phariseeism, they want the right to be indifferent and lukewarm in the name of Christ. Our Lord makes it clear in Revelation 3:16–17 that it is the lukewarm who have a pharisaic self-righteousness and confidence.

All self-righteousness has self-defined moral goals. George Sarton, in *The History of Science and the New Humanism* (1931), said that survival and hope require that "we must anchor ourselves to some great purpose" (p. 190). All this sounds noble, but, when the "great purpose" is self-defined, we identify our thinking and purpose with greatness and true morality. Wherever men define the "great purpose" apart from God's declared law-word, they quickly fall into self-righteousness and Phariseeism. The definition of law and purpose is not a right nor a prerogative of man, but of God only.

> To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them. (Isa. 8:20)

92

THE "RIGHT TO PRIVACY" AND THE "RIGHT" TO SIN

Chalcedon Report No. 230, September 1984

In an excellent study, Professor Charles Rice analyzes *Legalizing Homosexual Conduct: The Role of the Supreme Court in the Gay Rights Movement* (Cumberland, VA: Center for Judicial Studies). The U.S. Supreme Court has been using the Bill of Rights to accomplish what it was designed to prevent by reading, as Justice Douglas insisted, "penumbras, formed by emanations," into its guarantees. Among other things, these "penumbras" and "emanations" limit the freedom of Christians while increasing that of homosexuals.

In everyday thought, "the right of privacy" has become the freedom to sin. Although in every other area, federal power has become more intrusive into the life of the churches, all kinds of schools, the family, business, and more, the courts have been drawing a strict wall of separation and protection around sin.

Ideas formulated at the top have a habit of percolating into the streets, closets, and bedrooms. As Richard Weaver insisted, ideas have consequences.

To illustrate: An attractive young woman, in her early twenties, was in bed with her lover when her husband came home unexpectedly. Since the couple was engaged in something other than spiritual exercises, the angry husband, made stronger by righteous wrath, beat up on the adulterer and threw him out of the house, tossing his clothes after him.

Meanwhile, the young wife called the police. When they arrived, she demanded that her husband be arrested, on the ground that he had violated her "right to privacy." The laughing policeman told her that no such charge could be filed, and they left, to her indignation. What, she asked her sister later, is this world coming to?

Strange or unusual? No. The high priests of humanism, the justices of the U.S. Supreme Court, are making new laws based upon their own religion, humanism. The angry young wife was simply anticipating the logical development of her "right to privacy."

This same "right" is invoked to defend abortion, homosexuality, and more. It is the key point in the breaching of the Bill of Rights to replace it with the freedom for men to sin, while the federal government assumes vast controls over every other area of life.

The "right to privacy" is thus the basic premise of the freedom to sin, and of our growing totalitarianism. For the substantive freedoms of the Bill of Rights, the degenerative freedom to disrupt the family and sexual order has been substituted.

93

THE WAR AGAINST CHASTITY

Chalcedon Report No. 346, May 1994

In various parts of the United States, as local school districts have attempted to include materials in the curriculum stressing chastity, legal battles have ensued, and, usually, such teaching has been banned. Some cases are on appeal.

It is urgently important to understand what is at stake. Such teaching is uniformly called a violation of the First Amendment and an establishment of religion, namely, Christianity. The First Amendment was added to the Constitution at the request of the clergy to prevent the state establishment of any particular church. It is now used to eliminate Christianity from the public life.

The opponents of the teaching of chastity see it as religious teaching, or, more accurately, Biblical teaching, because chastity goes against "nature." It is a restraint upon nature, which the Christian sees as fallen, and it calls for following God's law. The unregenerate natural man is to be converted by Christ's atonement, governed by the Holy Spirit, and guided by God's law-word. The old natural man is to be replaced by the new man in Christ. The fallen humanity of the old Adam must give way to the last Adam, Jesus Christ (1 Cor. 15:45–47).

We can thus speak of the religion of the fallen, natural man, or humanism. Man is good as he is, and what he needs is self-expression in every area of his life, including his sexuality. Restraints placed upon him are bad because they limit and inhibit his ability to attain self-realization. Whether we like it or not, for the courts, schools, and civil agencies, this humanism is their accepted religion. Without formally acknowledging it, our courts have made humanism the established religion. Never have our state schools and courts been more zealously religious than they are now, but their religion is humanism, naturalism. They speak with horror

of past persecutions by Christians while ever zealous against Christians.

Their premise is that the natural man should be free to express himself as sole lord over his life. This can mean abortion; it can mean homosexuality, bestiality, euthanasia, and more. Controls on man from the supernatural realm, from God and His Bible, are violations of man's freedom, for these people. Such people look forward to a new world order in which a world state and its law replace God, and in which man is free to do as he pleases.

The strange thing is that so many churchmen are unaware that a war is on, and it is being waged against them. Chastity is not a way of life for a fallen man. It is an aspect of the life of the redeemed. If a state is Christian, it will be supportive of chastity and more. If a state is humanistic, it will promote and support unchastity and immoralism in the name of freedom.

These are the alternatives. Two radically different religions are in conflict. Total war is being waged against Christianity. The war against chastity is simply one aspect of a conflict that is being fought in every area of life and thought.

This is not the kind of war that will cease tomorrow. The enemy wants the total obliteration of Christianity. Until Christians convert the enemy, exercise influence in all spheres of life and thought, and reestablish godly standards, the battle will continue.

The war against Christianity is apparent on all fronts, including within the church. The battle against teaching chastity is one aspect of the struggle.

94

FALSE ATONEMENTS

Chalcedon Report No. 363, October 1995

The Reverend Steve Schlissel, in a recent article in the *Chalcedon Report*, called attention to the relationship between pagan atonement sacrifices of innocent children and present-day abortion. The relationship is closer than people recognize. But the subject is dropping out of common knowledge because it does not conform to the modern views of paganism. Larousse's *World Mythology* (1965), edited by Pierre Grimal, has little to say about it. Sir James G. Frazer, in *The Golden Bough* (1922), had more to say at that earlier date. Most people know what they do on this matter from the Bible — the pagan Moloch worship with its sacrifices of children.

Such sacrifices have atonement and renewal as their purpose. Such an atonement for guilty men requires the blood of innocent victims, hence the widespread use in antiquity of little children, whom paganism held to be innocent.

The necessity of blood atonement has been a subject of history, mythology, and drama. Euripides wrote *Iphigenia in Aulis*, which in 1978 was again translated, this time by W. S. Merwin and George E. Dimock Jr. (published by Oxford), with a foreword by William Arrowsmith. This modern version is notable for its ignorance of the meaning of sacrifice and atonement.

The theme of the Iphigenia story is that, in order to war successfully against Troy, Iphigenia's father must atone for his royal family's sins by sacrificing her at the altar of the goddess. In retelling, the motives and outcome have been blurred by authors and by translators.

Dimock saw the play as showing us "how to be free of necessity" (p. 20). This is not explained. Did a sacrificial death provide freedom from guilt, or was this evaded? Since the subject of atonement is excluded from

literary criticism, the Iphigenia tale ends up a confused humanistic tragedy or near tragedy. Euripides held that the sacrifice to Artemis was mandatory. Iphigenia sees that, "It is hard to hold out against the inevitable . . . All these good things I can win by dying. Because of me, Greece will be free, and my name will blessed there." It is held that "this pure blood from the throat of a beautiful girl" will give the Greeks victory.

The issue was atonement. There was a belief that children, and innocent virgins, could by their shed blood make atonement. This is why, although historians avoid the subject, human sacrifices in great numbers were basic to Greece and to Rome, to the Aztecs and Mayas, and to other peoples. In northern Europe, ca. A.D. 800, it was with difficulty that Charlemagne put down human sacrifices. He succeeded when he forcibly baptized the tribes and told them that further sacrifices would incur the wrath of the Christian God. After that, such sacrifices were somewhat rare, and, in time, were blamed on the Jews by the covert pagans.

The Iphigenia tale was the subject of a play (1779 and after) by Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, *Iphigenia in Tauris*. His basic premise was, as Edward Dowden wrote, that "a human transgression . . . might be atoned for by human means." He saw the substitution of love and peace "as the true way of being Greek." Goethe substituted love and feeling for atonement. His comments on Iphigenia are in essence feministic. Iphigenia's reek of innocence: "The curse of others seized me." The "redemption" set forth in Goethe's *Faust* is here present: "A good word from a woman often can lead a noble man far onward." The excuse for sin is humanistic: "and as for his transgression, it was human!" Humanism prevails for Goethe: "We are taught by life." Love replaces sacrifice as the means of atonement. Goethe, the great humanist, set aside the atonement requirement to replace it with human emotion.

But man's being is God's creation. Every atom of man's body witnesses to the Creator, and the need for atonement is God-ordained and cries out in all man's being. If man rejects God's atonement through Jesus Christ, he will substitute his own forms thereof. In sadism, he lays his sins on other peoples to punish and even to kill them. In masochism, guilty man seeks self-atonement through self-punishment. Many utilize both means and are sadomasochists.

The twentieth century has become the bloodiest of all centuries as men have turned from Christ's atonement to their own bloody varieties of sadomasochism. We cannot escape the God-ordained orders of life which, among other things, require that man the sinner have atonement before he faces the righteous God of all justice.

We must not misunderstand theology. Because God is God, theology

is the fact of life, and atonement an inescapable fact. As Harold J. Berman showed in *Law and Revolution*, our Western legal system and our civilization rests on the doctrine of the atonement. Our abandonment of that doctrine is leading to the increasing collapse of our culture and our society. There can be no return to a viable civilization except by a return to the classical doctrine of the atonement, fully set forth by John Calvin. We have become the culture of death; our media, books, television, and films are brutal and bloody, because the way of life is foreign to us.

There is a critical need to restudy the Old Testament doctrine of the atonement and its totally essential link to the atonement by Christ. Christendom cannot be restored by pious feelings but only by the truth, by the atonement.

95

DOCTRINE OF SELECTIVE DEPRAVITY, PART I

Chalcedon Report No. 132, August 1976

To all practical intent, there are three basic doctrines of the nature of man, although numerous variations of each exists. The *first* is *the doctrine of man's natural goodness*. This is more often affirmed in theory than in fact. To affirm that man is naturally good means sometimes that man as he is needs no improving. Everything that is, some in more than one age have affirmed, is holy. Evil is a myth, and every person, thing, or act is holy. There is, then, no such thing as an evil person or an evil or perverted act. The logic of the doctrine tends to this position. Others, however, affirm the goodness of man but the evil of the environment, and the environment can be defined almost in any way possible. The problem then becomes this: if man is naturally good, why is he so readily prone to evil influences? The doctrine of the natural goodness of all men is more logical, but then no change or progress is necessary. A good humanity in a good environment means that all things as is are as they should be.

Humanism, however, has usually preferred a *second* doctrine, *the doctrine of selective depravity*, one of the most pernicious ideas ever propagated by man. According to the doctrine of selective depravity, most men are naturally good, but some men are diabolically evil. These depraved men have been variously defined in various eras: priests, pastors, communists, fascists, capitalists, bankers, the masses, the blacks, the whites, the Jews, Germans, Japanese, the Americans, and so on. The doctrine of selective depravity, whether in the hands of radicals, conservatives, or liberals, leads always to Phariseeism. Depravity is limited to a class or group. Instead of seeing the problem as sin, and sin as pandemic to all men in Adam, it sees sin as limited to a segment of humanity. Instead of fighting against sin, it calls upon us to fight against a particular group of men. This means a radically different plan of salvation than that which is

set forth in Scripture. Instead of Jesus Christ as the Savior of all men, of every race, color, and class, it sees one segment of humanity, the "good guys," as the world's hope. The problem, then, is to exorcise the "bad guys."

Because of the prevalence of the doctrine of selective depravity, the modern era, and especially the twentieth century, has become a time of especially bloody warfare, torture, and persecution. On all sides, men seek a solution by going after their scapegoats. The present hue and cry everywhere about "corrupt politicians" is an example of this idea of selective depravity. There is no reason to believe that the people are any better than their politicians, and they are probably not as good, but there is a widespread pharisaic moral self-satisfaction today in exposing the sins of politicians. The politicians themselves, of course, have often gained power by using the idea of selective depravity to damn a class or group and appeal thereby to the pharisaic greed and self-satisfaction of the electorate.

Marxism thrives on the doctrine of selective depravity. Having carried the doctrine to its logical conclusion, the Marxists find that every use of the idea favors their position and finally leaves them the winners.

The doctrine of selective depravity ensures conflict, not against sin, but between man and man, class and class. It has made humanism the most divisive creed ever to exist, and it leads to the isolation and "alienation" of man. In terms of this doctrine, no solutions are possible. A whole segment of mankind must be exterminated, if this doctrine be held, or at the very least brainwashed into submission. However, as new problems arise, a new group will be classified as the depraved class, because no other explanation for evil is possible.

The doctrine of selective depravity is basic to modern politics, education, sociology, and, too often, our religions. As long as this doctrine prevails, and it is deeply imbedded into modern man's being, no solutions are possible. In fact, every "solution" only aggravates the problem.

The *third* doctrine is the Biblical doctrine of *total depravity*. By total is meant that all men are involved in it, and that the total life of man is involved in his depravity. It does not mean that the totally depraved man is not capable of some good. It does mean that the depravity is total in its extent in all of mankind and in all of a man.

In such a situation, it will not do to limit depravity to a class, race, or group. All men in Adam have a common nature. The problem is thus not limited to some men, nor is the answer in any man. As St. Paul declares, in his great theological, social, and political statement, "There is none righteous, no, not one" (Rom. 3:10). The answer is in God incarnate,

Jesus Christ, who redeems man from his plight, gives him a new nature, and enables him to walk, not in the spirit of disobedience, but in the spirit of obedience to God and His law.

Man is removed from the bondage of his depravity into the status of a covenant man. Once a covenant-breaker, he now becomes a covenant-keeper. No longer an outlaw, he becomes God's law man. He is now on the road to dominion as God's dominion man.

There is thus no solution to our social crises as long as the humanistic doctrines of man's natural goodness, or of the selective depravity of man, prevail.

96

DOCTRINE OF SELECTIVE DEPRAVITY, PART 2

Chalcedon Report No. 133, September 1976

The doctrine of selective depravity is a doctrine of radical Phariseeism. By isolating depravity in a particular class, race, or group, it implicitly locates virtue in all others, particularly in the defining group. If evil is a national or racial trait, then membership in the other group, whether black, white, red or yellow, Anglo-Saxon, Arab, Japanese, or whatever it may be, constitutes virtue. All "facts" are collected to prove the point: we are the good guys, they are the bad guys. This is a very widespread and common practice, but it is no less evil and pharisaic for that.

(As a boy, I picked up an interesting form of this doctrine of selective depravity. My father went to Scotland for his advanced degrees and fell in love with the people and country. His Scottish friends kept me well supplied with books and magazines full of Scottish tales. Sir William Wallace was an early hero. The English were the villains, foul despoilers of all things good and pure. My American history confirmed that! I have since learned differently, but *not* because my wife is of Scottish ancestry! At any rate, Scottish nationalism is *no* surprise to me. I am only amazed that it took so long to develop.)

But, to return to the very aspects of the doctrine of selective depravity, it is inevitably a doctrine of murder. Sin must be destroyed. If sin is in us, we must through Christ destroy the principle of sin in order to be redeemed and to redeem history. However, if sin is incarnate in a race or class, it is then logical to destroy that race or class. Capital punishment is basic to human action, whether admittedly so or not. Marx placed virtue in the workers and evil in the middle (and upper) class. Hence, Marxism works to execute and eradicate the incarnations of evil in its midst. Hitler defined the evil class as the Jews: hence, the Jews had to be destroyed. Hitler himself had no anti-Jewish beliefs: his action was pragmatic.

However, the logic of his position required, in a time of emergency, the elimination of evil. The result was the gas chamber. In the latter days of the war, he believed that the Germans were unworthy of him and betraying him, so he set the stage for the destruction and partition of Germany.

Whatever form the doctrine of selective depravity takes, it is a call, logically, for murder, and it begins to express itself accordingly. It declares: The only good Indian is a dead Indian. The only good Jap is a dead Jap. The only good nigger is a dead nigger. The only good honky is a dead honky (or white). The only good cop is a dead cop. The only good lawyer is a dead lawyer (according to something passed on to me today). And so on and on.

The doctrine of selective depravity leads not only to Phariseeism, and murder, but to a pharisaic self-righteousness about the most vicious murders. It closes the door to Christ's salvation, because it defines sins, not in terms of every man's apostasy from God, and the fall of man in Adam, the federal head of *all* men without any exception save the second Adam, Jesus Christ, but it defines sin in terms of some men, other people. Salvation then means the elimination of these other people. On all sides of the political scene, the answer to problems is in terms of the doctrine of selective depravity. Who is to blame? Why, the Communists, the conservatives, the whites, blacks, Jews, capitalists, workers, or what have you. The result is a radical incapacity to deal with the problem. Every "answer" only aggravates it.

In terms of Scripture, *every man* is created in God's image, to be God's covenant-keeper, and to be a dominion man, subduing the earth under God's law to be God's Kingdom. *No* man is exempt from this calling. It is *not* enough to profess faith and to be moral: we are called upon to develop God's dominion requirements and to make every area we live and work in an outpost of His Kingdom. Otherwise, we are called "unprofitable servants," and are cast into the "outer darkness" (Matt. 25:30).

The means to dominion is the law of God, the means to sanctification. God's covenant people live in terms of God's covenant law. This means tithing, restitution, responsibility, the family as the basic governmental and social unit, and much, much more.

There are different kinds of outlaws and prisoners in a jail. Some are there for major offenses like murder, rape, and kidnapping: others are petty criminals, with a string of small crimes. *But all are outlaws.*

Similarly, if we feel that we have not committed any "major" sins against God and are therefore still a part of His family, we must remember that all sin has as its principle the belief that "my will, not God's be done, unless it is to my advantage and convenience to obey God." *The*

principle of selective obedience is as offensive to God as the principle of selective depravity.

The covenant man knows that his problem was total depravity: in every area of his life he served himself rather than God. By God's grace, he is now a redeemed man, a dominion man, and therefore a law-man, not an outlaw. Christ's declaration becomes his also: "Lo, I come to do thy will, O God" (Heb. 10:9). Salvation for him is not the elimination or murder of a social class, race, or group, but the atoning death and the resurrection of Jesus Christ. The mark of salvation and the way of sanctification is the delight in God's law-word, and his desire to place his whole life and world under God's law. His calling becomes, in the words of T. Robert Ingram, "The world under God's law," beginning with himself. This is not a doctrine of salvation by murder: it is a calling to regeneration and life in and through Christ.

97

DOCTRINE OF SELECTIVE DEPRAVITY, PART 3

Chalcedon Report No. 134, October 1976

The doctrine of selective depravity creates a political order and a law structure after its own image.

In an earlier era, when kings and noblemen ruled, and again in the age of aristocracy, it was a common conviction that the "rabble" were incapable of morality and order unless kept firmly in check by a powerful force. Intelligence, virtue, responsibility, and the ability to rule were powers communicated by blood and rank.

Later, this idea of a ruling elite took various other forms: the Germans, Anglo-Saxons, the whites, the workers, the freemasons, and so on, and now it is gaining modern forms in Asia and Africa, where such ideas have long existed. Marxism, of course, holds militantly to one version of this faith.

We have seen that the final implication of the doctrine of selective depravity is salvation by murder. Eliminate the evil group. Of course, reeducation is often attempted first, but, in a society of failures, as in Marxism and Fascism, there must be a sacrificial victim for the continued failures. The evil class or race must therefore be "purged."

In the meantime, however, the people are told that their political order is their savior, and that salvation is a matter of law, and, in democracies, this also means elections. Elect the right people, who will pass the right laws, and salvation will arrive or be accomplished. More Social Security, Medicare, more taxes on the rich (or middle classes, or poor), more this and that kind of legislation, and paradise will begin.

This program of salvation by law means legislating against certain people in favor of other people. It means legislating against the rich, the poor, the middle classes, this or that race or class, or whatever group is defined as evil.

It is easy, of course, for the devout believers in the doctrine of selective depravity to catalogue the sins of the evil class. We all have our share of sins. On one trip, a man tried hard to convince me of the special depravity of the oil companies and the international bankers. All our problems and evils he traced to them. When I tried to present a Biblical doctrine of sin, he was rude, arrogant, and hostile. I had a duty to keep quiet and listen to him, or else I would lead people astray with my ignorance! Later, his wife apologized for what I learned was his chronic behavior and added, "I don't know anything about the oil companies and bankers, but I do know from living with my husband that they have no monopoly on sin!" Exactly. There is no monopoly on sin. No class, race, or group has a corner on the sin market (although all nowadays seem to be trying!).

Legislation as well as thinking which has as its premise the doctrine of selective depravity not only denies the facts about all men, but it denies the very idea of justice. True justice, God's justice, requires that we be blind to the people involved but alive to God's requirements. It is in this sense that justice is blind, blind to human prejudices, partisanships, and claims, but alive to the law of God. God declares, "Ye shall do no unrighteousness in judgment: thou shalt not respect the person of the poor, nor honour the person of the mighty: but in righteousness shalt thou judge thy neighbour" (Lev. 19:15). We are not justified before God's law by our estate: rich or poor, believer or unbeliever, clergyman or layman, our estate is not a determining factor, but God's law is at all times to govern all men. At the same time, we cannot, in rigorously applying God's law, forget that we are also under it, and that the person on trial is our "neighbour." We cannot treat him as a different kind of humanity in whom selective depravity is operative. As the old expression has it, we are to remember, "There, but for the grace of God, go I."

The doctrine of selective depravity overthrows justice because it legislates in terms of class, race, or group. It declares a segment of humanity to be the depraved element by nature, because of their membership in a class, race, or group. Injustice then becomes a way of life, as it is now, in varying degrees, all over the earth.

Moreover, if we believe that some other group is the selectively depraved group, then it easily follows that they will decide that we are the selectively depraved blight upon the earth. Present-day economic and political thought begins and ends, on the whole, in terms of the doctrine of selective depravity.

The returns are now coming in. Politics has long operated on this premise of selective depravity. Now more and more people are concluding that the depraved class is the political one, politicians and bureaucrats.

Terrorists are increasingly in evidence everywhere, and political assassinations are becoming common, because the true believer in selective depravity believes finally in salvation by murder. The solution is then simple: kill the men of the establishment, and freedom and paradise will be born. Hence, "death to the pigs," or death to the establishment in its every form. Salvation by murder becomes a passionate faith and hope. And I do mean passionate, as I have often seen. For example, on one occasion, I argued with a university student, who believed in selective depravity. He lost his temper, and began to shout that all the pigs in power should be killed, and I should be "prevented" from going around the country corrupting people. It does not take too much pressure for such people, whatever their politics, to express their demands for murder.

Consider, then, what hard times will do to many of them. It will push them over the edge in demands for revolutionary or for repressive, reactionary actions. Salvation by murder will become a faith in action. Reasoning with such will not work. The premise of their thinking, whatever their professed politics of religion, is a false doctrine of man, a doctrine of selective depravity. Nothing short of a return to the total Word of God can give men and nations a new direction.

98

SELECTIVE OBEDIENCE

Chalcedon Report No. 135, November 1976

In recent months, I have bought and read four new books on Mary, Queen of Scots. My reason for this is that Mary is a symbolic figure, one who epitomizes much of the modern world and who accordingly has a passionately loyal following to our own day. I find, in fact, at times an intense feeling about Mary among a wide variety of peoples.

Perhaps Madeleine Bingham is right (*Mary, Queen of Scots*, p. 1): "Those who die well attract the courtesies of history." The Christian martyrs, then and now, however, have attracted no such loyalty. Perhaps Antonia Fraser is right that Mary was more sinned against than sinning. But Mary began early what one biographer has politely termed a course of "prevarication." She continued her course with adulteries and murder, while maintaining an amazing self-righteousness through it all. In marrying the Dauphin of France, Francois, she lied to the Scottish delegates and signed away the Scottish succession to the French. Bingham sees this as contributing to her troubles and death in a central way. She tried to apply the divine right of kings to Scotland, which was alien to the dogma. She was so foolish in her speech that she spoke of her mother-in-law, Catherine de Medici, as a woman descended from shopkeepers, a slur that queen took action against when Francois died. Mary had a gift for making enemies and assuming that charm and tears could remedy the matter. An English ambassador saw her rule in Scotland as suicidal to Mary's interests. Her two marriages there were, to be kind, very foolish blunders. Having lost her kingdom in battle finally, she sought refuge where all her friends advised her not to go, in England. She had made herself a rival claimant to the throne of England, and then a focal point of continuing conspiracy and rebellion, and yet Mary foolishly placed her hopes on charming Elizabeth's just fears away by a personal confrontation. That

her execution was so many years in coming was due to Queen Elizabeth's horror of shedding royal blood. Mary's dying words showed self-righteousness, and also courage.

On the other hand, her appeal is understandable. She had beauty, charm, and remarkable courage. Although years before her death both the Vatican and the Scottish Kirk had given her up as incorrigible, she died confident in her faith, and with an amazing physical and spiritual fortitude. It is easy to understand why the Romantic revival made so great a heroine out of Mary.

But my interest in Mary is because of her modernity, because she exemplifies an aspect of sin in every age, and an aspect of modern man in particular.

Bingham, who dislikes Knox and likes Mary, says all the same, "Mary was constitutionally devoid of either fundamental sincerity or natural prudence" (p. 69). The problem lies deeper, and Bingham's judgment must be held in abeyance until we can recognize that Mary saw herself as outside the law, and openly said so. In part, she based this on the divine right of kings, but in part also, she based it on her renaissance humanism. Her view of life, law, politics, and people was totally personal. Her interest was not in a cause but in herself. The kind of humanism she manifested came to focus finally in Max Stirner's *The Ego and His Own*, the classic statement of total anarchism. Roy Strong explains Mary thus: "Her behavior was always conditioned by her upbringing and she thought of government and policy in terms of the personal intrigues and amours which motivated politics at the Valois court" (*Mary, Queen of Scots*, p. 72). Not law but an anarchic personal concern governed her every action; Strong is right: this was the reason for all her disasters.

But what about her faith, to which she witnessed so eloquently before being beheaded? One pope renounced her, and Knox denounced her; some in her day, at her death, saw her as a saint, others as a devil. The truth is, Mary was very much like all of us. Where her faith was concerned, she practiced *the principle of selective obedience*. She was obedient to God, and true to her faith, when it suited her to be so. At such a time, she was more zealous in her defense of it than most of us ever are. But we have this in common with her, for the most part; we in our time practice a very selective obedience. We, of course, cannot put people to death as she did, for example the poet Chastelard, but we are no less hostile to those who cross us, and as ready to regard our sins and lusts as somehow excusable ones.

Mary's principle of selective obedience made her faith inoperative in the rule of her kingdom; it was her passions which ruled her and the

kingdom and brought disasters to both. It is also the modern Christian's selective obedience which makes his faith inoperative and ineffectual in our world today. Such a professing believer may claim to believe the Bible from cover to cover, but his selective obedience makes him a practical and practicing humanist. If we are honest with ourselves, we would have to say that Mary is the real patron saint of today's Catholics and Protestants alike, because we are so radically selective in our faithfulness to God and our obedience to His law. Even more, to denounce Mary's, we must first denounce ourselves and our flagrant practice of selective obedience.

It is childish to blame various persons for Mary's disaster. Her biographers at this point are more or less agreed: she did it to herself. The same is true of us: whatever enemies we or our cause may have, we have our selective obedience to thank for our plight. We are doing it to ourselves.

After all, the principle of selective obedience means also selective disobedience to God. Even more, it has implicit in it the principle of total disobedience and revolt: it says in effect, "Not thy will, O Lord, but mine be done."

The Prince of Ligne is said to have replied, when his wife asked if he had been faithful to her, "Frequently." She was hardly likely to be happy with that answer. If we can give no better answer to God, He is hardly likely to be any more pleased with us than the princess was with the Prince of Ligne. We are then humanists not Christians. Our condition is more than sin: it is lawlessness.

99

CONSEQUENCES OF SELECTIVE OBEDIENCE

Chalcedon Report No. 136, December 1976

The principle of selective obedience to God means finally no obedience at all. It means that, whether we obey God's Word or not, in either case, it is our will that is done, because we insist on being in the driver's seat. We pass judgment on God's requirements and pick and choose what suits us. In such a world, every man is his own god, determining for himself what constitutes good and evil. In such a world, anarchism rapidly takes over.

Hand in hand with anarchism, we have terrorism. Where man takes control, he assumes the right, whether through the state or as an individual, to enforce his own will. No law then exists outside of man, and this comes down basically to the individual.

Terrorism is very much with us today, all over the world. In a few countries, stern measures control it to a degree, but they do not eliminate it, as witness the riots and murders in Communist countries, nor do they remedy the causes.

Although only a very small minority in any country are terrorists, the seeds of it are in most of us. Terrorism believes that no progress is possible through the normal processes of law, civil government, and society. The situation is seen as hopeless: it requires violence to clear away the roadblocks. Therefore, the answer is in disruptive acts of murder and terrorism. The idea is to disrupt and break down all normal processes, because they are seen as evil beyond redemption.

In one country after another, the popular mentality is congenial to terrorism. More and more people on the left, right, and middle insist that things are hopeless. The aphorisms expressing this feeling are many. To cite a few: "You can't fight city hall." "This country needs a few good

funerals." "Why bother to vote? It all adds up to the same thing." "All politicians are crooked," and so on. These attitudes are very common, and they are the philosophy of terrorism. During the student riots of the 1960s, I met an anguished father whose son had gone "underground" to "fight the Establishment." The father shared all these opinions we have just cited, but he held a fine position and functioned as an upper-middle-class leader. His son was simply applying his father's (and professors') logic: if the establishment is hopelessly rotten, then knock it over. All counsels of despair logically require us either to withdraw from the world and retreat into the desert, as some did before Rome fell, or to overthrow the supposedly hopelessly evil order.

I find it significant that so many people are more and more indifferent to voting. They regard it as useless to vote for anyone: they claim that there is no man on any ballot worth voting for, and that voting is useless anyway. "It's all been decided." Such people are the parents of terrorism.

The terrorist and the indifferentist are agreed: the "Establishment" is hopeless. All too many who vote share their despair concerning change.

The problem, of course, is that all these people confuse the "Establishment" with God: they ascribe omnipotence and/or eternity to it. Moreover, they see the "Establishment" as the great cause, the great determiner, rather than an effect, an effect of man's sin.

The locale of sin is not the "Establishment" but in the heart of man, all men. The false principle of selective depravity leads men to localize sin in a race, group, class, or "Establishment." The answer then, is to destroy that element in society. Such a course only increases the corruption of society.

All counsels of despair are denials of the lordship of Jesus Christ. They deny His sovereignty and His government of all things.

The terrorists are very much the children of our times, the apt pupils of their parents, teachers, professors, pastors, and elders. They are conscientiously applying the lessons they have been years in learning. The "dropout" mentality in all its forms, terrorism, drugs, liquor, the sexual revolution, hedonism, and more is a product of these counsels of cynicism and despair. In Rome, this "dropout" mentality led to a common reaction, "let us eat and drink: for to morrow we die" (1 Cor. 15:32). Some people commit suicide; others plant bombs; both have a common despair of life and a cynicism regarding progress.

The faithful Christian knows, however, that he has a duty to "occupy" (Luke 19:13) every area of life and thought for His Lord. He knows that the very "gates of hell" cannot "prevail" (i.e., hold out) against Christ's Kingdom (Matt. 16:18; the word *ecclesia*, translated as *church*, means

the assembly or congregation, the entire people, with its institutions and armies). To this Lord he must render, not selective, but *unqualified* obedience. Anything short of this makes man the lord, not Christ. The Lord says to all who render Him selective obedience, "And why call ye me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?" (Luke 6:46).

Terrorism? Most of us don't like it but most of us help create it. We sometimes talk like Christians, but we act otherwise. We sometimes talk like terrorists with our cynicism and despair, but we are horrified at the idea of terrorism. Somebody has been taking us seriously, and it is not the Lord.

100

DEPRAVITY OR NATURAL GOODNESS?

Chalcedon Report No. 137, January 1977

We have seen that the doctrine of selective depravity is very dangerous because, while having a seemingly Biblical doctrine of sin, it shifts the area of sin from all men to some men. Sin is localized in a class or race.

We must now turn to another form of this same pernicious and dangerous doctrine, one inherited from the Enlightenment. Enlightenment thinkers believed in the natural goodness of man, provided the man was a *philosophe* like themselves, a rationalist and a skeptic. Religion meant for them superstition and evil. For most men, their natural goodness was only *potential*, because they were influenced by religion. For the intellectual and scientific elite, the *philosophes*, natural goodness was *actual*, because they had abandoned the superstition of the Christian religion.

This doctrine has been, in various forms, a persistent factor in modern history. Marxism, with its dictatorship of the proletariat, Fabian Socialism and democracy, with its guidance by scientific planners, and National Socialism with its leadership principle, are forms of this belief in selective depravity. If we believe in selective depravity, we then believe also in selective leadership by an elite class, race, or group.

In neo-orthodox thought, there was a supposed revival of the Biblical doctrine of original sin. Karl Barth and Reinhold Niebuhr, for example, seemed to echo the orthodox doctrine of man and his sin. Their doctrine of sin, however, was only formally theological but actually sociological. An example of this was Reinhold Niebuhr's *The Illusion of World Government* (1949), which first appeared in the April 1949 issue of *Foreign Affairs*. Men assume, Niebuhr held, that because world order is desirable, it is therefore attainable. There is no proof, he held, that there is "either the moral ability of mankind to create a world government by an act of

will, nor of the political ability of such a government to integrate a world community in advance of a more gradual growth of the 'social tissue' which every community requires more than government." The underlying presupposition and faith of Niebuhr are here revealed. There is no *theological* moral inability, but only an *historical* inability. Given enough time, an international community and government will develop. (There are echoes of Edmund Burke here.) The disability of sin is not theological and does not require regeneration. It is sociological and requires simply the passing of time.

Of course, Niebuhr and Barth had no real answer to breakdowns of national and local communities because of sin. For them, an historical development became a natural asset, because there was for them no truly supernatural grace in history. The centuries of Christian grace and development were for them a natural asset, a product of an evolving history, which would grow a new social tissue, the world community. Of course, some of them, as superior men, had already developed that social tissue and could therefore guide the world into the new order!

Because for them creation by God's supernatural act is a myth, theological concepts of sin and grace are all mythical. Sin is sociological, and grace and power come from the context of history. Adolph Hitler, that clear-cut theologian of humanism, stated the implications of historical rather than supernatural grace. As a super-democrat, he told Chancellor Bruning at the end of 1931, "the fundamental thesis of democracy runs, 'All Power issues from the People.'" There can be no law or right beyond the will of the people. The majority will of the people can thus abolish any constitution, previously granted rights, or laws and do no wrong, because there is no power, right, or grace, Hitler held, beyond the people.

It is not enough to hold to the possible or actual depravity of all men, as some neo-orthodox thinkers have done. Is man's sin theological, i.e., against the sovereign and living God, or is it sociological, against human society? Sin is against law, against ultimate power and authority. If that ultimate creating power is society, then salvation is social salvation, and it involves, as it did for Niebuhr, a world community. If that ultimacy is in society, then grace, saving grace, can only come from society, and hence the importance to Barth and Niebuhr of creating a new world order. We can then understand why, for political (rather than theological) man, the problem of social salvation by a social gospel becomes so urgent. For them it is man's only hope.

This doctrine of selective depravity thus has two or three important presuppositions. *First*, it holds that all sin is in essence sociological, against society, rather than theological, against God. *Second*, it holds

that some enlightened ones are aware of this fact and are living in terms of a world community which is to be beyond sin, beyond good and evil, and they are thus empowered to deal with those who are less enlightened. This can lead to a *third* presupposition, and usually does, that "power to the people" means power to the *philosophes*, the enlightened ones.

David, however, saw the meaning of sin more clearly: it is in essence always theological, because the law broken is God's law. Therefore, of his sin of adultery with Bathsheba, and his murder of Uriah, he declared to God, "Against thee, thee only, have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight" (Ps. 51:4). It was because it was God's law he had broken that David knew the enormity of his offense against Uriah and Bathsheba.

The only true doctrine of depravity is thus theological. Only when we face up to the meaning of sin can we also know what grace is, and whence it comes. The harvest of the Enlightenment and neo-orthodox doctrine of sin, which now prevails everywhere in the councils of state, is an evil harvest, and a bloody one.

101

THE ESTABLISHMENT

Chalcedon Report No. 58, June 1, 1970

War against "the Establishment" is a basic fact of our time. This in itself is a significant fact, in that, not too long ago, it was a basic hope of most college youth to become a part of the establishment.

In the late 1930s, I recall my first day in a required course I had long postponed taking. An auditorium was required to accommodate the large enrollment. When the professor entered, there was a round of applause; when he finished his first, introductory lecture with some general remarks on the current scene, there was a standing ovation. Even in those days, professors were not usually well received, but this man carried weight with most students: he had, for two years or more, been a fifth-echelon "Brain Truster" in Franklin Delano Roosevelt's administration. He had the prestige of the powers that be, plus the "independence" to be critical at points, and as a result, this mild nonentity was a "somebody" to the students.

There are still some lingering echoes of this attitude, but now, on the whole, students are at war with the establishment, which represents to them everything which is evil and hateful: the entrenched and established men and institutions of the past and the present. For these rebels, the establishment is the state, the church, and the school. It is the family and their parents. It is the world of the police and the law, of professors and parents, of the military forces, and everything which seeks to perpetuate the present order.

Students are not alone in being anti-establishment. Many radical groups, as well as conservative organizations, are, each from their own perspective, anti-establishment. More than that, many members of the hated establishment seek favor from the mob by taking an anti-establishment stance. Some politicians succeed momentarily, as do some

professors and clergymen, as long as they run with the mob. Many only gain contempt for their efforts. Thus when a mob of students, some 2,000, "liberated" the faculty club at a Canadian university, seizing liquor and money and celebrating with various antics, the head of the faculty club, according to Jerry Rubin, "tried to co-opt the orgy. He stood on top of a chair and thanked everyone for coming."

The reasons for this deeply rooted hatred of the establishment deserve attention. Only a few aspects can be touched on. *First*, a dramatic aspect of this protest is the increasing involvement of the U.S. in Southeast Asia. Protests range from the total hostility of the radical left to the "win and get out" stand of many conservatives. There are good grounds for the protest. The U.S. Constitution does not permit the use of drafted men in wars outside the boundaries of the United States. The Spanish-American War and the Pershing campaign against Villa were fought with volunteers and a professional army. Two world wars, the Korean War, and now the Vietnam-Cambodian War have been waged in violation of the Constitution. Moreover, the war is fought in a strange way: perhaps more harm has been done to the cause of our allies than to our communist enemies. The distrust and resentment of both right and left have good grounds and much justification.

Second, a major target has been "the law," i.e., the courts and the police. The police have been the unhappy targets of much of this, although the basic resentment is against the "system." The radical hostility to the courts is the basic aspect of this protest. This hostility has been apparent in a variety of movements, from the conservative "impeach Earl Warren" movement to the revolutionary antics of the Chicago conspirators when on trial. Again, we must say that there are good reasons for this protest. A study of Chicago, Ovid Demaris's *Captive City* (1969), makes clear the connection between organized crime, politics, and the courts. The author is emphatic, as are many other students of the subject, that organized crime cannot exist without a working alliance with politics and the courts. The criminal world today is a part of the establishment, and its power is manifest in the highest places of the country.

The radical relativism of the courts is apparent in Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas's book, *Points of Rebellion* (1969), as well as in many other judges' statements. Chief Justice Burger holds to ideas alien to justice. The *Chicago Daily News* of June 3, 1969, reported that "Among the 'techniques, devices and mechanisms' Burger questioned were: The jury system, the presumption that a defendant is innocent until proven guilty, the right of a defendant to remain silent and putting the burden of proof on the prosecution . . . Burger suggested that defendants ought to

be required to testify in a courtroom. And, he said: 'If we eliminate the jury we would save a lot of time'" (*Review of the News*, April 22, 1970, p. 23). There is no lack of reason for rage and protest: the courts today do all too often present a spectacle of studied injustice.

Third, the church is despised and with reason. Where the church today is not captured by modernistic relativism, it shows instead a pious irrelevance, antinomianism, Phariseeism, and a general immoralism. Consider, for example, the comment of Billy Graham in Hamburg, Germany, as reported by Robert Davis ("News Briefs," *Chicago Tribune*, April 7, 1970, from an interview in *Der Spiegel*). Graham "refused to discuss communism, although he had once been known as a great foe of that system. 'For years I have not spoken about that,' he said. 'I cannot go around the world and say who is right and who is wrong.'" If a minister is unable to say whether or not communism is morally wrong, who can? If a minister finds no ground to call communism wrong, what ground can he claim to say anything? The church today is so radically irrelevant, whether it represents the modernist or evangelical branches, that it is scarcely worth attacking. But it is a cause for deep grief.

Fourth, in every area, there is a radical impersonalism. Students have protested against being a mere cipher in the university. They have satirized the computer-like mechanistic operations by wearing badges reading, "Do not fold, staple, or mutilate," because they insist on being persons. A classic example of this impersonalism is Dr. Arnold Hutschnecker, a Nixon associate, who proposed that all children between six and eight years of age be tested for possible criminal tendencies; all those whom the tests ruled to be potentially criminal should then be subjected to special psychological training. (Psychiatrists disowned the plan.) Dr. Hutschneker declared that he was "shocked" and upset at reactions: "I was bewildered as I could be" (Jack Nelson, "Ex. Nixon Doctor Upset Over Reaction to Plan," *Los Angeles Times*, Sunday, May 3, 1970, sec. E, p. 1). Well, bless his little pinhead: he plans to play god in the lives of all children, and he fails to understand why people are upset. After all, he said, it was merely preventive medicine! This total unawareness that people are persons, not social fodder for the future, is increasingly characteristic of the modern mentality, and establishment planning usually reveals this impersonalism in varying degrees.

It would be possible to discuss at great length the various areas of protest, but the foregoing is sufficient for our purposes. The modern establishment is basically humanistic and relativistic: it recognizes no law save man. It despises God's law, and therefore it cannot admit that there is a law order in any realm. Hence, whether in politics, economics, or

religion, the modern mentality believes in a do-it-yourself law: set aside the old laws, and write your own, in terms of your planning.

Having no law to judge by, the establishment pays lip service to man. Thus, when Commissioner Otto N. Larsen, a University of Washington professor of sociology and a member of a federal commission, received a pie in the face from Thomas Forcade of the Underground Press Syndicate, Larsen did not protest: "What he wanted was outrage. I refused to engage in physical interaction . . . I've had classroom confrontations with militants before. I try to engage all kinds of people in serious dialogue. These people have something important to tell us" (*Los Angeles Herald-Examiner*, May 14, 1970, p. A-11). This statement reveals a radical moral bankruptcy. The façade of receptivity covers a radical emptiness. What is the something important to be told? The modern intellectual has no principle of truth, no concept of real transcendence. As a result, he is formally open to everything, because all things are equally important, but actually open to nothing, because nothing is really of value. In consequence, his own will to power is his only truth.

The establishment today is radically relativistic. This is the cause of its deep immoralism, its opportunism, and its contempt for all law, economic, constitutional, religious, or otherwise.

The forces of student protest, however, are not better and actually worse. The students are the true sons of the establishment: they reflect the relativistic philosophy of state, school, and church; if anything, they apply it more honestly and systematically. The students have simply learned their lessons well.

Recently, some rather conservative doctors, when questioned about abortion, responded usually with surprising, uniform answers. One said, "I don't like it, but who is to say what's right and wrong?" Another declared, "I'm personally against it, but who am I to inflict my morality on others?" and so on. We should not be surprised at the results. Relativism today breeds a radical and total lawlessness.

An episode was reported to me on one of my trips. During a demonstration and protest march, one hippy marcher stopped to urinate openly and defiantly in the street. Thirty years ago, the reaction would have been swift: arrest, public disapproval, and a general feeling that the young man was a "nut," a mental case. Now it was different: students quickly and gleefully imitated him. Young men from the "best of families" took a defiant pride in following suit. They professed that they were symbolically urinating on the establishment, and, no doubt they were, but even more they were demonstrating that a civilization and its discipline had died.

To cite another example: a quiet, stable city in 1950 had 22,000

people; a ranking police officer told me then that it had perhaps one-hundred adults who were petty, small-time criminals, and 300 juveniles who had at some time been in trouble, of whom 150 would probably, as adults, be in and out of trouble. The work of the police was light; crimes were few and minor, and traffic problems their main concern.

By 1970, this same city, now with 27,000, has a major problem: its juvenile offenders are more than the officer could readily cite, and they are out of hand. Their offenses are all more serious, and drugs and robbery are common problems. The increase of adult irresponsibility and crime is also marked, and the police feel the situation is out of hand.

In a major city, an officer stated that the day may not be too far distant when the lawbreakers outnumber the law-keepers, and the result will be radical lawlessness and anarchy.

Protests against the establishment are justified, in that the establishment reveals a moral relativism which is destroying the country, but the protesters themselves in most cases reveal an even more radical relativism. The evil they protest against is most fully present in themselves. As a result, the protests against the establishment are sterile and morally bankrupt. They only compound and aggravate the evils they complain about. The protesters are merely revealing that they are indeed sons of the establishment.

This moral bankruptcy is also true of too many conservatives. Those who truly believe in the triune God see His handiwork in all things: they believe that God's absolute decree and law govern every area of life, that men either obey God's law-word or they are shattered by it.

Too many conservatives, many of whom claim to be Christians, are in reality Satanists. They see all things controlled by satanic conspirators: every event is read as the careful development of a satanic plan. They see, not God in control, but the powers of darkness. The world for them is governed, not by God's law and decree, but by dark and hidden evil conspirators. They fear, not God, but these evil powers. Whatever their profession, they are in practice Satanists, Satan worshippers.

But the world is only and always governed by God and His law. Progress and reconstruction are only possible under God and His law. The world is not changed by futile rage nor by protests, but only as men, by the grace of God, reconstruct their lives, their calling, and the world around them in terms of God's law-word. It is time to rebuild.

102

THE IKS

Chalcedon Report No. 95, July 1973

When Colin M. Turnbull's *The Mountain People* (New York, NY: Simon and Schuster, 1972) was first published a year ago, at least one reviewer felt that the book should not have been written, and more than a few were disturbed. None came to grips with the book's central point. Turnbull, in spite of himself, has written an epitaph on humanism. Turnbull is by no stretch of the imagination Christian. He tries to derive a humanistic moral from his experience as an anthropologist among the Ik people in Africa. He says, in fact, "Although the experience was far from pleasant, and involved both physical and mental suffering, I am grateful for it. In spite of it all, and contrary to the first tidal wave of disillusionment, it has added to my respect for humanity and my hope that we who have been civilized into such empty beliefs as the essential beauty and goodness of humanity may discover ourselves before it is too late" (p. 12). His book tells a different story.

The Ik are a small group of Africans in the mountains between Uganda, the Sudan, and Kenya. They were moved out of their homes, when a National Games Reserve was created, into a barren area. In this new area, they now live without their old faith and tradition. They are a "modern" people, i.e., rootless, without any ties to the past or the future. They are truly "existential" in their outlook. The result is a world of total isolation, total egoism, and a radical immoralism. The family has ceased to exist. Turnbull, an honest reporter, saw no evidence of family life, no affection, no tears of sorrow, nothing except the rule of "the immediate moment, and with relation to one standard value, the good of self" (p. 129). The mother "throws her child out at three years old." The child must then provide for itself or die. This means eating what the baboons leave, berries, bark, grubs, insects and the like (p. 133ff.). Turnbull

speaks of "the almost universal practice of adultery" (p. 181). Marriage is losing all appeal. Since either marriage or fornication require some kind of gift to the girl, young men have come to believe it is cheaper and simpler to masturbate (p. 258). The girls sell themselves to outsiders. The Ik have, however, attained the goal of modern libertarians: theirs is a society without any coercion, and also without either law or responsibility. Turnbull, as a liberal and an anthropologist, approves of this, stating, "The Ik, however, have learned to do without coercion, either spiritual or physical. It seems that they have come to a recognition of what they accept as man's basic selfishness, his natural determination to survive as an individual before all else. This they consider to be man's basic right and at least they have the decency to allow others to pursue that right to the best of their ability without recrimination and blame" (p. 182).

Turnbull is not quite accurate, however. Where food is concerned, coercion exists. The Ik can and do steal food out of the very mouths of infirm parents, and they regard it as a joke to do so, as hilarious fun. The weak are ridiculed, tormented, and cast out to die. There is no sense of any moral responsibility to one another. "It was rather commonplace, during the second year's drought, to see the very young prying open the mouths of the very old and pulling out food they had been chewing and had not had time to swallow" (p. 261).

As a humanist, Turnbull reacted both with horror to what he saw, by trying to preserve life and offer help, and also with intellectual assent: he had no moral grounds to condemn what the Ik did: "I wonder if their way was not right" (p. 228).

When a good harvest came, Ik life did not improve. When welfarism by the state came to the Ik's aid, they did not improve. It only heightened their isolation and egoism, their anarchism. "If they had been mean and greedy and selfish before with nothing to be mean and greedy and selfish over, now that they had something they really excelled themselves, in what would be an insult to animals to call bestiality" (p. 280). The degeneration of society became even greater. "The surface looked bad enough, the hunger could be seen and the trickery perceived, and the political games were well enough known, but one had to live among the Ik and see them day in and day out and watch them defecating on each other's doorsteps, and taking food out of each other's mouths, and vomiting so as to finish what belonged to the starving, to begin to know what had happened to them" (p. 283).

The point which concerns Turnbull is the Ik in all of us. Modern culture has abandoned its ancient religious faith which bound man to God and man to man. The Ik have developed the implications of no faith more

logically than the rest of the world. Modern man looks to the state; the Ik looks only to himself for answers. The Ik have become parasites through welfarism; apart from that, they were still radically contemptuous of all standards and law other than the will of the individual. The moral values we have historically prized turn out to be, Turnbull sees, not a part of human nature at all, nor is man "the social animal" scholars have deemed him to be. The Ik have abandoned morality and religion, and they have renounced society as well, for survival "values" alone. For them, it is enough to survive and to have your own way. According to Turnbull, "The Ik teaches us that our much vaunted human values are not inherent in humanity at all, but are associated only with a particular form of survival called society, and that all, even society itself, are luxuries that can be dispensed with" (p. 27).

This latter point is of especial importance. The humanist has long held that moral values are "inherent in humanity" itself, and now humanistic anthropology has itself denied the validity of this faith. Man is *not* the source of moral law and order: God is. Law and value are inherent in God: they are aspects of His being. God does not do or conform to values: He is Himself the sum total of all values, in that they are simply manifestations of His nature. Man is required to conform to God's law; apart from God, man is lawless and valueless, in that he can only affirm, as do the existentialists, his own being. In such a world without God, as Sartre rightly recognized, man has being (he *is*) but not essence (i.e., man has no pre-established nature, law, or standards). Man must then become his own god in order to establish any values, and this quest, as Sartre concluded in *Being and Nothingness* (1959), is a futile one. In the humanistic worldview, the Iks are the best existentialists of all, and we are all destined to become Iks. The Marquis de Sade saw and welcomed this almost two centuries ago.

"The Ik in all of us" is a matter of growing concern. In the prologue to *The Mugging* (New York, NY: Signet Books, 1972), Morton Hunt writes of the rapid growth of crimes of violence against persons. Their growth has changed the nature of American life, and life within the cities in much of the world. The result is, as Hunt points out, a very real threat to civilization. "For when unpredictable violent attacks upon one's person become an ever present and uncontrollable danger, the great mass of citizens lose their faith in the integrity and viability of their society; they cease seeing themselves as members of a cooperating community of fellow creatures and no longer come to each other's aid or band together to seek broad solutions to the problem, but look individually for some private *modus vivendi*, some form of survival through retreat or escape.

With this loss of belief and this erosion of the spirit of communality goes society's only chance of survival" (p. viii).

Hunt's point deserves more attention on all sides. Both liberals and conservatives have persisted in failing to see the issue. Radicals and liberals want to change man by rearranging society: they fail to see that society is a social product, an expression of the faith and character of a people. Experiments in new housing in slum areas have shown that the changed environment is speedily reduced to the level of the people in it. The fallacy of radicals and liberals is to see sin in the environment rather than in man.

The non-Christian conservative's answer is similar: he sees the need as "law and order." Law and order are profoundly important and necessary, but they cannot supply faith and character. When the number of lawbreakers in a society, and the number of disbelievers in the religious foundations of a society, reach a level of determinance, then the society will be governed by its unbelief and its lawlessness, not by its past faith. No law-and-order crusade today can restore what only Biblical faith can give. It is suicidal to look for law and order, the fruit of the tree of Biblical faith, and to reject the tree itself.

Thus, the answers proposed by both the left and the right are no answers at all: they are a part of the problem. The beatniks, the hippies, the dropouts, the careless parents, the faithless churches, the humanistic schools, *the people*, these are the Ik in our midst. In talking today to a young man who works at an open-all-night store from midnight to eight in the morning, I learned that the great majority of customers are teenagers, many just barely teens. Many of these are on narcotics. This is in a good, suburban neighborhood, with a high percentage of engineers and research men in the sciences. The key question is, why do these parents permit their fourteen-year-old sons to drift around all night? Summer vacation is not excuse enough. For some of these boys, drifting is "better than being home," which is the worst alternative. The radical rot in the parents is the most appalling fact. There are only limited numbers of Iks in the mountains of Africa; there are millions throughout the rest of the world. More than a few scholars are fearful that the world will soon belong to the Iks.

We can be grateful to Turnbull and the Iks for spelling out so plainly the collapse of humanism. The death of humanism will be the triumph, however, of the ultimate barbarian, the sophisticated, existentialist Ik, unless we work for the reconstruction of faith and society.

Godly reconstruction must thus be the order of the day, the rethinking of every area of life and thought in terms of Biblical faith. (This is

the function of Chalcedon, and the studies we are sponsoring at present.) The collapse of values apart from that faith has been inevitable. Only by reconstruction in terms of the foundations of that faith is any ongoing civilization possible. The implicit humanism in all other cultures is carrying them down the road of the Iks (pronounced "Eeks").

In terms of godly reconstruction, the future is a most promising one. The progressive failure of laws and controls to solve man's economic, cultural, and political crises only underscore the failure of humanism and its age of the state. The times are strongly clouded with threats and storms, and disasters are clearly ahead, worldwide in their scope as never before. These future events also mean the collapse of the statist hope and the humanistic world of values. They offer the promise, if we but use the opportunity and build in terms of our faith, of a more free society and a richer one. This is a time of unequalled opportunity, the greatest age of the frontier man has yet seen. The new frontier is the challenge of a new civilization, of the most sophisticated and intensive pioneering the world has yet seen. It is a time of times, an exciting time to be alive, a time to build and a time for advance. To be most alive is to be alive when and where it counts most, and this is the day. Get with it!

103

ANARCHISM

Chalcedon Report No. 57, May 1, 1970

One of the most logical expressions of the modern mentality is *anarchism*. In anarchism, the basic premises of the Renaissance, the Enlightenment, Kant, and religious modernism come to maturity and their logical conclusion. Not only is anarchism the most logical expression of the modern mind, but it is also its most psychopathic manifestation. In anarchism, the radical evil and sickness of the modern mind comes to focus.

Let us examine some of the basic presuppositions of anarchism, which simply pushes the modern faith to its logical conclusion. *First* of all, anarchism denies the doctrine of original sin and holds to the natural goodness, or, at the least, the moral neutrality of man. The sin in the world is therefore not a product of man's fallen nature but rather a product of an evil environment. If there is evil in man, the environment is responsible. As Herbert S. Gershman observed (in *The Surrealist Revolution in France*, p. 189), "For Rousseau man's desires (which are wicked) were instilled in him by society; for the surrealists, man's desires (which are good, in that their satisfaction will presumably make him happy) are regularly thwarted by society." In either case, society, the environment, or the state, is guilty, not man; therefore, make war on society and the state. The premise of all modern revolutions is here. The anarchists are most logical in their application of it: since evil is in the environment, and man's strongest environment seems to be the state, free man totally by destroying the state totally. The logic of this position is so compelling to the modern, humanistic mentality, that even the total statists, the Marxists, justify their totalitarian state as the necessary means for eliminating the state.

The *second* main premise of anarchism is its belief in the autonomy of man, his total independence of God and man. It is the heresy of absolute

self-government. There must be no God, no church, no state, no family, no institution with any authority over man, because man is his own god, his own law and state. An interesting early expression of the anarchistic ideal is to be found in an early and seminal book, Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe*, still excellent reading. We are often told that Crusoe represented the expression of the spirit of private enterprise, of capitalism, turning a desolate island into an ordered world. There is more than a little truth to this opinion, but another strand of thought is also apparent. The most compelling fact about Defoe's day was the great wealth capitalism was bringing to the cities. One reason for the growth of and poverty in cities was the influx of the poor to the cities to get jobs in this area of wealth. A continual influx meant a continual new class of poor as the earlier arrivals gained status in the growing middle class. The slums, in brief, were a first station on the road up, and people crowded into them readily in hopes that their ride would be upwards. The city was thus a focal point of the new world of capitalism; out of the confusion, crowding, and poverty of the city, capitalism was shaping an amazing new world. But Defoe chose a deserted island, a primitive and savage one, a condition of radical autonomy rather than the intense community of the city of his day. The element of anarchism was thus strongly present. The only other man in Crusoe's world was not a capitalist competitor, but a savage to emphasize his autonomy and dominion.

This is the world of the anarchist, a world in effect without other people. The problem of philosophy for the existentialist Sartre is not God, but other people. In *No Exit*, Sartre has Garcin declare, "Hell is . . . other people!" Levi, in *Philosophy and the Modern World* (p. 420), observed that "[h]ell is other people for Sartre because in his quaint universe of appropriation and domination (a kind of Hobbesian state of nature where the stakes are not the externals of wealth and deference but purely internal states of consciousness like nausea, shame, pride, and alienation) all contact with the Other implies a latent contest."

Crusoe at least had a real island; the modern anarchist increasingly flies to a new island, his own inner world, one, he trusts, no man can invade. According to Gershman, "Liberty, to the surrealist, has a pronounced negative aspect — or perhaps it would be more accurate to say that it recalls the principles and goals of Riesman's inner-directed man. If it seeks martyrdom and oracular revelation, at the same time it denies the world and man's flesh and blood existence" (p. 12). The real world is, after Kant, to be found in the mind and imagination of man and his autonomous reason. Living with the reality of the outer world is seen as compromise. The new absolute is "the individual man" (p. 132).

For this autonomous man it is a moral necessity to deny not only the claims of God but the claims of law, society, the state, and the family. The attitude is, "I am god: don't fence me in." With many hippies, there is a denial of cleanliness and of social graces as a means of denying any interdependence with other people. The family, because of its strong and God-given ties, is especially warred against, and a major hallmark of the anarchistic mentality is rebellion against the family.

To cite a typical instance of this: a young man infected by the anarchistic mentality went out of his way to be offensive to his parents in appearance. Were they going to an important social function? He refused to cut his hair, wear clean clothes, or be other than a boor in his manners. Requests for compliance were treated as attempts to control him, but he felt entitled to take whatever he needed from them as his right. He married a girl of like anarchistic tendencies: on one occasion, his deliberately bad manners upset her and she remarked about it. He turned on her in a screaming rage and slugged her. He was logical at last: his rights were total in his eyes, his freedom absolute, and the rights of the world to "invade" his absolute freedom were nonexistent: he was "resisting" an invasion. Precisely because he loved his wife as much as he was capable of loving anything, he resented her attempt to presume on that tie. He was, he declared, captain of his own soul, lord and general of his life, and no one had better try to "dictate" to him. In brief, like a good anarchist, he believed in autonomy: "I am god, don't fence me in."

Autonomous man indeed finds life with other people, and especially life with a loving family, to be "hell." How can a man be his own god and his own world, if other people make claims on him? People who have never heard the word "anarchism" today are deeply infected by it. A young father brutally beat his infant because she was crying; his excuse: "she was bothering me with her crying." How dare anyone disturb our little gods? Another young man, whose mother had long walked in fear of his tantrums, turned on her when she asked when he would come home that night and slugged her; his excuse: "she was always bugging me." How dare anyone limit his independence with a suggestion or even a question? "I am god: don't fence me in."

A *third* basic premise of anarchism is closely related to the second. It is the belief that the rational is the real. After Hegel, modern man has progressively remade the world after his own image, in terms of his concepts of rationality. People well beyond the borders of formal Hegelianism are infected by this belief. To cite an example of this, a bestseller widely read by conservatives and liberals is *The Peter Principle* by Dr. Laurence J. Peter and Raymond Hull. The Peter Principle is simply this: "In a Hierarchy

Every Employee Tends to Rise to His Level of Incompetence." In other words, every bureaucracy promotes a man until he reaches a point where he is no longer competent, and there he remains, so that all jobs are potentially held by incompetents. The "beauty" of this "principle" is that it is so "rational," and therefore the appeal of the principle and the book.

But is it true? Some years ago, on an isolated American Indian reservation, I saw in practice a decidedly different principle. The Indian agency superintendents gave their most competent employees poor or average ratings: this prevented promotion to another, higher agency and kept them there and enabled the superintendent to build up a better rating for himself. The incompetent men were given the highest ratings and promptly moved upward and out to another agency. Eventually, some of the competent men became discouraged and quit.

The same is true of several corporations I checked on. Incompetent executives, who know only management and nothing about engineering, transfer men from plant to plant to prevent anyone from being around long enough to spot their ignorance. These executives regularly move from company to company to prevent anyone from detecting that they are, as executives, mainly paper-shufflers and buck-passers.

The Peter Principle, however, appeals more to people than does the truth: it is more "rational." Much of modern politics and economics rests on the same premise, that the rational is the real. In other words, man remakes the world in terms of his own supposedly creative word.

A *fourth* premise of anarchism is its relativism. Since all objective law is denied, and God is rejected, every man is his own god and law, and no one law is binding on all men. Outside of man, no absolutes exist. The "purpose" of art and music then becomes a desire to prove that it makes no difference what note is sounded, which color or line is used, or which word follows another. Anarchism prevails in art and in science. The result, then, is the death of science, because objective meaning and purpose are dead. Gunther S. Stent, in *The Coming of the Golden Age: A View of the End of Progress*, believes it is not only the death of science which lies ahead, but the gradual decay and death of mankind. Jerome Lettvin, reviewing Stent's book in the March 1970 edition of *Natural History*, praised it but added, "However, I am not convinced by his optimism." Sudden, rather than gradual, death is more likely for an anarchistic world.

The denial of law is the affirmation of death. The dead are insensitive to law. Maturity is not anarchism, the ability to live in independence from man and God, but rather to live in interdependence with others under God. Without God, men are soon dead, their culture and civilization in ruins. "He that sinneth against me wrongeth his own soul: all they

that hate me love death" (Prov. 8:36). The love of death is deeply rooted in our age.

Earlier, we cited the childish tantrums of the anarchistic mentality in reaction to normal claims on their lives. Not surprisingly, *hysteria* has been a major concern of psychology in the modern era. Dr. Ernst Kretschmer, in his study of *Hysteria, Reflex and Instinct* (p. 132), observed, "We can therefore sum up the situation in these words: *such hysterical persons are not weak-willed but weak of purpose*."

Without God, meaning and purpose wane and disappear; anarchistic man can only lash out hysterically at a world he never made and therefore hates. He destroys civilization, as though civilization were the sinner rather than himself. Anarchistic man has no future: he cannot construct; he can only kill, and die.

Let the dead therefore bury the dead. The world is ours under God, to exercise dominion over it and to subdue it. Because God is sovereign, every day is the day of the Lord, and every year is *anno Domini*, the year of our Lord. God only and always reigns.

104

MORALISM

Chalcedon Report No. 29, January 1, 1968

Samuel Pepys (1633–1703), an important figure in the history of the British admiralty, left a secret diary which is one of the most entertaining and revealing documents. Pepys, who was quite congenial to a consistently adulterous life, was also a very self-righteous and moralistic man. He was ready to take and to create any opportunity for adultery, but he also wanted to be morally clean. As a result, Pepys worked out a system of moral bookkeeping. In one way or another, he fined himself or made amends to his wife for his sins. Also, he regularly "reformed" immediately after an act of adultery, when his desires were at a low ebb. One set of rules he made to keep himself "moral" even included rules about kissing women other than his wife: the first kiss would be free, but every additional kiss would cost him twelvepence to the poor (John Harold Wilson, *The Private Life of Mr. Pepys*, pp. 134–135). Mr. Pepys was a very charitable man. Mrs. Pepys herself in various ways regularly cashed in on her husband's sinning.

What Samuel Pepys represented is moralism. The dictionary definition of moralism is that it is the practice of morality without religion; that is, it is a humanistic and man-centered morality. This definition is not entirely accurate, because moralism has a religious faith, and that religion is humanism. Pepys, for example, wanted to maintain appearances before man and society, and, since he believed he was basically sinning against man, he as man could also make atonement for his sins. Briefly, moralism is man-centered, not God-centered in its conception of sin.

In Pepys we have seen the *negative* side of moralism. Negatively, moralism believes that man can make atonement for his sin, cleanse himself from evil, and right the balance of good and evil. Negatively, the moralist indulges in all kinds of works of atonement as the means of ridding himself from guilt. This is very different from the Biblical law of restitution.

For the Bible, sin is, first of all, against God, in every case. Thus, David, in repenting of his adultery with Bathsheba, said to God, "Against thee, thee only, have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight" (Ps. 51:4). It was God's law David had violated, and, second, God was also his only savior: "Create in me a clean heart, O God; and renew a right spirit within me" (Ps. 51:10). Man is neither creator, lawgiver, nor savior.

Positively, moralism believes that man can save himself and remake himself and the world he lives in. God, if He is acknowledged, is at best a senior partner in this endeavor. Man saves himself and re-creates the world. Socialism is a conspicuous form of moralism, or humanism. It is a religion of salvation by the works of man, the works of the humanistic state. Marxism is thus moralism compounded. And too many "ex-Marxists" are simply rebelling against a particular manifestation of moralism in the name of a purer moralism. A telling example of moralism is a book by Stalin's daughter, Svetlana Alliluyeva, *Twenty Letters to a Friend* (1967). The religion she advocates is a one-world religion; in other words, humanism. She reduces Christianity to total love and total forgiveness. She wants us all to "have faith in the power of decency and goodwill," which is "the same thing" as faith in God (p. 72). In other words, man is the true god, and we must believe in man's essential goodness. Her picture of the Communist leaders is along these lines; all of them, including her father, Joseph Stalin, were good men, filled with zeal and goodwill towards men. The only evil man was Beria, who somehow exploited these simple, decent souls and brought about so much evil. "What sterling, full-blooded people they were, these early knights of the Revolution who carried so much romantic idealism with them to the grave!" (p. 234).

Before we laugh this off, let us remember that Stalin and many others like him saw themselves in these same terms. They were the pure "knights" waging war against the monsters of capitalism and Christianity, and any who opposed them, including their nearest and dearest friends and relatives, immediately became evil. This is *logical*: humanism makes man his own god, and if man is god, then his enemies are devils. And Karl Marx made it clear, in an early writing, that the enemies of the revolution must be seen as devils: it is liberators versus oppressors. All dissent is evil, and opposition must be destroyed.

The religious fanaticism of socialism rests on this faith. It is moralism, and moralism makes man his own god and his own savior. When such a man sins, he can also, like Pepys, right the balances according to his own tastes, twelve-pence a kiss, four shillings for adultery, or what have you. The socialist makes easy amends for his sins according to his own law; and, according to his own law, whoever sins against him must die. He is the law.

The social gospel, modernism, and Arminianism are all moralisms. They believe that man is his own savior by works of law, man's law. The humanism may be dressed up in seemingly Christian language, but its end purpose is the same, to supplant the sovereignty of God with the sovereignty of man.

Liberal politics, too, is simply moralism. Its anti-Christianity is apparent at a number of points. *First*, liberalism holds to the sovereignty of man rather than the sovereignty of God. There can be no reconciliation between these two points of view. Sovereignty is a theological concept: it is an attribute of God alone. For this reason, the word "sovereignty" was strictly avoided in the U.S. Constitution. The entrance of the word came with the rise of Arminianism and Unitarianism.

Second, the characteristic doctrine of liberalism is equality. The Bible is anti-equalitarian. The doctrine of predestination is a total negation of the concept of equality. Modernists often cite Galatians 3:28 as "proof" of equality: "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." Now, the point of this verse, and the entire passage, is simply that, with respect to God, not with respect to human society, all distinctions are equally worthless before God's sovereignty and electing grace. We stand before God in Christ's work, not in terms of human status. In terms of society, we *are* male and female, and many things more, but in terms of God, nothing we are gives us any credit before God: we are saved by grace. This verse, instead of asserting equality, asserts God's sovereign and electing grace.

Third, liberalism tries to build the civil government and the social order on humanism rather than on Scripture. Every civil government is a religious establishment. All civil law rests on moral law, and all moral law presupposes a religion. When a state begins to alter its laws and constitution, it is because it has altered or changed its religion.

Moralism is thus the morality of humanism. It is a works-religion and a works-morality. When such a faith appears within the church, it is not to be regarded as a variation of Christianity but as anti-Christianity. Its goal is always the same: to enthrone man as his own god and savior. It may have a façade and form of Christianity, as Samuel Pepys did, but moralism is always anti-Christian. It tries to set the world right by man-made gimmicks, but, from the Christian perspective, the end of moralism is always immoralism.

The only hope of men and nations is therefore in Christ. "Except the Lord build the house, they labour in vain that build it" (Ps. 127:1).

105

POLITICS AND THEOLOGY

Chalcedon Report No. 105, May 1974

On the last page of *The Cantos of Ezra Pound*, we have a sharp and clear statement:

> That I lost my center fighting the world.
> The Dreams clash and are shattered—
> And that I tried to make a paradiso terrestre.

The last line of all expresses the forlorn hope: "To be men not destroyers." The *Cantos* were written in the bloodiest years of world history, when men were destroyers. Between 1911 and 1945 at least seventy million died in two wars, massacres, famines, and executions. After 1945, in Red China and Africa, as well as elsewhere, the slaughter continued. Men had become destroyers in their attempts to create an earthly paradise.

Earlier, in Canto 74, Pound's massive frustration is expressed in these lines:

> I don't know how humanity stands it
> with a painted paradise at the end of it
> without a painted paradise at the end of it. (p. 136)

Mankind has a dream, derived from Scripture, of a world of peace, in which wars cease, men beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks, and all men live in peace one with another (Isa. 2:1–4, etc.). Wherever this dream goes, men begin to change and to work frantically for the new world order, but, apart from faith, the dream is a frustration and a troubler of man. Life is impossible with this dream, and impossible without it, as Pound saw.

Some, of course, have tried to escape from the dream by a return to primitivism as they imagine it. Walt Whitman, in his well-known lines expressed this hope of escape:

I think I could turn and live with animals, they
    are so placid and self-contain'd;
I stand and look at them long and long.
They do not sweat and whine about their
    condition;
They do not lie awake in the dark and weep
    for their sins;
They do not make me sick discussing their
    duty to God;
Not one is dissatisfied — not one is demented
    with the mania of owning things;
Not one kneels to another, nor to his kind that
    lived thousands of years ago;
Not one is responsible or industrious over the
    whole earth.

Whitman, however, was less than honest. He had not surrendered by any means the dream of an earthly paradise. Not only in "Passage to India," but in poem after poem he celebrated this soon-to-be-realized future. Whitman's hope of realizing an earthly paradise depended on man, more specifically, on awakened man. Man must realize, he believed, that he is an unfallen creature, and man must rouse himself out of the sickness of Christianity into the health of free, natural, uninhibited man. Then, man will enter into perfection. In "A Song," Whitman wrote,

Come, I will make the continent indissoluble;
I will make the most splendid race the sun ever yet shone upon;
I will make divine magnetic lands,
    With the love of comrades,
    With the life-long love of comrades.

Abolish Christianity and the idea of sin, and the natural goodness of men will flower and will create heaven on earth.

In France, George Sand in 1869 wrote, "If one does ill, it is because one is not aware of doing it. Better enlightened, one would never do it again . . . I don't believe it is due to wickedness but to ignorance."

Modern man bought this argument. How easy it was going to be to create an earthly paradise! Simply abandon orthodox Christianity, and educate people out of their erroneous ways. Sin is ignorance, it was held, a lack of proper knowledge and instruction, rather than an evil character and a wilful commission of acts of lawlessness.

The great instrument in this mighty transformation would be the state by means of its control of education. The statist schools, as Horace Mann, James G. Carter, and others, following the example of Prussia,

envisioned, would gradually reduce and eliminate the role of Christianity and stress education as the means of salvation. The problem being ignorance rather than sin, the cure to social problems would be education.

When the products of statist schools have revealed themselves to be barbarians, the answer of the statist educators has been faithful to their presuppositions: they have demanded more money for more education. While the *content* of education has been steadily lowered, the *extent* of education in terms of years in school has been extended. Now many educators believe that every child should have a college education. If the answer to "doing ill" is education, this is a sensible answer, and statist educators are faithful to their humanistic faith. Events, however, have demonstrated that they are disastrously wrong, and the results of their work are the rise of a new barbarism and widespread social disorders.

Walt Whitman's new Adam, who denies the fall and the possibility of sin, is very much with us, and his good news is animalism. A pornographic "underground" paper, which espouses freedom for any and all kinds of voluntary and consenting acts of sex, was attacked recently for being too "puritan." Why? The young man declared, after espousing "free natural animal sex" without any formalities of courtesy or attraction, "You are still imbedded with old wives tales, Mrs. Robinson. You can't have sex without bringing into play fantasy, affection, mother protection, quasi-prostitution (men spending money on dates) and personality and 'in-crowd' cults." Eliminate all attention to personality, and rut in animal fashion, he demanded.

In brief, let there be no principles, and the sexual utopia will arrive. Abolish God and His law from the universe, and men will be at peace. Instead of sin, our problem is ignorance, it is held, ignorance of the fact that there is no sin, no law, no absolutes to limit or govern man. The modern state denies that there is any higher law. A former chief justice of the U.S. Supreme Court asserted, "Nothing is more certain in modern society than the principle that there are no absolutes." These words of Frederick Moore Vinson sum up the credo of the modern state: beyond the state, there is neither a god nor a law.

A problem remains, however, and it is a problem in every modern state, the Soviet Union, the United States of America, and others. The state has denied all absolutes; it has denied God, and it has sought to make itself the new god, and its purposes the new absolutes. Statist trained youth have learned their lesson well, however, and the result is that they are as rebellious against the state as against God, and even more so! By destroying the principle of authority, the state and its schools have destroyed their own authority. By exalting rebellion and revolution into the only

virtues, the state and its schools have created a world programmed for perpetual revolution. The earthly paradise has in fact come to mean total civil war by mankind. The world thus drifts towards a third world war while caught up within by an even deeper war, the isolation of man from man, and the warfare of man against man because no common faith binds them to a higher law, and to each other in terms of the God of that law. The earthly paradise is fast becoming an earthly hell.

St. James declared, "There is one lawgiver, who is able to save and to destroy: who art thou that judgest another?" (James 4:12). All men's attempts to create a law apart from God, or to make judgments apart from Him, are doomed. The only possible order is from God and His law. He alone can destroy evil by His sovereign grace. He is the only lawgiver. Apart from Him, men lose their center: they have no valid principle of judgment, and their efforts collapse finally into anarchy. They may dream, with Ezra Pound, of being "men, not destroyers," but they only become destroyers and ravagers of mankind.

It is only God's grace and God's law which can reconstruct and restore a world ravaged by sin, by man's attempt to be his own god, determining for himself what constitutes good and evil (Gen. 3:5). Erik von Kuehnelt-Leddihn, echoing Proudhon, has pointed out that "at the bottom of politics one always finds theology" (Erik von Kuehnelt-Leddihn, *Leftism* [New Rochelle, NY: Arlington House, 1974], p. 54). The theology at the bottom of our contemporary politics is the theology of humanism, the worship of man.

We cannot have a new politics without a new theology, and the only theology which can provide the needed justice and order is Biblical theology. Our present politics is a product of a bankrupt humanism. Bad as that politics is, men will continue to flounder in the morass of its decay and corruption until they surrender their faith in man for faith in the living and triune God. The renewal of politics is urgently and desperately needed, but it must be preceded by the renewal of Christian faith. This will not come from waiting on the churches but only from the Lord.

106

LAW VERSUS SELF-INTEREST

Chalcedon Report No. 113, January 1975

When Pilate asked Jesus, "What is truth?" (John 18:38), he spoke as a Roman. Guilt or innocence of the charge at hand, he could understand, but the idea of truth was beyond him as too abstract and irrelevant. One of the most ancient premises of Roman law was the declaration, "The health (or welfare) of the people is the highest law." Expediency and pragmatism took priority over all other considerations. The premise of success and advancement in Rome, for individuals and for the state, was threefold: survival, self-gratification, and opportunism.

With the Renaissance and the Enlightenment, the European states began to operate with progressively easier consciences on the classical Roman model. One of the abler statesmen, Lord Palmerston, British Foreign Secretary, was a student of things Roman, and he applied the Roman premise in his famous aphorism: "We have no perpetual allies and we have no perpetual enemies. Our interests are perpetual." Self-interest had become the new law for men and nations, the "higher" law.

This shift from the higher law of God to the higher law of man is a significant one. It comes to focus in part in the idea of laissez-faire. The background of this doctrine is theological: it rests on a belief in the higher law of God. Nonintervention by the state in economics and in other areas rests in origin in a belief that the sovereign and absolute God governs all things by His law. For man to legislate where God has already legislated is not only irrelevant and foolish but also potentially dangerous. After all, one does not legislate laws of physics, biology, or mathematics. To do so is dangerous, as the Soviet Union found out with Lysenko: it can mean disastrous failures in the agricultural realm, or in some other practical realm. Such laws of God await man's discovery, not man's legislation.

This older view led to a secularized version: "Nature" is the source

of this higher law, it was held, and interference with natural harmony makes matters worse. The laws of nature govern all things, and statist tampering with natural harmony leads only to disaster.

The next step was to secularize the matter further: the source of natural harmony is the individual and his self-interest. The best working of society thus rests on the radical self-interest of the individual. Thus, the source of freedom and law shifted from God to nature to man, and then, finally, to the state, the humanistic state, in the twentieth century.

In Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations* (1776), the first three factors, God, Nature, and man were blended and identified. Smith wrote that the individual "generally neither intends to promote the public interest nor knows how much he is promoting it. He intends only his own security, and by directing that industry in such a manner as its produce may be of the greatest value, he intends only his own gain, and he is in this, as in many other cases, led by an invisible hand to promote an end which was no part of his intention." As a defense of the free market, this was hardly accurate. Self-interest, then and now, leads many industrialists and labor unions to prefer the security of subsidies to the free market and to connive against both freedom and law. Moreover, no sooner were freedom and law clearly grounded in man than man shifted it to his agency, the state. John Stuart Mill began by championing a radical concept of liberty for man and concluded by transferring liberty and law to the socialist state.

Not principles but self-interests are perpetual, modern man has held, together with Palmerston, and to maintain the autonomy of man in his self-interest, man has been ready to scrap freedom and law. For the new existentialists, true autonomy means only existence, not essence, not a pattern, purpose, or law, inner or outer, to limit man's autonomy.

The older cry of humanistic man was, "I want to be free," but this has given way, in terms of existentialism, to a new creed, well expressed in the theme of a popular song, "I Wanna Be ME." This ME does not want to be anything except itself: it denies the validity of any objective norm, law, or standard. This ME is in fact at war with all standards: it hates slavery and freedom alike; it hates justice and injustice, and it has only one goal, the destruction of all norms.

The modern state, as it increasingly reflects this existentialist man, also lives for its own sake. Its purpose in politics and economics is meaningless except in terms of its only motive, survival on its own lawless terms. Thus, from a world of natural harmony, we have come to a world of total and natural disharmony and war.

The warning of Isaiah 2:22 still stands: "Cease ye from man, whose breath is in his nostrils: for wherein is he to be accounted of?" Men and

nations who build upon man make their foundation sand. In the storms ahead, they cannot stand (Matt. 7:24–27). Look to your own foundations: do they rest upon sand, upon your own being, or are they established on the Rock?

107

HUMANISTIC DOCTRINES OF SIN

Chalcedon Report No. 174, February 1980

The purpose of all law is to set forth the doctrine of justice or righteousness and to punish injustice or sin. When a society's doctrine of righteousness and sin changes, its laws also change. Every social order has a doctrine of law, of justice and injustice, and the source of that doctrine is in its religion.

In our day, because humanism is the established religion of the modern state, our law is in process of change, because we have a new definition of the meaning of righteousness and of sin. The Biblical doctrine of sin holds that all men are sinners by virtue of their birth into the humanity of Adam. Only by rebirth into the new humanity of Jesus Christ are they transferred to a life of righteousness, although not perfectly sanctified in this lifetime. Thus, sin and righteousness are attributes of birth and rebirth.

Humanism, too, has doctrines of sin by birth. To cite some examples of this, many hold that it is a sin to be born rich, and to remain rich; richness is seen as a form of depravity. The same doctrine holds that to be born into the middle class involves a similar taint which only mass destruction or perhaps reeducation can remove. Likewise, to be born poor is to be born deprived, tainted, and by definition oppressed. It is a taint which for many only revolution or great social upheavals can remove.

But this is not all. There is also added to this burden of guilt a racial guilt. To be born white is held to be an example of sin; it means an immediate inheritance of centuries of supposed guilt, expletive propensities, and assumed arrogance. The white man is told he should feel guilty. The black man has a similar guilt trip laid on him. He is told that he is by nature inferior, or that the white man has made him inferior and exploited him, and that he is a betrayer of his race and destiny if he works, minds

his business, and enjoys life. Wherever he turns, a guilt trip is laid on him. The same is true of every racial and national group; false pride and false guilt are posited, and a false doctrine of sin which blames others for their past, and then for failure to become engines of revolution.

The same is true of the sexes. One feminist leader has written a book on the supposed fact that all men are by nature rapists, and the idiot clergy have given favorable reviews to the book, thereby telling more about themselves than about reality in general. The feminists tell men they are by nature and history guilty, and the women that they are guilty for being women in the Biblical sense. Humanistic male supremacists work to make women feel inferior and guilty, and godly men to feel weak and foolish.

The point is sufficiently clear. All men have a doctrine of sin or injustice. The Bible declares, "sin is the transgression of the law," God's law (1 John 3:4). For the humanist, sin is not an offense against God's unchanging law, but against man's changing standards.

The relief of sin is by law. For the Christian, salvation as received by man is by God's sovereign grace alone, but it is all the same an act of law. The atonement of Jesus Christ is our salvation and justification, and it is the satisfaction of God's unchanging law, of God's death penalty against man. Thus, in the economy of the Trinity, our salvation is an act of law, a fact set forth in the doctrines of atonement and justification. In the experience and life of man, salvation is an act of sovereign grace. Thus, salvation is both an act of law and an act of grace: to deny one part of this fact is to undermine the other.

For humanism, too, salvation is an act of law, but statist law, and it is also an act of grace. The law of the state is a changing law, however. Daily, thousands of pages of new laws are added to city, county, state, and congressional codes, and to the federal register. As against one unchanging book which all can read and understand, we have with humanism a jungle of laws, volume upon volume by the tens of thousands, which none can read in full or understand; courts and commissions regularly alter their meaning, and no man can escape being in violation of many of them. Moreover, the grace of the state is purely external. It grants funds, subsidies, and privileges, but it does not touch the nature of man. By its externalism, it aggravates and feeds man's sin and increases social decadence and disintegration. The humanistic doctrine of law becomes a form of social suicide.

When God declares, "Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate" (2 Cor. 6:17), He did not mean a merely ecclesiastical separation but one governing our total life. Having given us His law, He certainly does not countenance our "concord" with humanistic law.

108

MEDICAL MODEL OR MORAL MODEL?

Chalcedon Report No. 185, January 1981

A law can come to have a radically different content and consequence without a word thereof being changed. All that is needed is a change in the faith which interprets the law. All law is simply an enactment of morality, or the procedural principles of a moral system, and every moral code is an expression of religion. If the religion of a culture changes, either the law changes, or its meaning changes.

Both kinds of change are apparent today, both changes in the meaning of existing laws, and new laws. The faith behind these changes is humanism.

The approach of humanism, as it approaches crime, social disorder, or deviant behavior, is governed by *the medical model*. Such aberrations as are illegal are regarded, not as immoral or sinful, but as a sickness. The problem of criminality thus becomes either a psychiatric or medical problem. We are given endless analyses as to the social causes of theft, rape, murder, alcoholism, drug addiction, and more. The medical model constantly increases the number of "criminal" or deviant offenses. Instead of the limited and fixed number of offenses stated in Biblical law, the medical model has an ever-expanding number of offenses. It becomes a mark of expanding knowledge to identify, catalogue, and legislate about these new social offenses, sicknesses, or diseases.

The medical model governs virtually all statist agencies. The state schools promote the medical model and apply it to student counselling; their teachings on the subject color the thinking of all their students in varying degrees. Prison psychologists and psychiatrists are very much dedicated to the same faith, as are other public agencies, such as welfare or "human resources" departments.

This medical model is no less pervasive in films, television, and fiction

(not to mention nonfiction). Newspaper columnists like Ann Landers apply it wholesale. Unhappily, it is also all too common among certain segments of the clergy.

The menace of the medical model is its destruction of responsibility. If my criminal behavior is not a moral fault in me but a social disease for which a disorderly society is to blame, I am then a victim, not an offender. It is not surprising that, in a generation reared on such a faith, even our criminals write essays indicting society for their crimes!

In terms of Christian faith, however, not only is the medical model wrong, but it is in itself evidence of sin. Scripture sets forth *the moral model*. God's law having been broken, man fell into sin; his problem is not sickness or disease but sin, his moral or ethical rebellion against God and His law. Man's irresponsibility is not due to an immaturity or to sickness but to a moral choice, a decision to be his own god and to determine good and evil for himself (Gen. 3:5).

The medical model sees the problem as a lack, an imbalance, a disease or sickness, or some like problem. The environment of the deviant needs to be made new, not the deviant. The lack must be supplied, i.e., love, learning, housing, and so on. Only so will the deviant be healed and made new. Of course, instead of healing, we have a subsidy to evil, and its proliferation.

The moral model, as set forth in Scripture, calls for moral solutions: regeneration, restitution, chastisement, and so on. The individual is held to be responsible and accountable, not sick nor immature.

The medical model implicitly calls for the elimination of law, and all instruments of law enforcement, and their replacement by the psychologist, sociologist, and their cohorts. The individual at most needs reconditioning in a better environment, not a moral change.

The medical model seeks to get the individual to abandon guilt or condemnation in favor of seeing his problem as purely medical. (Some have inveighed against implying to any degree that venereal diseases can involve immorality; they must be viewed as a sickness purely. In one clinic, a doctor was regarded as having erred very seriously because he said to a girl in for a venereal disease test, "Be good." Ann Landers tells a girl with a serious moral problem, "There are many excellent mental health facilities in your city. I urge you to make an appointment at once.")

Our laws today are under the influence of the medical model to an extensive degree. As a result, we are in the midst, not only of a moral crisis, but a legal crisis. In the medical model, the lawyer and judge must give way to the psychologist and psychiatrist. Lawyers who promote this medical model, and clergymen as well, are furthering this cultural decay

and collapse. (We need to remember that for the past generation, pastoral psychology books, almost all of which promote the medical model, have been the most popular reading with the clergy. Is it any wonder that their parishioners spout humanism without knowing it?)

It must be said that, without a concept of personal responsibility, a culture and civilization will collapse. A moral model is a social necessity, and a moral necessity. The deepening decay of our culture has basic to it the medical model. Men find it easier to claim a sickness, for which society is held responsible, than to affirm a moral model, which requires them to confess, "For I acknowledge my transgressions: and my sin is ever before me. Against thee, thee only, have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight" (Ps. 51:3–4).

109

SIN AND VIRTUE

Chalcedon Report No. 144, August 1977

A number of confused ideas have met repeatedly in history to create a false idea of sin, one which has again and again been destructive of civilization. In the Western world, Neoplatonism, Manicheanism, and various ideas about nature and the natural life have fed this dangerous notion, and, in the Far East, similar tendencies have also prevailed. Rome was dominated by this error, and the hippies of the 1960s believed in it also, as do many radicals, liberals, conservatives, and ecology advocates. This great error involves a false idea of both sin and virtue. Not only humanistic groups and movements, but also the church repeatedly over the centuries, have been dominated by this error.

Very briefly, to cite the Roman statement of it, sin is luxury, and virtue is the simple life.

For Scripture, sin is the desire of man to be his own god, knowing or determining for himself what constitutes good and evil (Gen. 3:5). Man can express this will to autonomy or independence from God, to be his own god, in many ways. He may choose the way of wealth and power, but he can be as guilty as an Alexander the Great or a Stalin and Hitler while seeking his autonomy in a very simple life. The key to sin is not in the outward forms of life but in the nature of the man, in his heart.

In Rome, as in other cultures, this false idea of sin and virtue was suicidal. It meant that every real advance was seen as an evil, and that virtue meant a return to primitivism and poverty. In the modern world, the revival of this doctrine in many quarters has meant that a marked hostility to progress and technology is seen as a sign of virtue. Countless people will argue that the automobile is a disaster to culture, and electricity also. Such people work for zero economic growth, but they actually mean a minus economic "growth," a return to a supposedly ideal primitive past.

Such "moralists" teach people to have a bad conscience about progress, comfort, and wealth. One of our finest Chalcedon friends left an executive position with a small company he led from losses to profits because the new owner regarded the profits he brought about as "obscene." Another such "moralist," a wealthy liberal, was hurt when I reminded him of the luxury he lived in and replied, "Yes, but I don't enjoy it!" He went on to claim that he used his wealth as a trust to help reform society. Because of his false idea of sin, his ideas on reform were false and dangerous.

The founding fathers of socialism were all children of Rousseau in this respect. They looked to the masses for revolutionary fervor and hope because they led "the simple life" and were hence naturally virtuous. In the nineteenth century, a major socialistic movement in Russia was based on this faith: students went to the peasant masses convinced that in them lay the hope of reform, of social salvation.

The Roman historian Tacitus, faced with the problems of Rome, saw the sin as luxury and then idealized a people he knew nothing of, the German tribes, and created the myth of the simple, primitive Teuton and his virtues, which Hitler drew upon centuries later. The American Indian is similarly viewed, not as a decadent people, but as an example of primitive virtue. Many ethnologists and anthropologists are guilty of such thinking. The ecology movement rests on primitivism, on the idea that virtue means the simple life.

Romans like Tacitus could give no answers to the problems of their day, because they misread the problems due to their false doctrines of sin and virtue. The same situation exists today. Virtually all politicians, parties, and reforms are carried on, not in the name of God, but in the name of the people. All political parties make a common claim, namely, that they best represent the people, and therefore they best represent virtue. "The common man," whoever he is, is supposedly the repository and source of virtue because his limited means requires that he live a relatively simple life.

However, in terms of Scripture, no more than wealth can create virtue can poverty or the simple life create virtue. To say that economic want creates virtue is to sentence civilization to death. From the standpoint of Scripture, the rich and the poor are alike sinners. Virtue is not a product of wealth nor of poverty but of grace, the grace of God through Jesus Christ. Now, to say this is not merely to make a theological statement, but also a statement of great importance for economics, politics, law, and education. It tells us at once that all currently reigning theorists are wrong, and that their ideas that economic arrangements are responsible

for sin and virtue are very dangerous notions. On the one hand, we have those who believe that appropriations of money, taxation and public or federal grants, i.e., wealth applied to problems can save society. For us, wealth itself is no evil, but as a savior, it can be made into an evil. On the other hand, others believe that man's salvation requires a return to the simple life, and a casting away of our technological civilization; salvation is in a return, really, to poverty. For us as Christians, poverty in itself is no evil, although any view of it as man's salvation is again ludicrous.

Clearly, the urgent crises of our times cannot be solved as long as men have false and dangerous ideas about sin and virtue. By beginning with false religion, they end in suicidal ideas about the future. Failing to see what the real problem is, they work desperately on answers which are destroying civilization. If wealth is the answer, then attempts at "sharing the wealth" decapitalize society and create conflicts. If poverty is the answer, then society is attempting to liquidate itself and calls suicide life.

Theology is everything, and a false religion is a prescription for suicide and a very present danger.

110

LIBERATION THEOLOGY

Chalcedon Report No. 171, November 1979

Two or three years ago, in response to numerous requests, I passed on to our *Journal of Christian Reconstruction* editor, Gary North, the suggestion that an issue be devoted to the menace of liberation theology, and the Biblical answer to it. Soon thereafter, he reported that liberation theology is so prevalent in all segments of the church that we would virtually have to write such an issue ourselves.

But the requests have continued, especially from foreign students, coming from Asia and Africa, and studying in the United States. Their statements can be summarized thus: American missionaries and theologians, Catholic and Protestant, Reformed, Arminian, or modernist, are almost all teaching envy and greed as well as class hatred, to our peoples. If we try to tell the truth about these things, our American teachers, in colleges, universities, and seminaries, accuse us falsely of representing the rich of our country, although most of us never met a rich man at home, nor until we came to America, where all seem rich to us. (To this can be added the fact that any American, like myself, who attacks liberation theology is accused of being the friend or champion of the wealthy.)

What is liberation theology? *First* of all, it is Marxism transported into theology and missions. It preaches revolution not regeneration. Some of the milder champions want a peaceful social revolution, but, in all cases, regeneration is set aside as a goal, or as a primary goal.

Second, it is held that it is both wrong and even impossible to preach the gospel to hungry peoples. Somehow, all our missionary efforts over the centuries are held to be invalid, because the "central" problem has not been dealt with. That problem is hunger and poverty, not sin. Sin is held to be a class trait, a property of the wealthy and of capitalists, not the poor, the middle classes, and the rich alike. But sin is no respecter of persons!

Third, although poverty is seen as the great and ultimate evil, somehow there is virtue in poverty! Ronald J. Sider, in *Rich Christians in an Age of Hunger: A Biblical Study* (Intervarsity Press, 1977), a book praised by Frank E. Gaebelein and others, asks, "Is God a Marxist?" and the essence of his answer is, "The rich may prosper for a time but eventually God will destroy them; the poor on the other hand, God will exalt" (p. 72). Again and again, this is set forth by Sider as the gospel. If this be true, God is a Marxist!

But Scripture is clear that it is not poverty which is the central problem of mankind and the key evil, but sin, which is "any want of conformity unto, or transgression of, the law of God" (Shorter Catechism, no. 14). Sider thus gives us an alien gospel, one we meet in the devil's demand of our Lord: "If thou be the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread," i.e., minister first to people's poverty, a temptation our Lord rejected, but Sider accepts for Him.

Sider finds "the Jerusalem model" of voluntary sharing, the sale of properties to supply needs, as the Christian ideal. He fails to point out that this was limited to Jerusalem because it was a unique situation, a doomed city. The remaining believers there believed our Lord's prediction of the total destruction of Jerusalem in their lifetime (Matt. 24). They either sold out to move away, or to remain as witnessing missionaries to their own people.

Sider gives promise of treating God's law seriously, only to dismiss it. His treatments of the tithe, gleaning, jubilee, etc., have only one purpose, to develop his concern for the relief of poverty as the heart of salvation, not to point us to obedience to the Lord. Rather, he replaces God's law with his own law, "The graduated tithe and other less modest proposals." He wants us all to be poor, to abandon church buildings, and so on. (His proposals do have some resemblance to the demands made on the church by Red China in the 1950s.)

Sider's proposals are indeed less than modest. When God, who declares that He does not change (Mal. 3:6), gives us His law, it is blasphemy and arrogance for man to set it aside in favor of his own law. Sider defines sin humanistically, in terms of specific outworkings of sin, such as covetousness and greed. But the heart of sin is to be as God, the desire of man to replace God as the determiner of good and evil (Gen. 3:5). To play God, to issue our own moral laws, and to redefine sin humanistically, is lawlessness and sin, however "noble" and humanitarian our purposes may be.

Moreover, Sider's book, and like works, are becoming manuals for a new Phariseeism, a new and high-minded covetousness. As I travel, I

encounter the Siderian commune cultists: young peoples who share housing (a Christian commune), strum a guitar for entertainment and singing, and speak with pharisaic contempt for the lesser breed who live suburban lives of capitalistic greed. (Some of the better meals I have had in the past few years were with such groups; there was no sin in living together and eating well; their sin was their spiritual pride and Phariseeism.)

What are we to seek first, the welfare of the poor, or the Kingdom of God and His righteousness (Matt. 6:33)? The Great Commission does not promise the exaltation of the poor, nor command it, nor does Scripture ever teach us that sin is a class factor. Rather, we are told that "all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God" (Rom. 3:23). It was the habit of the Pharisees to define sin as the mark of a class or a race. At the very least, the new Phariseeism, like the old, rejects Christ for its own wisdom, and, in place of the grace of God, it offers its own plan of salvation. Its end and condemnation are the same.

III

TWENTIETH-CENTURY PLANS OF SALVATION

Chalcedon Report No. 411, October 1999

Over the centuries, a variety of plans of salvation have governed men. The most common in antiquity has been salvation by politics, as in ancient Egypt, Greece, and Rome. The classic statement of this salvation was Plato's *Republic*.

In the twentieth century, this plan has been in full force, and its early prophet was Woodrow Wilson, with his dream of world salvation by means of a world state. Wilson's work was the prelude to the greatest growth of imperialism.

Another twentieth-century plan of salvation has been education, statist, humanistic education, and its prophet was John Dewey. Statist education, he believed, would remake man and create the true humanistic society. World peace and prosperity would prevail.

Other plans of salvation were also in evidence. After prophets Freud and Jung, men would be remade and would learn to live in peace with their sin. Wilson and Dewey hoped to overcome evil by their philosophies, whereas Freud and Jung saw redefining man and sin as the solution.

Other plans of salvation have also been in evidence. As the twenty-first century looms, all are clearly failures. They cannot intelligently nor morally define good or evil, nor successfully change men into a new creation.

The twenty-first century thus begins with a great challenge and a heritage of moral failure, a failure which time and history have not solved, but only magnified. There is no evidence of a resort to the Biblical solution. Salvation is not by human action but by God's grace. Statist grace is, however, what man wants. Every session of a congress or parliament sees billions appropriated as the manifestation of statist grace. Grace is now essentially monetary, rather than religious.

Religions of state, school, money, or the like are proven failures and will be increasingly more so. The world rejects salvation in rejecting Christ.

We need to be speaking openly and freely about false plans of salvation if the twenty-first century is not to be a continuation of the twentieth century, an age of death and tyranny.

It is an error of the twentieth century to limit salvation to man's soul. It means that and much, much more. It is the regeneration, also, of every area of life and thought by the power of God and the submission of all things to the triune God and His law-word. The world has become *catholic* or universal in its claims while the church has become *provincial*. It is time for a change.

112

THE FAILURES OF HUMANISTIC SALVATION

Chalcedon Report No. 127, March 1976

Instead of being depressed by current events, we have every reason as Christians to feel vindicated. On all sides we see the failures of humanistic plans of salvation.

Let us glance at a few examples of such failures. The idea that dollars can save the world is dying a grim and painful death. Billions of dollars have been poured out as a salve for all human ills, and, instead of a grateful and redeemed world, we see in 1976 a far more critical world problem that in 1946. Salvation by military power and interventionism has been tried by most of the great powers with little success as far as man's basic problems are concerned, and with much loss of life and ill will. Both the United States of America and the Soviet Union are now the objects of ill-will and the subjects of self-doubt because of their costly interventionism.

Salvation by psychiatric and psychological rehabilitation has not solved the problem of crime but only aggravated it. Salvation by education, that most popular doctrine, has created instead a generation and more of new barbarians. Salvation by statist law, applied by messianic legislators and judges, is shattering the fabric of society. Salvation by monetary manipulation is destroying money and with it sound economic wealth.

Seeing these things and more should encourage and strengthen our hearts, because they demonstrate the growing decay and collapse of humanism. They stress all the more the need to return to God's plan, redemption through His Son, and then the application of His law, as the ordained plan of conquest whereby covenant man, as God's king, priest, and prophet in Christ, will exercise dominion over every area of life and thought to the glory of the triune God. There is no other valid answer,

and current events are a dramatic demonstration of this. If we are too distressed over these events, we need to ask ourselves the question: are we pulling for the wrong side?

113

PEACE AND SECURITY?

Chalcedon Report No. 82, June 1, 1972

Despite their differences, which are very real, our political left and right have much in common: they are concerned, in varying ways, with peace, and with law and order. The left, militant in its hostility to the war in Vietnam, has international law and order in mind. Granted that many of the recent demonstrations against the war have been communist-controlled (as Mayor Yorty of Los Angeles proved), they clearly have a popular following because the hostility to the war is very deep. The hostility has good constitutional grounds, moreover. According to the U.S. Constitution, a drafted army, or militia, can *only* be used to repel invasion, suppress insurrection, and enforce the laws of the Union, *not* for a foreign war. Those conservatives who favor the war are thus as lax in their use of the Constitution as the U.S. Supreme Court, and they contribute to the erosion of the law.

The conservatives, on the other hand, also want peace, and law and order. They maintain that international law and order depend on defeating communism. Nationally, it means strict law enforcement, and here they are able to score against the left for its lax use of the law and the attendant erosion of the vitality of the law. They can point to the steady disintegration of social order, the increase of crime, and the widely prevalent disrespect for law.

The reigning liberals are no less concerned with peace, and with law and order, although their definitions would not agree with those of the left and right. Their involvement in Vietnam, according to every president from Kennedy to Nixon, has been a peacemaking involvement. Their attempts to gain internal peace are very prominent, although they are in effect the same as their international efforts, namely, to gain peace by buying peace. Concessions are made to the communists, to minority groups,

to capital and to labor, both to buy support and also to buy peace. The principle is simply the old idea that a tiger with a full stomach is safer to live with than a hungry one. The hope, in fact, is that the satiated tiger can be turned into a pussycat with constant stuffing.

But peace on all sides is a common goal, however differently sought. Men are weary with trouble, tension, and the growing lack of safety for man in his own home or on his own street.

This situation is not new. Mattingly gives us a telling insight into the attitude of the people of the Roman Empire:

> Peace is the boon that is most steadily and fervently desired, for on it depend such possibilities of the good life as the Empire can still offer.
>
> Liberty is still valued, but no longer as the supreme good; it is never for long in the foreground . . . The Empire gave stability and rest to a weary and aging world. (Harold Mattingly, *The Man in the Roman Street* [New York, NY: W. W. Norton, 1966], p. 111)

The Romans, Mattingly points out, had "a great absorption in the present with a vast respect for the past." They had less interest in the future. "'The rapture of the forward view' is very hard to find in any corner of the Roman Empire." The Roman concern was to maintain what they had, not to work and plan for a greater future (ibid., pp. 137, 141–142, 149). As a result, despite the lack of any real enemy other than itself, Rome fell. It had only one future-oriented element, the Christians, who then built a new civilization.

The people of Rome wanted peace with law and order, and Rome was less and less able to deliver it. Today, the failure of the state to give peace is everywhere apparent. The goals of most people are limited ones, simply to be given enough law and order to enjoy what they have in peace. If they could turn the clock back twenty years, they would be very happy. But people whose goal is peace rarely enjoy it. Peace is a product of true victory, and law and order cannot flourish unless first of all there is theological law and philosophical order. People today want the fruits of peace, not the roots.

Where people long for peace rather than victory and progress, there also a distorted vision prevails. This distorted vision governed many American writers of the nineteenth century. They had broken with the Puritan faith of their fathers and were hostile to the America it had produced. As a result, many of them could see little good in the United States and everything evil. Still surrounded by forests, streams, and a continent of rich resources, they looked all the same to other shores for their paradise and hope. Herman Melville, in *Clarel,* spoke of Tahiti as the only fit

place on earth for the advent of Christ. But both the authorities Melville used and his own knowledge confirmed the fact that the South Sea Islands were no paradise, less so then than now: the islands were marked, Baird tells us, "by filth and disease, idiocy and cruelty. They had plagues of stinging flies, fetid heat, ordure around the dwelling places, filth and vermin over the food, and so on." William Ellis reported that on an island near Tahiti, he had seen a hungry child given a piece of her own father's flesh for nourishment. Lieutenant Wise, following Melville on Nuku Hiva, saw the chief's brother, drunk with *ava*, "coiled upon a bed of filthy mats, 'half dead with some loathsome disease'" (James Baird, *Ishmael: A Study of the Symbolic Mode in Primitivism* [New York, NY: Harper Torchbooks, 1960], pp. 120–121). Somewhat later, Gauguin, while admitting that Tahitian women were "not beautiful, properly speaking," still held that they had an indefinable quality "of penetrating the mysteries of the infinite" (p. 149). Both Melville and Gauguin failed to see the potentialities of their respective countries and looked for the impossible in the South Seas and imposed their imagination on a world they would not face realistically. This same imposition of dreams on to an ugly reality has been common among travellers to the communist countries: they see no good in their country and see the Marxist states in the light of their imagination.

When men place peace above other considerations, they are unwilling to face up to anything which tells them that their dream is a futile one. They are ready then to compromise truth in order to gain peace, because they are weary of the struggle.

But peace, like happiness, always eludes men when they make it a goal of human endeavor. Peace and happiness are by-products of other goals. We cannot make ourselves truly happy by deciding we need to be happy. Happiness is a product of work well done, of a life lived in successful community, of peace with God, and of much more. Men make happiness a goal when they have failed miserably in all other objectives, and what they then mean by happiness is really a narcotized state wherein they feel no griefs and can enjoy some very limited pleasures of play. Similarly, peace is a by-product of a general success in one's relationships to God and man, in one's calling, and in a confident prospect concerning the future. Peace implies a harmony of affairs and a general harmony of personal and social interests. What most people mean by peace is an attitude of, "Leave me alone, and don't bother me with the problems of the world," or, "Do anything, but get rid of all these problems, and leave me to enjoy myself." Peace in this sense is a retreat. It is more than that: it is a form of suicide, a surrender of life for a retirement to the sidelines of life.

Unfortunately for these people, the world is now moving towards a radical confrontation of man by the basic issues and problems of life. All the postponed problems, the deferred and pressing debts of life, are beginning to fall due and are demanding attention. The luxury of indifference is fast waning. Church members who left the defense of the faith to their clergy are now finding that God is requiring them to defend their faith or to surrender it. The state, which has been promising man more and more cradle-to-grave (or womb-to-tomb) security is less and less able to deliver any kind of security. A radio announcement today by a presidential candidate asked, "Are you tired of phonies in political office? Then vote for me . . ." The appeal of this approach has been great, and the reason is an obvious one. *Any* politician who offers man peace and security will offer thereby a fraudulent claim, so that a contender can always impugn his integrity in order to gain office. He in turn will be regarded as equally a fraud, because no politician can deliver what God Himself alone can give, and does not give more than a limited amount of in this world. Psalm 24:2 tells us something about the world, and our life in it, which men prefer to forget: "For he hath founded it upon the seas, and established it upon the floods." This is a very precarious foundation for life! The seas and the floods are places for alert and steady movement, not a peaceful standing still. History is a battlefield, and it calls for action to victory. There is peace and order in the graveyard, not on the firing line. A culture or civilization which thinks first of peace is most certain to have war and death, because it has lost its will to live.

In the midst of a Roman Empire dedicated to peace and security, oblivious of the future and trying to hold on to the remnants of the past, one element was future-oriented and able to command the day, the Christians. For long years now, the church has been asleep, clergy and laity alike. The widespread apostasy of the clergy is forcing many of the laity out of their slumbers. If the faith is to be defended, they must do it. The result is a spreading revival of doctrinal concern, a reawakening of faith, prayer, and action, and a readiness to stand for the faith which did not exist twenty years ago. The old forms are crumbling, perhaps because they must. Old wineskins cannot contain new wine. The oldest and most worn of the old wineskins is the humanistic state. The state as man's savior has tried desperately to give man that peace and security which its political lullabies have promised; however, even its pampered brats of the academic community are awake and squalling. The things the modern state least provides are those it most promises, peace and security, and, in the growing monetary crisis, its ability to give even a measure of these is limited.

We live in a momentous and exciting era, a turning point in history. Before the healing rains come, the sky always darkens, and the thunder and lightning are very much in evidence. We are not in the wintertime of the world, but in its spring. Wise men will plant for the future.

114

DROP-OUTS AND DROP-INS

Chalcedon Report No. 33, May 9, 1968

A false perspective leads quickly to moral disarmament. If a man sincerely believes in the brotherhood of man, he is morally disarmed as he meets the reality of man's enmities. If a man believes that Martin Luther King Jr. was a basically good man but sometimes misguided, he is morally disarmed in coping with the evil begotten by King.

It is important, therefore, to analyze some of the broad outlines of perspectives. *What are the basic perspectives* which a man can have with respect to our world crisis?

The *first* perspective is that of the *dropouts*. The hippies, of course, come to mind first of all. The hippie holds that all of modern civilization and religion is hypocrisy and fraud; only a fool becomes involved in it and a part of it. The basic act of virtue and of wisdom for the hippie is, therefore, to drop out. The glow of self-righteousness which characterizes all hippies comes from this fact of dropping out: it is a sign of superior wisdom and virtue, and, accordingly, the hippie despises all those who do not share his superior wisdom. The hippie talks about love, but he seethes with hatred for everything in the "square" world; he feels no compunction about exploiting it, defiling it, or destroying it.

A *second* element in the dropout movement is the black "civil rights" champion and revolutionist. The readiness of these people to burn and destroy comes from their hatred of the existing order. But this is not all. The civil rights movement is first and last an anti-black movement, seething with hatred not only for the white man but for the black also. The first targets of burning are usually blacks who are law-abiding and hardworking. In one city, when King was murdered, many blacks sat on their roofs with guns to protect their homes from black revolutionists, while their wives met in prayer meetings, beseeching God's mercy and

protection. The black civil righters have dropped out of American life, white and black; they hate and despise the liberals who aid them, and they spit out contempt for the good men of their own race. They are dropouts. They despise the achievements and morality of Western Christian culture, and their one target is to destroy: "burn, baby, burn."

There are many other varieties of dropouts, but a *third* will suffice to illustrate the nature of the dropout. The leading dropouts are the Marxists. Marx's basic philosophy was a faith in the regenerative power of destruction, the religion of revolution. Marxists are thus dedicated above all else to destruction. The appeal of Marxism to all kinds of dropouts is thus very great. This means, too, that Marxists can exploit dropouts easily because it offers organization to their urge to mass destruction. The hippies, the student rebels (who are dropouts in their own way), and the various radical groups are all easily used by the Marxists to further their dropout goal, the total destruction of the past and of all godly law and order.

The black "civil rights" movement is made to order for the Marxists. In Russia, the Bolsheviks were too few and too "intellectual" to fight a revolution themselves. They had to use dupes to do the job for them. Basic to the revolution was the naval mutiny of the sailors of the Kronstadt fleet. This was the beginning of the collapse of Russia into lawlessness, anarchy, and revolution. The sailors had their grievances; but when it was all over, the settlement the sailors of the Kronstadt fleet received was death for all. February 23–March 17, 1921, marked the mutiny of these sailors against the Bolsheviks; instead of getting their original demands, the sailors were worse off. Their payoff now was death.

The blacks are the modern Kronstadt fleet. They are encouraged and subsidized for violence; and, at the same time, local law enforcement agencies are progressively hamstrung to lead to a federal power over all people in order to "cope" with rioting. The black is made increasingly the object of hatred by the subsidized rioting of some so that the majority of whites will later welcome a socialist power which suppresses the disorders.

The Marxists, as the strongest and most systematic dropouts, cash in on every dropout effort: it all contributes to their ultimate goal of destruction. But many who do not consider themselves Marxists or who are anti-Marxist actually contribute to the Marxists' success. This is done by accepting the basic Marxist premise: environmentalism. The *Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders* (March 1968) blamed the riots, not on hoodlums and revolutionists, but placed the guilt on the law-abiding white population, i.e., on the environment. Now,

there are two steps in settling any problem: *first*, find out what is wrong and who is responsible; *second*, remove the conditions and persons which are responsible. At this point, the commission was not honest. It blamed the white environment. It called for certain corrective actions. But it did not openly state that it was in effect calling for the punishment of the law-abiding white population. By calling for more taxes and more laws, it was instituting repressive measures against those who must pay the taxes and whose freedom of association is limited by the laws.

Now, environmentalism places the blame, not on the guilty parties, but on the human environment and the cultural environment. It condemns that environment and calls for a dropout from it, and then, logically, the destruction of it. The Marxists are the leaders in the world of dropouts: they see the implications most clearly.

The *second* basic perspective can be called that of the *drop-ins*. The drop-in declares that everything is basically fine: all that is needed is a little tinkering, some neat changes here and there, and all will be well.

In analyzing dropouts, we began with the hippies, an adolescent phenomenon. In dealing with the drop-ins, let us begin with another adolescent phenomenon, the great drop-in voice of youth, *Playboy* magazine. The gospel according to *Playboy* is total humanism. Accordingly, *Playboy* is strongly hostile to orthodox Christian faith and morality and wages unceasing warfare against it. For *Playboy* the glory of life is our humanistic culture; get rid of the Christian hangover, get rid of the Internal Revenue Service and the income tax, and get rid of federal snoopers which invade our privacy, and all will be well. Even as Marxism represents a radical humanism, *Playboy* represents a conservative humanism. For both, Biblical Christianity is the enemy. *Playboy's* philosophy presents "the good life" for those who believe in dropping in, in creaming our heritage without any responsibility to it, who want to live well rather than to live responsibly under God.

Another kind of drop-in is to be found among the political liberals and conservatives who believe that with a little tinkering, an election or two, the world will be well. This position is basically rationalistic. It has no sense of roots or life. Some political cure-all is the answer. H. du Berrier has again and again called attention to the fallacy of the liberal rationalists (and radicals) whose cure for Vietnam was to remove the emperor and institute "democracy." But their action has effectively destroyed Vietnam and left it without a principle of authority. We may not like it, but in terms of the religion of these people, the emperor is a divine-human figure and is the source of authority. Take away the emperor, and you take away authority and introduce anarchy. Now, we may

prefer a Christian Vietnam, or a "democratic" and liberal Vietnam, or a conservative republic there: but the reality of Vietnam is that such things cannot have roots there; in the future, perhaps, but not now. Remove the principle of authority, and what are your choices? Anarchy or totalitarian coercion. There is nothing left to hold society together.

Rationalists, conservative and liberal, are ready to dream up ideal schemes to build a new world: a little tinkering or a great tinkering, but always some addition or subtraction, and paradise will come. It's a fine world, say these men: we want it to realize its possibilities. But does paradise come? Unfortunately, the Marxists arrive instead, to cash in on the anarchy.

But these drop-ins refuse to learn. One more tinker, one more election, one more something, and all will be well. The election of Eisenhower, I was told some years ago, would "turn the tide." And not too long ago some people refused to speak to me because I saw no gain in electing Reagan.

The drop-ins refuse to face up to the fact of evil, its deep and religious roots, and its power. Pass a good law or win an election, and does evil go away, or does it not rather move more savagely against you? We are at war, and the basic war is between the Kingdom of God and the Kingdom of Man; and there is no coexistence in that war.

The drop-ins believe that everything is basically well with us, except for their little or big gimmicks. They want to cure cancer with nose drops, whereas the dropouts want to "cure" it with a gun.

How can you deal with the world of the dropouts without seeing its deep roots? Darwin, Marx, and Freud are the shapers of the modern mind and of environmentalism in its present form. Their influence saturates state, church, school, home, society, and both work and play. No law or election can change that fact overnight. It takes the grace of God (conversion) and the response of man (education, instruction, application).

This points us to a *third* perspective, one to counteract moral disarmament: *Christian Reconstruction*. This means facing up to the facts of the situation and recognizing how far gone we are, and it means driving that fact home to people. It means then reeducating and reconstructing society from the ground up. This means Christian schools instead of statist education. It means new and truly Christian churches instead of humanistic ones. It means building from the ground up in politics in terms of Biblical perspectives. It means a Christian economics, godly science, agriculture, and so on. It means the centrality of the family, and it also means a Christian principle of authority as against a humanistic doctrine of authority.

When the dropouts say of our culture that it is sick, they are right; but their answer is to kill the patient. When the drop-ins say they love our culture and want to improve or heal it, we can commend their wishes but not their common sense because cancer is not cured by nose drops, nor glaucoma by eye drops. Whether sincerely held or not, a false perspective leads to moral disarmament. But moral disarmament is a major step towards suicide.

115

PERFECTION VERSUS MATURITY

Chalcedon Report No. 176, April 1980

The Biblical word "perfect" (*teleios*) normally means fully grown, mature. Unfortunately, too often modern man, in reading Scripture, misunderstands it to mean sinless, thus giving it a different meaning. In politics, too, the word has been misunderstood. When the preamble to the U.S. Constitution speaks of "a more perfect union," it refers to a more mature union, not a flawless, sinless estate.

This false demand for perfection is a product of sin. In the Garden of Eden, a sinless place, there was no perfection in the sense of a mature and fully developed order. On the contrary, Adam and Eve faced daily the necessity for hard work in caring for the trees, vines, and vegetables, in developing tools to enable them to do their work, in providing themselves with housing, and so on. Eden was a pilot project: what they learned there was to be applied later to the development of a vast world of wilderness. The world of Eden was sinless, but it was not perfect in the sense of being fully developed. The world was at its beginning, not its end.

Their temptation, and their sin, was to reach out to gain a final result without the intervening work, planning, capitalization, and trial and error learning which was required of them as two novices at every task. The tempter's program was simplicity itself: God is preventing you from realizing your true goals; you can yourselves be gods, knowing or determining good and evil for yourselves (Gen. 3:1–5). Man could become his own lord and creator; he could abolish all evil at will and he could remake the world into a better place for mankind.

Man's solution to his problems was thus not growth and maturation, not work and planning, but rather the attempt as his own god to reorder reality in terms of his own will.

Since then, history has been the repeated attempts of man to legislate

reality into conformity to his will. Problems are not to be dealt with in terms of Eden's "primitive" way but by fiat legislation. The state becomes the great agency whereby man as god seeks to hurl his fiats against the world, demanding that the world be transformed by the will of the state.

As a result, fallen man seeks for the abolition of all evil by means of law. Are there problems sometimes with parents, and in a number of families? Abolish the family. Are there problems in industry, and in the operation of the free market? Control industry, and abolish the free market. The logic leads to a final conclusion: is life a continual problem? Abolish life: suicide answers all questions!

The world, and all things therein, as God created it, was "very good" (Gen. 1:31). Disorder and chaos are products of sin. The very demand for perfection is a creation of chaos and confusion.

Men, however, are now accustomed to regarding their desires for perfection as legitimate demands to make on God, man, and society. What do I need, they ask, to enrich my life and give me what I believe is necessary for self-realization? Is it more money, a new home, husband, wife, children, or another job? Then God and life must supply it, or else we will "punish" God and man by being miserable, sulky, and petty!

This is clearly the attitude of all too many people. A very large percentage of all pastoral, psychological, and personnel problems have their roots in such demands. All too many people throw a tantrum and expect the world to come to a halt with an awed hush, and then jump to do their will! Even worse, such people, with their demands for perfection, do more than mess up their own lives and the lives of all who are near them. They are all too often effective in other arenas as well. They are citizens, church members, workers, executives, union members, corporation council members, and more. The demand for perfection now is carried into one sphere after another.

The result is tantrum legislation to satisfy those who scream the loudest. Tantrum legislation seeks to bypass human factors and relationships, as well as work and forethought, to give man instant utopia. The result instead is the march of hell, which, like the Sahara and its winds, erodes everything it touches.

Perfection, as maturity, is not a product of legislation but of growth, faith, and work. Humanistic law has too long been loaded with all kinds of utopian expectations and has been a fertile source of increasing disorder. Laws whose premise is a radical immaturity as well as a sinful rebellion against God can contribute nothing to society except more erosion.

The very ancient definition of *tyrant* in Greek was one who rules without God. Humanistic law is tyranny.

116

SABBATH OR REVOLUTION

Chalcedon Report No. 343, February 1994

Some years ago, I knew for a time a man who was a fanatical Sabbatarian. What his theology was, none really knew. He had reduced faith and morality to Sabbath observances and little more. I cite this to make it clear that such a person is not truly a Sabbatarian. He was a tense, humorless, and nervous man. Now, the Sabbath means rest, *rest in the Lord*, whereas his sabbaths were simply a set of strict rules for himself and the family. During the week, they were all lacking in Christian virtues.

The Sabbath means resting in the Lord. It is the recognition that our lives and times are totally in God's hands. We therefore, week by week, take hands off our lives and work in terms of our faith. We acknowledge that our times are in the Lord's hands and better there than in our own. We rest in the Lord, in the confidence of His government. We affirm thereby, "Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world" (Acts 15:18). The Lord is better able to care for our future than we are; thus we can commit our lives into His hands. We can say with David, "I will both lay me down in peace, and sleep: for thou, Lord, only makest me dwell in safety" (Ps. 4:8).

If we lack this faith, if we have no true Sabbath, then everything depends on us, and this makes us *restless*. We then believe that there is no future for us unless we plan and control every factor. This leads to a condition described by the old saying, "Why pray when you can worry?" If *everything* depends on you, then you have every reason to worry!

Today, belief in God's providence and predestination is not common, and restless, nervous, impatient activity is very prevalent. The 1930s were a time of depression economically, and most people were poor. All the same, it was time of much laughter and song. People sang in cars, in buses, and everywhere. Boys whistled as they walked, and some were

excellent at whistling tunes. Life was not easy, but it was still good. The Depression increased church attendance, and faith gave to many a greater strength.

Revolution is a reaction of despair and anger at events. Revolutionists believe that the answers lie in violence, in destruction, and in hostilities. Revolutionists believe that just beyond the revolution lies utopia: kill off the enemies, and all will be well. Instead, things become dramatically worse. The instant solutions which the revolutionists believe in do not arrive, and so the blame for this is imposed on some group. Their execution does not solve the matter, and so more murders follow. "But the wicked are like the troubled sea, when it cannot rest, whose waters cast up mire and dirt. There is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked" (Isa. 57:20–21).

The revolutionist has no Sabbath, but he dreams of creating a national or a worldwide Sabbath by revolution. This means killing off all who dispute his world-revolution or world-Sabbath dream.

Lenin and his associates believed that, when they took over Russia, the perfect society would flower with the death of the people of the old order. The radical and vicious bloodletting only led to greater problems, and so the dream of utopia was postponed until the world revolution would occur.

The goal of world peace and justice is basic to the Bible, but its attainment comes only by the regeneration of humanity. Fallen men can only create an evil "society," a fact which our politicians studiously ignore. Criminals within a prison establish a nightmarish world. Outside the prison, Christians provide a restraining force that prevents the world outside the prison from becoming similar in kind and degree to the prison world. As the Christian influence on society has waned, our civil societies have become more and more tilted to injustice and evil.

And *rest* is gone. We have become a tense and joyless people because we have no rest. We have become in effect revolutionists because we believe in quick "solutions," not in patient work to conform ourselves and our world to God's royal Son and His law-word.

False theologies, and weak theologies, have taken the Sabbath rest out of the lives of churches and church members. We have, in effect, chosen revolution over the Sabbath. Revolutions seek quick answers but gain quick deaths.

Well, what do we want, Sabbath or revolution? The Lord will give us what we really want. The Sabbath means a patient faith, working and waiting on God. Revolution means a lust for quick answers, and the results are deadly. Make up your mind. Do you want God's true Sabbath or man's revolution?

117

UTOPIA

Chalcedon Report No. 90, February 1973

A particular type of literature marked the beginning of the modern age, utopianism. One writer and scholar after another gave his version of the City of Man, the man-created and man-planned society of the future. Thomas More, Francis Bacon, Campanella, Harrington, and many others wrote their accounts of how the world could be remade by man into a paradise (see R. J. Rushdoony, *The One and the Many* [Nutley, NJ: The Craig Press, 1971], pp. 266–276).

There had been no need for utopias in preceding centuries. Christian man already had his blueprint for the future in Scripture, and the way thereto, by faith and by obedience to God's law-word, was clearly set forth. The utopias of the Renaissance expressed a new hope, and they looked to another god, the state. By capturing the state, philosopher-kings could remake man and society into a happy and perfect order of life. The utopias were in part tracts aimed at persuading rulers and statesmen to allow their humanist scholars to guide them and the nations into the promised land.

Van Riessen, in an excellent chapter on "Utopias," commented, "The Utopians are driven by homesickness for the lost paradise, and long for the new earth. Their dreams are utopias, 'never to be realized,' because they seek a road to such a paradise that does not pass along the station of the fall into sin" (H. Van Riessen, *The Society of the Future* [Philadelphia, PA: Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Co., (1957) 1972], p. 38). Man is not seen as a sinner, nor does man need a Savior; man's need is for the expert, the elite mind, to take over man's life and all society and to reorganize all things in terms of his wisdom. Man, especially elite man, is beyond good and evil. Man must become his own maker, and, in terms of the thinking of his philosophical and scientific elite, rethink all things

and redefine the public good, happiness, profit, and justice. Van Riessen observed of Plato's *Republic*, the model of all utopias: "The argument of the 'Republic' boils down to the contention that an ideal just communal life can be obtained, and existing deficiencies and injustices can be corrected simply by permitting the state to *organize* society in terms of its own *conception of justice*. This is the key to *Plato's* reasoning; it is the basis of all utopias, including present day socialistic proposals. *Sin* in society is to be overcome, paradise regained, an ideal state established, simply by employing *human power*, in the *central organization of society*. Life is not to be redeemed by the Messiah but by man!" (ibid., p. 39).

For utopian thinkers, the problems of man can all be solved by a different arrangement of things. Thomas More was close to the heart of all such utopianism when he located sin in the private ownership of property; abolish private ownership, and man's problems and misery will disappear. Bacon added another central theme to the utopian myth: the scientific elite as the central planning agency to ensure a perfect society. The way was prepared by More, Bacon, and others for the communist theoreticians, for Proudhon, who held that "ownership is theft," and Karl Marx, who made "science" basic to his utopianism.

At the same time, however, other humanists were beginning to torpedo their own hope. Nietzsche, as utopian as any, in his disillusionment and bitterness wrote the finish to utopianism by admitting that man is a beast of prey ruled by the will to power. He tried vainly to use this fact constructively but could not: it led only to nihilism. H. G. Wells, in *The Time Machine*, saw the future as a perverted one, with security destroying most men, and the will to power destroying their rulers. Forster's *Celestial Omnibus* foresaw man's doom as scientific socialist man became the slave of his own creation, the machine.

Even more devastating a picture was Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* (1932), which saw a statist future in which man surrendered his freedom for a drug-controlled euphoria. Man in his brave new world lives only for today as a total existentialist. His slogans include, with regard to sex, "Do not put off till tomorrow the fun you can have today"; "Civilization is sterilization"; "Everyone belongs to everyone else," and so on. A ruler in this world is of the opinion that God exists (the people are kept from all knowledge of God), but God is not to be spoken of in a statist society: "God is not compatible with machinery, scientific medicine and universal happiness." God is therefore replaced with Henry Ford as the originator of the assembly line.

George Orwell, in *1984* (1949), saw the future in terms of Nietzsche's will to power. The goal of the state is not man's happiness but power.

Power means "inflicting pain and humiliation. Power is in tearing human minds to pieces and putting them together again in new shapes of your own choosing... If you want a picture of the future, imagine a boot stamping on a human face — forever" (p. 203).

According to Roland Huntford, in *The New Totalitarian*, we have the *Brave New World* in Sweden, and *1984* in the Soviet Union.

Other writers continued in the same vein, seeing only disaster ahead as a result of utopianism. Thus, Constantine Fitzgibbon, in *When the Kissing Had to Stop,* gives a chilling picture of the hypocrisy and inability to face reality on the part of the Utopians (Constantine Fitzgibbon, *When the Kissing Had to Stop* [New Rochelle, NY: Arlington House (1960) 1973). The more deeply men commit themselves to the utopian dream, the less able are they to recognize their own depravity. The equation is a simple-minded and pharisaic one: I want what is best for humanity, and my idea of a peace-loving socialist state is the best and most moral order; therefore, I am the best and most moral of men.

Elliott Baker, in *A Fine Madness* (1964), gives us another glimpse of the uses of power: a psychiatrist uses his position to perform a lobotomy on his wife's lover. This kind of tale right-wingers were discussing as a possibility; now a writer from another camp saw it as a logical aspect of the developing social order. The future was no longer seen as a new paradise, but as a nightmare.

A telling account of the future as nightmare is a tale written not too long before the Russian Revolution of 1917 by Valery Brussof, *The Republic of the Southern Cross*. The setting is an ideal socialistic republic, built sometime in the future at the South Pole. Star City, the capitol, is exactly at the pole, but no star is visible, because it is covered by an immense opaque roof. Everything works to perfection in terms of democratic socialist planning; everything is uniform (clothing, buildings) and standard in construction, but all are happy, since all their wants are met. The secret police were a real force, but men were gently conditioned into the right paths. The Republic of the Southern Cross was the dream utopia realized. Suddenly it collapses into anarchy as a mental malady overcomes everyone, *mania contradicens*, with people contradicting themselves. The stricken, instead of saying "yes," say "no"; wishing to say caressing words, they splutter hate and abuse. Nurses cut the throats of children. A concert violinist begins to scratch out dissonance. People abandon their homes in fear of the mobs. Youth runs wild, and their mothers do the same. "The moral sense of the people declined with astonishing rapidity. Culture slipped from off these people like a delicate bark, and revealed man, wild and naked, the man-beast as he was. All sense of right was

lost, force alone was acknowledged. For women, the only law became that of desire and indulgence." In the anarchy, "cannibalism took place" (Valery Brussof, *The Republic of the Southern Cross* [New York, NY: Robert M. McBride & Company, 1919], p. 25). A socialist society which ruled in terms of power (the Republic began as a large steel plant) and bypasses morality soon finds itself faced, Brussof showed, with an amoral people who become the voice of raw, anarchistic power, and the result is a vast and nightmarish blood-hunt. Organized power is contradicted by anarchistic power. The only reality recognized by the socialist state is power: it finally leaves nothing in the minds and lives of the people but the lust for contradicting power.

Brussof wrote his tale in the form of a news report by a writer piecing together stray pieces of information from the outside, and the picture which emerges is of startling depravity. The fiction writers, champions of man's goodness have turned into reporters of his depravity and sin!

Now, from the world of reality comes another telling report, J. A. Parker's *Angela Davis: The Making of a Revolutionary* (New Rochelle, NY: Arlington House, 1973). Parker writes as a Christian, one who cites the works of J. Gresham Machen as the great influence in his life. He cites evidence for the fact that revolutionists like the Jackson brothers were from a comfortable and good background, if anything, overprotected and overindulged. The problem is not one of injustice but a contempt of truth and a search for power, which, according to Mao Tse-tung, comes "out of the barrel of a gun" (p. 104). Language is used as a tool for power (p. 150). The appeal of the left, of Marxism and its examples in China and Russia, is not primarily for the dream of justice, but far more plainly in terms of the lust for power. This lust for power is motivated by a radical hatred and a contempt rather than a love of either the truth or of people. The only proper goal as held and visualized by these people is a revolution, "completely destroying the American social, political and economic fabric and replacing it with one designed by the Communist Party" (p. 77).

The modern humanistic state has abandoned Christianity; it believes in a planning economy, *in technological rather than moral answers*. It thus operates on a power basis, very rigorously under Marxism and less rigorously by far in the democracies, but, as the socialism of the democracies increases, the rigor and the control increases. On both sides of the Iron Curtain, the *mania contradicens*, the contradiction of amoral power by amoral power, is increasing.

The humanists everywhere, *in* the establishments and at war with the establishments, have denied the doctrine of original sin, but they have

become prime examples of it! Their own literature testifies to this fact. They refuse, however, to take the logical step and to declare that this is sin, and it is exactly what Scripture says it is. To say so would require them logically to add that man needs the Savior. This they cannot and will not say, because for them, their savior is the state, and the state is already on the scene. Their alternative to the state is anarchistic man, but Nietzsche has already described him as a beast of prey, driven by the will to power. Dostoyevsky saw it clearly in his novel, *The Possessed*, a biting indictment of revolutionary socialism. The gods of modern man are really devils.

Van Riessen, in criticizing Orwell's thesis in *1984*, saw the issue clearly. However idealistic Orwell was, "His conception is that of a negative freedom, a freedom from tyranny . . . Orwell can oppose a nihilism of power by substituting for it the nihilism of freedom, the nihilism of Sartre. Therefore he cannot 'stand firm' in his freedom (Galatians 5:1)" (*Society of the Future*, p. 66). Utopianism is dying, and its hopes and dreams have turned into a nightmare. But the dreamers of utopia can only awaken from that nightmare through Christ.

When a man awakens from a bad dream, it is often more real to him for a brief while than the reality around him, his home, familiar room, the slumbering dog at the side of his bed, and the familiar sound of the clock. Then, after a few minutes or more, the nightmare has so faded that by morning he cannot even recall what it was. So it is with a culture. When men break with a culture, when its dream world of ideas suddenly loses all hold on them, its reality rapidly fades away.

St. Paul summoned men to break with the dream world of their day, saying, "Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light" (Eph. 5:14). This is our task: scatter the nightmare, and bring in the Light.

118

STERILE PROTEST AND PRODUCTIVE WORK

Chalcedon Report No. 91, March 1973

One of the key factors in any era is the attitude of the people. Men have often put up with great evils because they have been loyal to the system, and yet at other times men have resented trifles because of their hostility to the order, or because of their own inner restlessness.

An interesting example of this is England after the Black Death. An intense discontent followed as the old order disintegrated and men felt out of place in the new. According to Sir Arthur Bryant, "Everyone tended to blame someone else for his sufferings." A vivid expression of this discontent was William Langland's *Piers Plowman*, often called "The Vision of a People's Christ." *Piers Plowman* depicts corruption in church and state and contrasted undeserved wealth with undeserved destitution. Langland's poem presented a mild and reforming view which soon gave way to more radical answers. The later defrocked priest, John Ball, declared, "Things will never go well in England so long as goods be not in common and so long as their be villeins (serfs) and gentlemen. By what right are they whom we call lords greater than we? . . . We are formed in Christ's likeness and they treat us like beasts."

One of the most important ideas in the Western European tradition, one which has been especially important in England, Scotland, and the United States, is the medieval doctrine that "law is not law unless it is the voice of equity" (Gervase Mathew). From John of Salisbury to Langland, this was a powerful concept. It was basic to the outlook of John Knox in Scotland at a later date, and again important in the American colonies. Both a great measure of the vitality and progress of the West has been due to this concept as well as much of its troubles. Our Western liberties are rooted in this concept, and also many civil disobedience movements and

revolutionary parties. One of those who misused the doctrine was John Ball. The monastic chronicler Walsingham tells us that Ball preached "those things which he knew would be pleasing to the common people, speaking evil both of ecclesiastical and temporal lords, and won the goodwill of the common people rather than merit in the sight of God. For he taught that tithes ought not to be paid unless he who gave them was richer than the person who received them. He also taught that tithes and oblations should be withheld if the parishioner was known to be a better man than the priest."

The age of Richard II (1367–1400) had real evils and problems to contend with. Du Boulay has declared, however, that the era did see economic and social advances. The problem lay elsewhere. The authorities did not take the dissatisfaction of the people seriously, and the people now did not view matters theologically. The appeal of John Ball was a humanistic one; it was not the relationship of rulers and people to God's law that he stressed, but the questions of wealth and status. The result was a rebellion, and the people, who had begun with *Piers Plowman*, the "People's Christ," chose as their leader Wat Tyler, an ex-soldier who had since then been earning his living by highway robbery.

A contemporary chronicler wrote of John Ball's program for the insurgents: "He strove to prove that from the beginning all men were created equal by nature, and that servitude had been introduced by the unjust oppression of wicked men against God's will, for if it had pleased Him to create serfs, surely in the beginning of the world He would have decreed who was to be a serf and who a lord... Wherefore they should be prudent men, and, with the love of a good husbandman tilling his fields and uprooting and destroying the tares which choke the grain, they should hasten to do the following things. First, they should kill the great lords of the kingdom; second, they should slay lawyers, judges and jurors; finally, they should root out all those whom they knew to be likely to be harmful to the commonwealth in future. Thus they would obtain peace and security, for, when the great ones had been removed, there would be equal liberty and nobility and dignity and power for all." The chronicler added, "When he had preached this and much other madness, the commons held him in such high favor that they acclaimed him the future archbishop and chancellor of the realm."

John Ball's program has a familiar ring. *First*, it was a gospel of salvation by equality. *Second*, evil was seen as the characteristic of a particular class, and a theory of class conflict was preached. *Third*, to solve society's problems, Ball held, eliminate the evil class and all will be well. The call for justice had now become a cry for mass murder as the way of salvation.

The ruling classes responded with no less a fallacious doctrine. *First*, it was progressively held that virtue and power were a class monopoly, and the monarchy claimed more and more of this for itself in the succeeding generations. *Second*, evil was seen as the especial property of the lowborn, especially those who might speak of equality in any sense. The word *villein*, meaning serf (and related to village), came to be our modern word *villain*. The common people were villains, thieves, and robbers. In our day, race has intensified this idea. *Third*, to solve society's problem, it was held that it was important for the right people to rule. *Fourth*, as against John Ball's idea of salvation by mass executions, the rulers held to salvation by legislation. In 1349 and 1350 attempts were made to freeze wages and control labor. However, as Du Boulay noted, "solemn laws do not stem such rising tides" (see F. R. H. Du Boulay, *An Age of Ambition* [New York, NY: Viking Press, 1970]; Gervase Mathew, *The Court of Richard II* [New York, NY: Norton, 1968]; Sir Arthur Bryant, *The Fire and the Rose* [Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966]).

Then as now, society floundered from crisis to crisis, searching for answers. It looked, however, for both problems and answers in the wrong place, and hence aggravated its problems. Both the rulers and the ruled were clearly a part of the problem rather than the answer. Sir Arthur Bryant called the problem "spiritual" and a "sickness of soul." The peasants resented the controls over them, and yet also demanded that something be done for them, and the same attitude marks our own day, and with far less excuse. Andrews has observed that, "The power to do things for you is also the power to do things to you" (p. 33). In every era, to ask for benefits is to ask for bondage. The origin of serfdom was in the Roman Empire. In exchange for cradle-to-grave security, people surrendered themselves and their possessions to the imperial estates and called it salvation. As Ramsay stated it, "The 'Salvation' of Jesus and Paul was freedom: the 'Salvation' of the Imperial system was serfdom" (Sir W. M. Ramsay, "The Imperial Salvation," in his *Bearing of Recent Discovery on the Trustworthiness of the New Testament* [London, England: Hodder and Stoughton, (1915) 1920], p. 198). Salvation is still seen as serfdom, as cradle-to-grave security, by all too many people.

The theoreticians of statism do understand one fact, as Andrews noted, and it is this: "Work is Power, and the modern trend is of necessity to subject power to increased social regulation and supervision" (Matthew Page Andrews, *Social Planning by Frontier Thinkers* [New York, NY: Richard R. Smith, 1944], p. 57). Exactly. Work is power, and, properly understood and directed, is essential and basic to God's Kingdom and man's exercise of dominion under God. The control of the future always

depends to a large degree on motivating and governing work. If the state governs work, then we have a statist order and a decline of social energy as men sullenly withhold cooperation from the state, as in the Marxist empires. If men govern their work, then men are as powerful as the motives which provide the fuel for their work.

But men who have the malaise and "sickness of soul" Bryant spoke of are better at sterile protest than at productive work. Moreover, then as now, there is a strong correlation between protest, lawlessness, and theft. The connection is a logical and natural one. When a man wants things on demand rather than in return for work, theft is a logical consequence of his demands.

The sins of the rulers are no less, and, in fact, are greater. The prophet Ezekiel gives us God's indictment of the rulers of Israel, saying, "The diseased have ye not strengthened, neither have ye healed that which was sick, neither have ye bound up that which was broken, neither have ye brought again that which was driven away, neither have ye sought that which was lost; but with force and with cruelty have ye ruled them" (Ezek. 34:4). Instead of being shepherds protecting the flock from hostile forces, the rulers have been wolves, preying on them. As in the fourteenth century, rulers offer laws as the solution to problems they have helped to create.

The great sin of the modern state and its theoreticians is the pretense of moral and religious neutrality, whereby humanism has been introduced as the new value and the new established religion. However, as Orton observed, "It is simply impossible to maintain, in either pure theory, or practice, that the state is by nature amoral — that is, morally neuter" (p. 24). Moreover, Orton pointed out, "every major political system rests on an act of affirmation as to the nature of man . . . The affirmation it embodies is therefore by nature moral rather than political or economic" (p. 55). It follows that, "The central concern of the state is therefore, in the widest sense, justice; not power; not even prosperity. The state is the social structure through which our sense of right becomes articulate and effective" (p. 59). The state in its law structure is a theological establishment. It represents a doctrine of man, law, and ultimacy. The control of the state today by "organized atheism" is simply a new form of religious establishment. "In the sphere of values it is simply not possible to be neutral — neither individually nor collectively" (William Aylott Orton, *The Economic Role of the State* [Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1950], pp. 31–32). One more important comment from Orton: "For it is the essence of the Christian position that there are limits both extensive and intensive to the scope and exercise of secular authority. I do not need

to remind the reader of the history of this issue; but I do need to emphasize the fact that it is a uniquely Christian tradition and that, whenever and wherever it is denied, the community ceases in both theory and practice to be Christian. Its values as well as its policies undergo a radical change" (p. 29).

It is this change we have been undergoing since the Enlightenment of the eighteenth century, and we now are approaching its end results. The future will not be commanded by protest; then, in the fourteenth century, as now in the twentieth, it is sterile and destructive. Similarly, barren statist power is again effective only in controls and destruction. Only as our thinking, our faith, and our values are again informed and governed by the Word of God, and only as we recognize again that work is power, and we work productively and effectively in terms of freedom under God, will we again have the motive force to redirect men and nations. Sterile men are governed by their fears and hates. Productive men are governed by a faith for living.

119

DISPOSABLE MAN OR DOMINION MAN?

Chalcedon Report No. 125, January 1976

The struggle to command history is an intense one in our day, with a variety of groups contending for mastery, some essentially political in organization and others religious. This struggle for power in history is the attempt by men to impose their ideas and plans on to history and to redirect the world in terms of their purposes.

There are two aspects to history that men can neglect only at the risk of becoming a failure in history. These are *permanence* and *change*. By *permanence* we mean those standards and values which are eternal in nature and absolute, God-given and unchanging. Direction and meaning are given to history by the absolutes which govern it. God as the Lord of history and the Maker of all things alone can give an unchanging and absolute law to it. *Change* has reference to development and program within history. Change is possible because permanence is basic to it, i.e., there are standards and absolutes which require that men and nations repent, grow, develop, and mature. To deny either permanence or change is to become eventually irrelevant to history. Old China once was ahead of the West, but its acceptance of total relativism meant a denial that absolutes exist; Taoism and Confucianism, and, later, Buddhism, denied absolutes and all permanence. In so doing, they made change meaningless, because there was then no standard which required change. As a result, Chinese civilization stagnated, except where conquerors briefly imposed their will on it. Relativism destroyed the meaning of both permanence and change.

In the Western world, the church has too often been infected by Neoplatonism and has not seen the necessity of change and has stressed essentially permanence. The result of such faith has been to make the church irrelevant. The same has been true too often of political conservatives. They have stressed permanence and resisted change. Moreover, their idea

of permanence has been commonly defective, humanistic rather than godly. By permanence they have been prone to mean simply the world up to yesterday, not the Lord and His Word.

Liberals and radicals, political and religious, have stressed change, and this has given them a great advantage in capturing the mind and imagination of youth. The idealism of youth and its dissatisfaction with accepted evils leads it to an uncritical demand for change, and the result is a boon to the prophets of change. Since change is inevitable, the champions of change come to believe in the inevitability of their doctrine of change, an entirely different matter. Moreover, change is mistakenly identified with progress, whereas some changes are an obstacle to progress. Furthermore, faith in change breaks down when a society loses its trust in absolutes. Nothing then has meaning, and change and permanence are alike meaningless and empty concepts.

Biblical faith alone does justice to both permanence and change. It declares the triune God to be the sole and absolute source of all true law, interpretation, and meaning. It is He who creates, predestines, and governs all creation and history. Change is required by His Word. *First*, man must subdue the earth and exercise dominion over it under God and in terms of His Word (Gen. 1:26–28). This requires change, development, and growth. *Second*, His Word requires change within ourselves, since we are fallen creatures and cannot put our creation mandate properly into force apart from His regenerating power. Change is thus required of both man and his world in terms of God's law and calling. Only Biblical faith does justice to history's requirements for permanence and change.

The duty of the Christian is thus to know and understand the word of permanence, God's Word, and to apply its requirements of change to himself and the world, and to every area and aspect thereof. This means godly reconstruction.

Non-Christian thought cannot do justice to history. It can only prevail for a time where the church defaults and defects from Biblical faith. In our time in particular, political and religious groups are increasingly incompetent in their grasp of history, in their defective views of permanence, and change. Having forsaken God, they have forsaken the command of history, and the result is our growing collapse and the rudderless drift of the nations from one crisis into another. Men do not command history now but are more and more commanded by it. The mood of men becomes one of irrelevance and impotence. Instead of God's dominion man, we have instead our modern disposable man, whose function is trifling and whose life is readily dispensable.

God did not make man to be disposable. The idea of disposable man

is a human creation, and a deadly one. God created man in His own image to be the lord of creation under God, to exercise dominion. Man was given estate and calling and made the crown of creation. God made man the necessary point in history, the bearer of God's plan, and He made the incarnation a means of recalling and regenerating man in terms of His purpose and plan.

The future, then, cannot be in doubt. Dominion man will prevail over disposable man. The issue, then, is us: which man are we? Disposable man, or dominion man?

120

OUR MAN-CENTERED FOLLY

Chalcedon Report No. 359, June 1995

A man, a devout and earnest churchman, believes that God has appointed men to govern in the various spheres of life, and his attitude towards his wife and family is that it is their duty to serve him. He has converted the doctrine of headship into a self-serving and false idea. The purpose of authority and headship must always be service (Matt. 20:25–28; Mark 10:42–45), but not so with him.

A minster's wife is regularly incensed at all he does for the parishioners. She accuses him of putting his work ahead of her. It only infuriates her when he says, "You are to be my helpmeet in my calling, which is not to cater to you." Because of her tantrums, he is going into premature retirement.

A child who seems to believe that all the brats portrayed on film and on television are the best role models makes one's visiting his parents a problem. Because of the parents' eminence, few dare to comment on the child's behavior.

In all three of these incidents, which can be multiplied endlessly, there is a common thread, original sin. Original sin is set forth in Genesis 3:5; it is man's will to be his own god, determining or choosing for himself, what constitutes law, morality, and good and evil. Original sin is taught in many state schools and is called "values clarification," i.e., everyone decides for himself what values to live by. This was the tempter's program for man's freedom in the Garden of Eden, and it is still his program. Its lure is stronger than ever as man dreams of using technology to create his new paradise without God.

The issue in history is basically this: one God, or many gods? How can gods many live in peace when each insists, "My will be done"? Each year I learn of more and more human disasters as men, in the church and out of it, insist that their will must be done.

To eliminate international conflicts, twice in my lifetime nations have tried to unite in an international organization, *first*, the League of Nations, which is not yet dead, and, *second*, the United Nations. The fallacy of these efforts has been the fact that coming together has not changed the nature of any country, nor any man. They remain sinners. Marriage does not convert a man and a woman from sinners into saints. If coming together could do that, polygamy or polyandry would cure human problems! False unions only aggravate problems.

We live in a world with many gods and therefore many problems. There is much talk about brotherly love when what we see is a widespread and senseless hatred. At its extreme, we have sociopaths, or, psychopaths, who cannot see any moral restraints as binding upon them. Their appearance and prevalence in our time is evidence that the Biblical, moral, and legal ties that governed men under God have eroded. Our times are resembling the days of the Biblical judges. "In those days there was no king in Israel [God was not acknowledged the king]: every man did that which was right in his own eyes" (Judg. 21:25).

One scholar concluded his account of World War I by speaking of "man's long, slow, faltering progress upward from the primordial slime." The problem with his perspective is that he cannot define "progress." Is it to outgrow war? What, then, of the greater slaughter of the unborn? Is it to value life? Who can say, without God, that life is good? More than one Eastern religion sees life as a curse.

Without the God of Scripture, we have the collapse of all values into totally subjective opinions. If man denies the Bible, and the God of the Bible, the logical alternative is the total demoralism of the Marquis de Sade.

Outside the doors of the church, and all too often within, there is a major erosion of faith and morality under way. For fear of offending the world, too many churchmen soft-pedal the offense of the faith, hoping thereby to win some over to their side. But the offense of the faith to fallen man cannot be long concealed. The Word of God is an indictment of us all; it is very often a distressing book as it tells us we are sinners, and that in us there is no good thing, and that "there is none that doeth good, no not one" (Rom. 3:12). This word requires the death of the old man in us, and the remaking of our being by Christ our Lord. We must abandon the world of gods many, and especially our own claims to be autonomous rather than theonomous; and we must be made anew by God the Son.

In 1909, two men wrote a *History of the Future* which was in part a vision of advanced technology *and* the disappearance in part of religion and the family. The authors wrote, "It will become clear that the concept of morality itself is outdated and has only to do with the convenience

of the social structure." It will be replaced with new forms of "global awareness" and "the acceptance of self as God" (p. 57). Of such thinking is madness made!

But "He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh: the Lord shall have them in derision" (Ps. 2:4).

We need to echo that heavenly laughter.

121

HUMANISM AND CHANGE

Chalcedon Report No. 195, November 1981

In the modern age, humanism has been the major driving force in social change. With a missionary fervor rivalling Christianity and Islam, humanism has captured men and institutions all over the world, and much in our world today is a product of humanism.

In a study of *The Renaissance in Perspective*, Philip Lee Ralph (St. Martin's Press, 1973), commented on the humanists' hope: "Together with other thinkers of the age, Erasmus, More, and Machiavelli shared a conviction that, without any change in human nature or any drastic altering of institutions, the political order could be made to serve desirable human ends." Ralph rightly calls attention to Machiavelli's "most remarkable quality," his belief that "splendid opportunities lie at hand, waiting to be seized upon" (pp. 75–76).

Ralph is right, of course. The basic Christian premise is that man has a critical fault which is ineradicable by man, original sin. Only God's regenerating grace can change man and thereby alter the human prospect. The impediment of man's sin colors his life and institutions, so that death and corruption haunts all man's efforts outside of the triune God.

As a humanist, Machiavelli held high hopes for man. He rejected any form or return to the medieval theocratic ideal, or to any other theocratic goal. His perspective was humanistic and pragmatic. Like Stalin much later, he believed that a man cannot make an omelette without breaking and scrambling the eggs. As man was "freed" from the Christian worldview, his pragmatism would have a clearer humanistic goal. Thus, Machiavelli was ready to allow to rulers a broad spectrum of moral freedom and power. As Ralph stated it, "Machiavelli exalted power — even naked brutal power, uninhibited by religious dictates or moral scruples — because this was the only reality that seemed to him effective" (p. 63).

Machiavelli had high hopes for man by means of the humanistic state.

Erasmus was the same. In February 1517, he wrote a letter to a friend, expressing his belief in "the approach of a golden age: so clearly do we see the minds of princes, as if changed by inspiration, devoting all their energies to the pursuit of peace" (p. 74). Man was coming into his own; the state was emerging from the custodial eyes of the church, and man would soon be free: this was the humanist hope.

It is no less so today. Human solutions are sought to all human problems. Man's freedom is sought without God, and changes in man and the world are sought without reference to God. Where humanism recognizes faults in man, these are environmentally explained — in terms of society, religion, the family, and so on. Man has been victimized, and he must be freed.

As a result, the humanist reacts intensely to any Christian concern for political order. Since the spring of 1980, and the participation of evangelicals in politics, much has been written against this ostensible threat of fascism, censorship, tyranny, and so on. Every name anathema to the humanist is hurled against these men, against all reason. Thus although the Reverend Jerry Falwell is well-known for his eschatologically governed pro-Jewish outlook, and friendship with M. Begin, he is irrationally called an anti-Semite! In other words, if you are against the humanists, you must conform to their stereotype.

At least in *Humanist Manifestos I* and *II*, the humanists stated certain religious presuppositions which should have made them aware that the differences are religious, and that strong faith exists on both sides. *First*, humanism rejects the idea that man needs regenerating by God; any changes necessary to man can be made by man. Humanistic and Christian views each necessitate radically different concepts of education. Both have fought for control of the state schools; both need to drop their efforts to force their educational faith on others and create independent schools to propagate their position. Until then, they are advocating coercion and imperialism.

Second, the humanist believes in a self-generated universe whereas the Christian believes in its creation by God. Each position has far-reaching implications for life, ethics, and the sciences. Each rests on a faith assumption rather than verification.

Third, the humanist denies God's government and predestination in favor of man's controls, planning, and predestination. For anarchism, this means man is in total control; for other humanists, it is the state. The rise of humanism has made the state the agency and ultimate power, replacing God.

Fourth, man, not God, is seen by humanism as the source of law. This means that law is the expression of man's will or mind, either of individual man, or statist man (the democratic consensus concept). It follows that ethics or morality is also man-made, and we are told that man should have the moral freedom to do as he pleases, provided that he does not injure others. This seems to be a simple and foolproof doctrine, but it poses serious problems. Incest with minors is now defended by some in terms of this doctrine (although such a practice is not a general tenet of humanism). What constitutes injury? What constitutes coercion? Is injury to others merely physical? Anti-Semitism may be purely verbal, but it can do injury to a person, can it not? Then why is this not true of anti-Christianity? Or of antihumanism, for that matter? The law codes and moral codes of humanism prove to be rubber yardsticks which can cover anything, and also justify anything.

Fifth, humanism does more than reject God. It affirms that man's hope must be in man, that "In man we trust"; it is an ethical faith and process that sees progress only in terms of a confidence in man and in man's reason, agencies, and activities.

The sad fact is that humanism is very much a part of the church scene, not only amongst modernists but evangelicals as well. The application of the Bible is limited to the church and to "private" life by all too many, and most spheres of life are viewed humanistically. It did, after all, take the gross and abysmal failure of the state schools to wake up Christians to their educational mandate. Only now is the corruption of modern humanistic politics compelling Christians to look to God's law and mandate. The churches are weak because they are only occasionally Christian.

C. R. Morey, in *Christian Art* (1935), said, of contemporary architecture, "The academic styles that have succeeded each other since the seventeenth century, as a consequence of this curious divorce of beauty from truth, can hardly be classified as Christian art, since they recognize no inspiration higher than the human mind" (p. 67). Exactly. Today, "Christian" action simply lines up with a humanistic alternative, not in terms of Scripture. Dominion man must apply God's dominion Word to the problems of this world.

122

MARCH TO A DUMPING GROUND

Chalcedon Report No. 128, April 1976

In 1943, a novel, bitterly fought against by Western pro-communists, saw the crisis of civilization in the fact that its *first* faith, Christianity, was virtually gone, and the *second*, free thought or humanism, was also fading. "Nothing exists that can fill the chasm: there is no third faith!" wrote Mark Aldanov in *The Fifth Seal*. His character, Vermandois, observed, "Humanity is marching toward a dumping ground." Men could resign themselves to it, or choose a fairy tale pleasing to themselves and use it to proclaim "that the dumping ground is in reality a crystal palace." In any case, the future meant the dumping ground.

Now a dumping ground, like every trash pile, has a characteristic feature: nothing has any relationship to anything around it. Things are simply dumped there, whether worthless or still usable, without any rule or any meaningful relationship to things next to them. Philosophically speaking, we can say that every dumping ground or trash pile gives us an excellent example of existentialism. Nothing derives meaning or significance from anything around it. There are no rules governing relationships or imposing an order. There is no philosophy governing all the facts in the dump. Each piece of junk must develop its own philosophy of existence or else have none.

A plain-spoken expression of this philosophy came to light in 1975 through a follower of Charles Manson. Lynette "Squeaky" Fromme, the twenty-seven-year-old girl who tried to assassinate President Ford, declared to her captors, "If you have no philosophy, you don't have any rules." By philosophy, Lynette Fromme meant a faith which prescribes rules binding on all people, a universal morality and law. Existentialism is a philosophy which denies this emphatically, and existentialism, whether held formally or informally, is the refining faith of the twentieth century.

In *Defiance #1: A Radical Review* (1970), one of the key declarations was simply this: "Good News! 2 and 2 no longer make 4." The revolution, one writer held, had already occurred. He was right, of course. The principles of relativism, of existentialism, i.e., the philosophies of the dumping ground, have triumphed. When I cite the *Defiance* gospel to some, they are shocked: 2 and 2 do make 4, they insist. However, when pressed about God's law, it is clear that they are existentialists about everything except a few practical items like arithmetic. Most twentieth-century men are to some degree existentialists; they object only when younger existentialists go a little further than they themselves are prepared to go.

The dumping-ground future predicted by Aldanov's Vermandois is increasingly apparent to more and more intellectuals and youths. Their answer is to look for that third faith. Hence the deep interest in Oriental religions, primitive faiths, magic, witchcraft, occultism, and much else. On all fronts, the religious interest is intense, but it is futile. All the "new" third faiths are simply variations on a common theme, humanism. I know very casually one such seeker, a brilliant and attractive woman, who regularly finds the great answer in some new form of this old faith, and then, before finding another, is suicidally pessimistic. For her, the one alternative never to be considered in her quest is Biblical faith. Not surprisingly, each new collapse drives her closer to suicide, to her own dumping ground.

Now, more than once civilization has turned itself into a dump heap by its adoption of some form of moral relativism, although never so drastically as in the twentieth century. There is a common consequence to every such event in history. Our Lord expressed it thus: "For wheresoever the carcass is, there will the eagles be gathered together" (Matt. 24:28). When civilization turns itself into a garbage dump, there the vultures will gather, and then too the vulture nations have an opportunity to gain ascendancy.

Certainly in our time, men seem determined to turn history into a dumping ground, and the vultures are not lacking on the scene. The second faith, humanism, is morally bankrupt: existentialism is simply its logical conclusion. There is no third faith, and there is too little left of the first faith to be a factor in the minds of vultures. The churches have virtually all succumbed to the influences of the second faith, humanism. But the first faith, Christianity, alone offers hope. Humanism has failed, because it has been applied and developed. Christianity has not failed; rather, it has been abandoned for humanism disguised sometimes as Christianity.

If the dumping ground and the vultures, both products of humanism, are to be avoided, it will only be in terms of Biblical faith. Existentialism can only destroy and negate: it must deny all meanings and relationships in order to affirm the autonomy and the ultimacy of humanistic man. Dotson Rader, writing also in *Defiance*, stated it clearly: "to destroy all limits is, in a perverse sense, to be truly free. To destroy is to *feel* free."

Reconstruction is only possible on radically alien terms, terms which make basic not man's feelings or experience, but God's atonement and God's law. Churchmen who deny the validity of God's law are humanists: they make man's feelings and experience basic to the faith rather than Christ's work and man's required response of faith and obedience.

The only way that the vultures can be exorcised from civilization is by the road away from the dumping ground, from humanism or existentialism, to a full-orbed and militant Biblical faith.

Existentialist man can never be dominion man on his own terms. He has no world except himself, no meaning except his will, and no arena of operation except a vacuum. The will of existentialist man is to be god, but even Sartre, the foremost existentialist, saw this goal and man himself as a "futile passion."

Godly reconstruction by dominion man has as its instrument Biblical law, God's plan of conquest. It provides for the reordering of every area of life in terms of God's sovereign word and purpose, and for the establishment of man as king, priest, and prophet in Christ over the earth.

Man has a "choice": to be a pretended god and sovereign on a dump heap, surrounded by waiting vultures, or a dominion man in Christ over the earth. In either case, there is only one sovereign, God. That can never change: it is man who must.

123

SUICIDAL HUMANISM

Chalcedon Report No. 100, December 1973

Bertrand Russell, when asked about the future of religion, answered, "I think it depends upon whether people solve their social problems or not. I think that if there go on being wars and great oppressions and many people leading very unhappy lives, probably religion will go on . . . I think that if people solve their social problems religion will die out" (*Bertrand Russell Speaks His Mind* [New York, NY: Avon Books, 1960], p. 25). This idea was not original with Russell. A similar belief was basic to Freud's psychology. Freud believed that religion would survive as long as the sense of guilt existed *and* was treated as a religious concern. Freud's psychology had as a central concern a desire to convert guilt into a medical problem, explain it in terms of social evolution, and thereby eliminate religion (R. J. Rushdoony, *Freud* [PA: Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Co., (1965) 1972]).

Other social philosophers have held that the elimination of religion will come as man is led into the great society or community, into a world beyond good and evil, and a world without problems and without a law structure derived from God. As a result, the drive to establish that perfect world order has had a double impetus for humanists. For them it means, *first*, the elimination of God and of religion. Where man has all that he wants, and problems of guilt and death have been overcome and peace and plenty prevail, who needs God? Hence the frantic and urgent drive to eliminate all of man's problems through the scientific socialist state, to bring in a humanistic paradise, and to forget forever the very idea of God. Hence, too, the readiness of scientists and people to delude themselves and to believe always that they are on the verge of a great breakthrough to the creation of life, its control, and its endless extension. All too many are ready to believe, as the world stumbles into hell, that

paradise is just a few years or a generation away. *Second*, with the God of the Bible eliminated by man's victory, man can then comfortably declare himself to be the new god of creation, and the elite planners can operate freely as the gods of a new world.

However, the more earnestly this hope is pursued, the more desperate man's plight becomes. Technology has supposedly brought man closer to the solution of his problem: in reality, it has only intensified and aggravated man's long-existing problem. The problem is not technological; it is not a question of a breakthrough in biology, politics, futurology, economics, or anything else. The problem is man: he is a sinner, and nothing can alter that fact save the grace of God.

The humanistic myth of human perfection is thus a dangerous one. It rests on an illusion of human autonomy and ultimacy, on the belief that man is his own god, can make his own laws, and can reorder reality in terms of his imagination. It leads man to that fundamental error which, for example, is at the heart of the new economics: if men determine that certain goals are to be desired, then nothing prevents their realization except the absence of power and technology. Given enough statist power and technology, socialism, it is held, will work. Given enough money and power, the state schools believe that they can produce the ideal socialist child of the ideal socialist state. Given the power and the technology, the new world order will begin to emerge, and then religion, the state, inequalities, sexual differences, and all like "evils" will gradually wither away.

The Biblical answer to this is to call attention to the real problem: man himself, and man's relationship to God. The next step is to recognize that God has His determined plan for man's progress, peace, and prosperity: His law. The law specifies what constitutes a good society, how to attain it, and how to suppress its enemies. The world under God's law, to use T. R. Ingram's great phrase, is a world in which there is a realistic achievement of the great goals of history. It is also a world in which the magnificent promises of Deuteronomy 28 are the natural consequences of faith and obedience.

The humanistic approach to life's problems is suicidal. The word of Wisdom, ages ago, stated this clearly: "He that sinneth against me wrongeth his own soul: all they hate me love death" (Prov. 8:36).

In 1966, more than 100,000 college students, ostensibly the future of America, threatened suicide; more than 10,000 actually attempted it, and 1,000 or more succeeded. The future leaders of the technological humanistic paradise saw no future. They were sick at heart, involved in sexual delinquency, drugs, and the "accepted forms" of student violence.

Finding meaning in nothing, some finally sought escape into what was for them total meaninglessness, death. In 1973, even kindergarten and primary-grade teachers report amazing acts of lawlessness and anarchy in their pupils. The heirs of Russell and Freud are destroying themselves, or their future.

Meanwhile, a growing number of students are in Christian schools, being trained for responsibility and leadership. The futurologists, who try to read the twenty-first century in terms of their technology, grind out their pipe dreams, unaware of the new power growing up all around them.

Proverbs 29:18 tells us that where there is no vision (in terms of God's Word) the people run wild and perish, but happy is he who keeps the law.

124

THE MARXIST SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE

Chalcedon Report No. 227, June 1984

An understanding of the Marxist doctrine of the separation of church and state is urgently necessary, because there is a growing confusion between the Marxist view and the earlier American position.

In the Marxist world, as in the Soviet Union, the separation of church and state means that the church must be totally separated from every area of life and thought. It cannot be allowed to educate or to influence education, let alone the state. Because children are seen as the property of the state, the church cannot influence or teach children. In all spheres, the church is isolated from the world and life of its times and is required to be irrelevant and impotent. In the Marxist view, the separation of church and state is a major legal handicap and penalty imposed upon the church. It is in effect a separation from relevance, the power to influence, and the freedom to function.

In the historic American view, the First Amendment places all the restrictions upon the federal government, which is barred from establishing, governing, controlling, or regulating the church. The Marxist view handcuffs the church; the American view handcuffs the state.

In recent years, the states, Congress, the courts, and the various presidents have in varying degrees manifested an adherence to the Marxist view. Even as the statist power has encroached on every other sphere of society, so now it is encroaching on the church. It is assured that the state has total jurisdiction over every sphere, and the courts in recent years have ruled on such absurdities as school dress codes, and the length of a boy's hair. No concern is too trifling to be overlooked by the courts in their zeal for totalitarian jurisdiction. Without being Marxist, they share in the Marxist belief in total state jurisdiction. Predictably, they are moving in the same direction.

This should not surprise us. Given the humanistic belief in man or the state as ultimate, any freedom or power claimed by the church is seen as irrelevant or wrong. The humanist is being faithful to his faith, to his presuppositions.

The sad fact is that too many churchmen share the Marxist view. For them, the separation of church and state means that the church must never involve itself with anything which is of political concern. I am regularly told by readers of pastors and church leaders who will not permit mention of abortion, homosexuality, euthanasia, or any like subject from the pulpit or even on church premises. Such matters, they insist are now "political" and "violate" the separation of church and state. They claim the name of orthodoxy for their confusion, cowardice, and heresy.

The prophets, God's preachers of old, were commanded by the Lord to proclaim God's law-word concerning all things and to correct and rebuke kings and governors. When our Lord promises His disciples that they shall be brought before governors and kings for His sake, and "for a testimony against them" (Matt. 10:18), He did not mean that they were then to forswear the faith, wink at abortion and homosexuality, and be silent about the sins of the state!

There are no limits to the area of God's government, law, and sovereign sway. There can then be no limits to the areas of the church's witness, its preaching, and its commanded concern.

125

SUBVERSION OF WORDS

Chalcedon Report No. 18, March 1, 1967

Few things are more readily and easily subverted than *words*: the subversion of words is accordingly a major factor in all subversive activity. The word "republic" has an important meaning for conservative Americans, and as a hope for many peoples of the world; the Communists adopted it for their order, the U.S.S.R., the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The word *love* has been reinterpreted to mean revolutionary action and the subsidizing of all kinds of evil, and Christians are told they are not showing Biblical love if they fail to support Marxist social action.

But perhaps the most subverted word of all is *God*. One of the first things we need to recognize when we talk about God is that virtually all religions are atheistic. As Christians, for us religion means God, but this is true of very little else than Christianity, if of any other religion. Humanism is the religion of humanity, the worship of man. Animism, the worship of primitive peoples, has no God. Shintoism has a multitude of *Kamis*, divine ancestors, but no God. Buddhism is an atheistic religion; for it, nothingness is ultimate. Hinduism also sees nothingness as ultimate, and the goal of reincarnation is to escape karma into eternal nothingness. Confucianism, a philosophy which became a religion, has no God. Taoism holds to an ultimate relativism; nothing is absolutely right or wrong since all things are relative. Greek religion, and Roman religion, had no God; their many "gods" were, like men, creatures born of chaos and destined to pass away. Greek philosophy talked of a first cause or god, but this was not a person but an original source, whether atoms or something else, none could say. The religion of the Germanic peoples again was godless; the "gods" they talked about were creatures out of chaos who were simply ahead of man in their development. Apart

from Biblical religion, the religion whose faith includes a God is Mohammedanism, but its concept, borrowed from the Bible, quickly was dissolved into an idea of fate on the one hand, and mystical pantheism on the other. Mormonism does not hold to the God of Scripture; instead, it holds to many gods who are all men who have graduated in rank, and Mormonism is a form of ancestor worship under its superficially Biblical language. Judaism grew out of the rejection of Jesus Christ and steadily became humanism, and the Talmud is essentially the exposition of humanism under the façade of Scripture. There is thus actually no true theism, or worship of the absolute God, apart from orthodox Christianity.

The word *God*, however, is widely used in order to nullify the gap between Biblical and non-Biblical religions, between Christianity and humanism. The churches today are quite vocal about the believer's duty to God, but they clearly take the name of God in vain, because it is humanism (and revolution) which they proclaim, not the gospel.

The Death of God school of thought is perhaps the most honest group on the religious scene today. They honestly declare that they have a double purpose: *First*, they want to destroy all faith in the God of the Bible, the triune God, and to destroy with this faith the whole structure of moral law which comes from God. If there is no God, then there is no law, and anything goes. Man is his own god and his own law. Therefore, the Death of God thinkers want to "*liberate*" man from God and morality by declaring that God is dead and man is "free." *Second*, by their own statements, they look forward to a "rebirth" of "God," this time as a united world order. The one-world order of brotherhood and socialism is this new god waiting to be born, and the Death of God thinkers want to stimulate this birth by furthering revolutionary thought and action.

By and large, the established religious leaders and churches are equally radical but less honest. They try to delude people into believing that it is still Christianity they preach by using all the old language with a new revolutionary meaning. One of the major forms of this deception is neo-orthodoxy, i.e., a seeming orthodoxy. But the churches of today are promoting revolution and calling it Christianity. It is the purpose of the church of today to murder God and the church in the name of fulfilling their Christian calling.

The support given to revolutionary activity is heavily borne by the churches. Saul Alinsky is one among many who depends on the churches for his support. The graduates of seminaries become revolutionists both in and out of the churches. At the University of California at Berkeley, Mario Savio originally was destined for the Jesuit order; Steward Albert planned to be a rabbi. Steve Hamilton went from Wheaton College to

Bishop Pike to civil-rights protests and university activities. He represented the University Church Council in 1964 in the free-speech movement. Patrick Taggart led in Youth for Christ activities and was a counselor in Billy Graham's last Los Angeles crusade. With Lois Murgenstrumm, who became the nude "living altar" in a Satanist wedding in San Francisco, Tuesday, January 31, 1967, Taggart is a leader in the Satan-worship cult there, and in the propagation of "liberal" ideas.

Many groups use the name of God, but, for all except those who hold to orthodox Christianity, God is the enemy who must be destroyed. These revolutionists hate God, because God means that there is an ultimate judge over all men, and an ultimate right and wrong in the universe, an inescapable truth, apart from which all else is a lie. These revolutionists are out to destroy not only God but all language, since language still reflects the idea of a right and wrong. Friedrich Nietzsche called for a "new language" to express this new faith, a mode of communication in which "The falseness of an opinion is not for us any objection to it." Man must live "beyond good and evil," beyond all law, and deny that there are any "thou shalt nots." "Love" as self-indulgence is his only law. In this new order, Nietzsche said, it is necessary "to recognize untruth as a condition of life," having as much "right" as the truth and perhaps more necessary. This philosophy undergirds both church and state today: churchmen and politicians lie to us "for our good" and with no sense of wrong-doing apparent. The "god" of these men is the state. Georg William Friedrich Hegel (1770–1831), the spiritual father of Marx, Kierkegaard, Dewey, Sartre, and others, and the grandfather of Marxism, pragmatism, Fabianism, existentialism, and much else, said, "The state in and by itself is the ethical whole, the actualization of freedom." This means that the state is god and is the source of all law and morality. Hegel said, "The march of God in the world, that is what the state is." The state is thus god walking on earth, and men must bow down to statism or be punished as evildoers, because the state is the fulfillment of man and of man's law.

This is the issue then, the state versus God, Christ versus Caesar. Every man who supports a church which is not proclaiming orthodox Christianity is supporting Antichrist and is in the camp of statism. These churches talk about God, but they mean the state. They speak of Christ as savior, but by salvation they mean socialism. Language has been subverted, and first of all the word *God*. We cannot counteract the subversion of our day without beginning at its root cause. We need to be "honest to God." And, as Dr. J. I. Packer, an Anglican scholar, remarked, in criticizing the book *Honest to God* by John A. T. Robinson, bishop of Woolwich, "The man who is 'honest to God' is the man who listens to

God's Word and lets it have its way with him, not evading its substance, nor deflecting its application one iota." The Bishop of Woolwich has another god and another savior than the Bible offers.

As against these false definitions of God, the Bible reveals the true God to us. Long ago, the Larger Catechism summarized the Biblical statements thus:

> Q. 7: What is God?
>
> A. God is a Spirit, in and of himself infinite in being, glory, blessedness, and perfection; all-sufficient, eternal, unchangeable, incomprehensible, everywhere present, almighty, knowing all things, most wise, most holy, most just, most merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth.
>
> Q. 8: Are there more Gods than one?
>
> A. There is but one only, the living and true God.
>
> Q. 9: How many persons are there in the Godhead?
>
> A. There be three persons in the Godhead, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one true, eternal God, the same in substance, equal in power and glory; although distinguished by their personal properties.

126

THE MENACE OF ARIANISM

Chalcedon Report No. 322, May 1992

For most people, Arianism is an unknown heresy. For scholars, it is a heresy which plagued the church during the first four centuries, was derived from Plato and Philo, and possibly Aristotle, reduced Christianity to a philosophy, and, above all, had a defective doctrine of Christ. While Arius spoke at times glowingly of Jesus Christ, he did not see Him as fully and truly God, very God of very God, or as simply a man but as someone more than man, not very man of very man. He was not fully God nor fully man, but somewhere in between.

What is there about Arianism that makes it still a menace? Although not so labeled, it prevails among the supposedly Orthodox, Catholic, Protestant, and Eastern churches. Very recently, a very fine pastor was summarily ousted from his pastorate by denominational and local church leaders when, in preaching on the meaning of Christ, His incarnation and full deity, he dealt with the meaning of Arianism. Arianism is too deeply imbedded in seminaries and churches to be recognizable by most because it is equated with orthodoxy.

Arianism has a long history in the English-speaking churches, and it usually had a position of respectability. The Presbyterians of Cromwell's day became Arians and then Unitarians; providentially, they ceased thereby to be a power in England. This was not the case with the Erastian Richard Hooker, a man much loved by the monarchs of his century. Hooker, in *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, denied the eternal being and deity of the Son. He held, "the Father alone is originally that Deity which Christ originally is not, (for Christ is God by being of God, light by issuing out of light)." Moreover, in writing about the incarnation, Hooker said, "The union therefore of the flesh with deity is to *that flesh* a gift of principle grace and favor. For by virtue of this grace, man is

really made god, a creature is exalted above the dignity of all creatures, and hath all creatures else under it" (bk. 5, chap. 54, sec. 2–3). Although Hooker denied Arianism, he still wrote, "Finally, since God hath deified our nature, though not by turning it into himself, yet by making it his own inseparable habitation, we cannot not conceive how God should without man either exercise divine power, or receive the glory of divine praise. For man is in both an associate of Deity" (bk. 5, chap. 6, sec. 5). Hooker could indeed talk at times of Christ's universal reign, but his comments were general; in practice, he made the state supreme and gained the respect of evil monarchs and is praised to this day by men who do not read him.

E. T. Davies, who did read Hooker, praised him highly in *The Political Ideas of Richard Hooker* (S.P.C.K., 1946). On December 14, 1558, Bishop White of Winchester preached a sermon, saying, "I warn you against the wolves be coming out of Geneva." Hooker (in bk. 1, chap. 6, sec. 1) had written, "The Soul of man (is) therefore at the first as a book, wherein nothing is and yet all things may be imprinted." This is the *tabula rasa* doctrine of Aristotle and Aquinas, and, after Hooker, of John Locke. It is the foundation of modern statist education and denial of the fall and of original sin. And this is only one bit of the nonsense in Hooker, whose work Davies called "one of the great works of the English language" (p. 33). Few read Hooker now, but Calvin's works sell in great numbers annually.

More than a few pastors have told me that, in seminaries, their church history professors paid great tribute to the Arians as successful and zealous missionaries in northern Europe. This tribute has an element of truth to it: the Arians were widely successful, but why? Katherine Scherman, in *The Birth of France* (1989), tells us the reason. Arius's thinking led to a good "pagan conclusion." The pagans found Arianism "immediately attractive" because its Christ or Savior "was no more than a lesser god" who could be readily included in a pantheon of gods (p. 70). In other words, it promoted polytheism in the name of Christianity.

As a result, great evils flowed out of Arianism. We have already cited one. The *first* evil was polytheism in the name of Christ. There were gods many and powers many, each with his own sphere. In this scheme of things, Christ was a "specialist": He specialized in getting people into heaven. Among doctors, we have many specialists: neurologists, obstetricians, gynecologists, proctologists, cardiologists, and so on and on. Polytheism held to a hierarchy of specialists among the supernatural powers, and Jesus Christ was a welcome addition to this pantheon of specialist gods.

Because of this Arian background, what later came to be called Erastiansim had a powerful influence on northern Europe in particular. Rulers were ready to worship Christ, but they were filled with wrath when the church claimed universal jurisdiction for Christ.

Second, Arianism and Arian influences limited Christ's realm and, therefore, in time the scope of canon or Biblical law. The king was seen as equally a representative of the great God as Christ's people and church. Rulers felt that they could govern the church and lecture to churchmen about their duties. The implicit polytheism of Arianism was at work where Arianism was formally denied.

Now let us see what Arianism means today. Its practical implication is that Christ and Scripture have a law for the church and the door into heaven, but the state, the school, the arts and sciences, and all things else are spheres independent of Christ.

Theonomy is therefore a source of horror to these tacit and implicit Arians. For them, Jesus Christ is the salvation specialist whose realm is the church and altar calls. The body of Scripture, God's law and God incarnate as Lord over all, is neglected or condemned. The churches say in effect, "We will not have this man to reign over us" (Luke 19:14); He can save us if we choose, but we will reign over ourselves.

Those who limit Arianism to the first four centuries falsify history because they reject the Christ who "is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings and Lord of lords" (1 Tim. 6:15). Arianism is even more prevalent than modernism, and it commonly masquerades as good, "Bible-believing" Christianity. It can call itself Protestant, Catholic, or Orthodox; it can boast of its Calvinism, Arminianism, or Thomism. But it is essentially Arianism: it limits the scope of Christ and the law of God. The Lord God says, "Thou shalt have none other gods before me" (Deut. 5:7), and He declares this as He gives us His law, meaning no other gods nor their laws.

Arianism is polytheism; it is also statism. But, above all, it is a form of idolatry.

127

GNOSTICISM TODAY

Chalcedon Report No. 418, May 2000

Gnosticism is a theory of knowledge which, over the centuries, has exerted a most powerful influence. Since it has a specifically anti-Christian meaning, it has been most powerful in the Christian era. The essential meaning of Gnosticism is that the only knowledge possible is human knowledge. Gnosticism excludes revelation, although when occurring in a Christian or Jewish context, it pretends to be of the faith.

Where such a pretense occurs, Gnosticism claims to give the true (non-supernatural) meaning. We see today Gnosticism in the church denying the physical resurrection of Jesus, six-day creation, and much more. Creation is reinterpreted to mean evolution. God becomes a name for natural cause.

It is apparent now that a variety of movements over the centuries, culminating in modernism, are Gnostic. Antinomianism, too, is gnostic; it does not believe in God's law. Wherever we substitute man's word for God's law-word, we are Gnostics.

Gnosticism is a word derived from a Greek word meaning knowledge, or to know. Gnosticism may claim to believe in God, but it cannot see Him as more than an idea. As a result, it eliminates or reinterprets everything supernatural in the Bible.

Modern science, like philosophy and most churches, is gnostic. God cannot be the "first cause" (nor the last) because all causality is natural. The Bible cannot be a source of knowledge because all knowledge must be humanistic.

Gnosticism was the full expression of ancient Greek humanism, and it is still the essence of humanism in all its forms.

Gnosticism in the twentieth century has captured virtually all seminaries and most churches. Only a few theologians like Van Til have opposed it. Its presuppositions are now basic to the pulpit.

One result has been the exclusion of God from the church in the name of God. God is viewed in Darwinian terms, often as, at best, a vague, natural force behind history.

Agnosticism is a milder form of Gnosticism. Agnosticism claims it does not know God. Gnosticism implicitly denies the Biblical God.

One result of Gnosticism is the disappearance of preaching on Genesis chapters 1–11 in most churches. It also means no preaching on God's law, and evasive preaching on the physical resurrection.

Christians must break with Gnosticism and believe the whole Word of God. Gnosticism threatened the life of the early church, as it again threatens the life of the church. Chalcedon is anti-Gnostic and stands for the whole Word of God without hesitation. Are you with us?

128

PILGRIMAGE

Chalcedon Report No. 103, March 1974

A pilgrim is one who journeys to a destination from a religious motive. Thus, we are all pilgrims in that our lives are a quest for those goals which are to us most desirable, goals which our faith makes us live for. There was a time when pilgrimages were exclusively religious, as with medieval man, and with the Puritans who became pilgrims by their journey to America, to establish a godly church and society.

With the Enlightenment, however, pilgrimage took on a new dimension, the grand tour of Europe in quest of experience. To become a gentleman, it was necessary for an English youth to go to Paris and Rome and to enjoy the pleasures thereof. The goal of pilgrimages had become, not Christian experience, but humanistic experiences, esthetic, intellectual, or sensual, depending on one's desires.

The Romantic movement added a new dimension, the pilgrimage into the bizarre, the perverse, and the insane, as Mario Praz documents so well in *The Romantic Agony*. The lust for experience meant a quest for the abnormal and for the perverted.

In the twentieth century, this quest has been greatly developed. Both in vicarious and in actual experience, the lust for the abnormal and perverted, and the delight in being shocked, has led modern culture into strange byways. Culture has become pathology. In recent years, entertainment has been heavily dominated by the pathological, and the film industry increasingly caters to an almost entirely voyeuristic sadomasochistic audience. The vast appeal of a stupid and tasteless film like *The Exorcist* is simply its appeal to this mentality: lines of people have waited by the hour to see it, and newspaper reports that some viewers had fainted and vomited only increased its appeal.

Thus, a fine symbolic note was struck when a major airline advertised

a 1974 travel pilgrimage, "Spotlight on Dracula," a guided "totally unique travel experience which involves you in an adventure combining present-day reality with medieval history and ancient folk beliefs. You participate in a re-creation of the Dracula legend, completely immersed in the original environment in which it flourished" with reenactments "for your exclusive benefits."

Of the historical Dracula, the papal nuncio reported in 1475 that he had by that date personally authorized the killing of 100,000 people, usually by torture and impalement. Contrary to the travel guide brochure, Dracula was not a medieval but a Renaissance figure. The Renaissance, which proclaimed the love of man and his rebirth, set a precedent for the twentieth century by its lust for torture and murder. It was the era of men like Ludovico Sforza, the Borgia pope Alexander VI, Sigismondo Malatesta, Caesar Borgia, John Tiptoft, and others.

It is fitting, therefore, that the twentieth-century pilgrim pay his money for a pilgrimage to Dracula's palace and realm: he is closer to Dracula than to God. Dracula's world is the world of his heart. The newspaper head-line reads, "600 Serious Crimes Reported in City Schools for 7 Month Period," and it tells of murders, rapes, robberies, assaults, and other crimes committed in "public" schools despite the presence of security guards. In spite of this, a prominent man objected heatedly when I suggested Christian schools as the alternative. Dracula is better than God, in the eyes of millions.

By their pilgrimages you shall know them, pilgrimages to Dracula's castle, to *The Exorcist*, to schools that educate for ignorance and godlessness, to entertainment geared to shock, violence, and horror, to blasphemy and immorality; this is the love of modern man. A new bumper sticker perhaps is needed, which will simply read, "Dracula lives again." In the age of communism, Nazism, and mass violence in the name of "rights," perhaps Dracula is too mild a figure; the twentieth century has surpassed him.

Ironically, Dracula was killed in 1476 by his own men, as a result of his own folly. In this, he is a fitting symbol of our time. Our Lord declared, "for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword" (Matt. 26:52). Again, we are told, "he that killeth with the sword must be killed with the sword" (Rev. 13:10). The meaning here is not the use of force in the execution of justice, but the denial of justice in the name of power. All who set aside God's law shall fall under its judgment. Those whose pilgrimage of life is a quest for experience and power outside of God will pay the penalty thereof.

The goals of the pilgrimage of modern man, both in his own person and by means of the statist orders he creates, are quests for Dracula,

for experience in the perverted and demonic, and for an order created through total tyranny. Dracula instituted so rigid a control over his people that he placed a golden cup near the fountain of a public square in his capital, and no man ever stole it: they did not dare. This did not mean that Wallachia was crime-free: the biggest thief and murderer was Dracula's tyrant state, and it tolerated no petty criminal to interfere with its life of crime.

Today, lawless as our cities are, the worst crime is committed by the state, the theft of freedom. Moreover, a people who themselves have a perverted pilgrimage, conspire to help the state destroy them.

But a more important fact remains: the Draculas of history are historical curiosities, they pass, but God remains, and His purpose prevails. The false pilgrims of our day can only build ruins, but we "know that [our] labour is not in vain in the Lord" (1 Cor. 15:58). The future is ours under God, and it is a time for strengthening the foundations, and for preparing to take over and govern. The Lord's order is very clear: "Occupy till I come" (Luke 19:13), and He does not issue impossible orders.

129

RATIONAL REFORMS

Chalcedon Report No. 127, March 1976

In the modern era, reform has very often been a prelude to revolution, not because the reforms have not been needed, but because they have been stiffly rational in conception rather than realistic. The humanistic reformers have erred badly, *first*, in developing rational programs for reform which are rootless and unrelated to the content of men's lives. Thus, instead of satisfying those whom they were intended to help, the reforms have only left them more disgruntled. The advances have often been very real, but they have not been welcome. *Second*, the humanist has concluded that the life of reason and of rational freedom is the most desirable life, but, unhappily, most people have preferred bondage, and their dream, like that of all slaves, is of bondage with plenty.

An example of a reform which aggravated discontent was the abolition of serfdom in tsarist Russia. It was a triumph of liberalism, but it created conditions which became a breeding ground for disaster. Serfdom in Russia was a modern product, only a couple of centuries old. Some serfs lived better than others, but most would have envied the life of an American slave. Their huts were without windows or chimneys, and without any artificial light, except for the limited use of bits of wood and tallow candles. The freezing cold outside made it necessary to keep newborn calves indoors. The serf, however wretched, had some security. Also, he regarded all of the lord's land as in some sense his also. "Freedom" handed him over to the world of modern statism and taxation. He was at once taxed, and, if he lacked the income to pay his taxes, he was imprisoned for at least two weeks, and then, if no funds were forthcoming, everything he had was sold, down to the family milk cow and chickens. If he had nothing, or if the sale failed to produce enough, he worked off the taxes in forced labor wherever the state officials chose to send him.

In 1856, Alexander II told the aristocracy of Moscow, in preparing them for the emancipation of the serfs, "Reforms must come from above unless one wishes them to come from below." Unfortunately, the reforms from above came as disruptions and further tyranny to the serfs, and a distrust of everyone above developed.

Reforms rationally conceived at the top are too often seen as disruptive and threatening to those below, and the result is the creation of a rootless mob below, whose lifestyle has been broken, their loyalties shattered, and their conditions all too little improved. Statistically, the ex-serfs were in a much better condition. Realistically, they were discontented and felt cheated, and their discontent made it possible later for professional revolutionists to take over the country.

Humanism has all too often failed to distinguish between reason and rationalism. Reason is a necessary tool in man's exercise of dominion, and it is basic to knowledge, and is inseparable from righteousness, which requires, among other things, the intelligent understanding of and commitment to God's law. Rationalism is the rigid application of man's idea of reason to reality as the ultimate yardstick and criterion, whereas godly reason recognizes that it is the mind and reason of God which is ultimate. Rationalism thus tries to remake the world in its own image, after its own reason, and its end result is a collapse into irrationalism. It forces a product of man's mind onto reality in order to make reality man's creation; in the insane this is unreason, whereas in humanistic planners it is irrationalism.

Rationalism once believed that the universe to some degree corresponded to man's reason, but now, with pragmatism and existentialism, it no longer believes this. The only area of rationality is in the mind of man, but, in the light of Freud and Skinner, modern humanism cannot place much trust in even that faint glimmer of rationality. It is held, however, that by some miracle, rationality will prevail in an elite group of scientific planners and through them conquer humanity and the universe. As the new gods of creation, by whose fiat word the world is to be remade, they logically regard humanity as it is, as the realm of chaos. Out of this chaos, light and order are to be brought forth by their supposedly sovereign word.

But will it? The new proverbs of humanism are marked by a wry and radical pessimism. "If anything can go wrong, it will." "If you see light at the end of the tunnel, it's not the sun but a train coming." "In the long run, we are all dead." "A fool and his hope are soon parted." There is an increasing cynicism about all humanistic reform plans, and modern man is more and more concerned with only enough peace to enjoy himself.

The philosophy is close to that of ancient Rome: "let us eat, drink, and be merry, for tomorrow we die." Give us, more and more men say, not reform and change, but a respite.

But history requires change; it requires movement. Time does not recess so that an era can take time for play. Humanism is in power, but it cannot function as the motive force for action, production, and change. Its troops are no longer eager for orders, but rather eager for discharge.

The time is ripe for a strong and virile Christianity, one firmly committed to Biblical law, to command the day. Nothing else can provide a comparable motive force for the reconstruction of all things. Change is certain, but whether or not it will be progress depends on who controls it.

130

MYTH OF CONSENT AND LOCKE

Chalcedon Report No. 139, March 1977

One of the key myths governing our age we owe to John Locke (1632–1704). This is the myth of consent. Locke held that all legitimate governments rest on consent: society is not natural to man, but rather conventional.

With this myth, Locke laid down the foundations for civil disobedience and revolution. It was this myth of consent which governed the student movements of the 1960s, the revolutionary movements of the past two centuries, and is the basis of every protest movement of our time.

According to this myth, the most basic right of man is this act of consent. Locke held, in his *Second Treatise of Government*, that all men are in the state of nature and remain therein "till by their own consents they make themselves members of some politick Society." Autonomy (or anarchy) is thus the natural and basic state of man. This autonomy or independence nothing can alter, diminish, or take away from, except by the free consent of man. While Locke added that men have a natural inclination to society, he made it clear that it is their autonomy which is basic and which is the fundamental source of right.

Consent was thus exalted to a higher place of authority than any word or law of God and man. True, Locke, because of his Christian rearing, assumed that these autonomous men would more or less act like Christians, but he reduced the actual role of Christianity to a very minor one. Locke held that religion (meaning Christianity) is essentially a private affair, and that churches must be private associations only. The ultimate consequence of his views has been to reduce the faith to a domain within man's heart and mind only, not of concern to his social life and world. The essence of Biblical faith, however, is that Christianity is the most public of faiths, and that church, state, school, family, the arts, sciences,

vocations, and all things else must be governed first and foremost by the faith, not by either an institution or individual man. Lordship belongs to God, not to man nor to the state or the church. To restrict Biblical faith to the private realm is to deny it and to deny the God of Scripture.

The myth of consent, however, transfers lordship to individual man; it makes man autonomous of man, society, and God. The ultimate sin and depravity then becomes any act which deprives a man of consent. Consent takes priority over God's law. It takes priority over other men, and man's law, over property rights, over justice, over everything. It means that the whole world and everything in it must pass the bar of man's judgment. (It was Margaret Fuller, in the last century, who, after much deliberation, said, "I accept the universe." After great thought, she gave her consent to reality! Today, many refuse to do as much.)

This myth of consent has infected all levels of humanistic education and the children themselves. The final word, as boldly pronounced by many children, and accepted by too many parents, is, "I don't like it." The child quickly learns the myth of consent. In dealing with children, mothers have moved through several states, from 1) eat it, or I'll slap you; 2) eat it, it's good for you; 3) see what I'll give you, if you eat it; to 4) if you don't like it, don't eat it.

In the face of this myth of consent, any effort to restore Biblical authority is regarded as a monstrous act of oppression. One gentle and goodly pastor, who established a Christian school on the premise of God's Word, was pictured, in a caricature by a national magazine, as brandishing a bullwhip over cowering children. The fact that the pastor has never owned a bullwhip and is a kindly man meant nothing: for those who hold to the Lockean mythology, any denial of this ultimate power of consent is depravity personified.

In terms of Biblical faith, however, it is not man's consent but God's Word which is authoritative. The Biblical pattern of government by councils of elders involves mature consent, but it is always subject to God's Word. Government ultimately and essentially rests on the absolute and autonomous God, not on man's pretended claim to autonomy. It is God's Word, not man's consent, which is authoritative.

The myth of consent thus redefines depravity as anything which withholds the power of consent from man. The myth, moreover, has redefined consent. After Rousseau, Hegel, and Marx, the general will, the consent of all men, is mystically incarnated in a self-designated elite who embody that total consent in their will. Thus, whatever happens to any victim of Red China, the Soviet Union, the new African Socialist states, or to any Cuban, is mystically his own consent judging him! The heirs of Locke

and Rousseau find it a greater privilege and a higher freedom for a man to be a victim of a socialist tyranny than to be prosperous or reasonably free in a society which limits his consent.

The myth of consent, however, destroys its adherents. I once asked an ex-student about a reformed professor of liberal beliefs who taught at his Midwestern university. The printable part of his verdict was, "An opinionated bastard." Why? Consent to the student's own more radical ideas, and opinions about class conduct, had been denied: the ultimate sin had been committed, because consent had been denied.

The myth of consent presupposes autonomous man. This myth of autonomy is only attained by man in the graveyard. A graveyard man has no problems with others: he is a logical existentialist, but he has ceased to exist, and therefore consents to nothing.

131

LOCKE'S PROMISES

Chalcedon Report No. 140, April 1977

John Locke's basic political principle was the myth of consent: "Man being . . . by nature all free, equal, and independent, no one can be put out of this estate, and subjected to the political power of another, without his own consent." For Locke, this universal consent took place in early time, when all men were in the state of nature. (Now, some revolutionists invoke revolution to create a new state of nature, and a new beginning.) Normally, in history, Locke held that the majority represented the whole body politic. Locke was a majoritarian to the core, as Willmoore Kendall pointed out a few years ago.

Locke's humanism placed right in man. Humanistic monarchism had located divine right in the king; Locke now relocated it in the majority. After Rousseau, this majority found its general will expressed by the actions of an elite minority who know best what the majority should want. Dante Germino, in *Machiavelli to Marx: Modern Western Political Thought*, holds, for example, "It is possible that today a minority of the people could prove to be the most authentic and effective exponents of substantive democracy" (p. 137). Frank L. Field proposes re-educational centers to remold dissidents, but claims these are not "full-blown concentration camps" because their purpose is benevolent (F. L. Field, *Current Bases for Educational Practice,* p. 46ff.). The myth of consent leads to "benevolent" concentration camps, where consent must be extracted.

Locke began by denying implicitly the sovereignty of God and His Word in favor of the sovereignty of right reason. True and valid government was for him, as Germino perceptively notes, "government of rational man, by rational men, for rational man." The champions of right reason soon find, however, that most men, including certainly the orthodox Christian, are not "rational." Thus civil government cannot be of or by them but over them for their welfare.

Locke rightly saw the tyranny of rule by one man, a monarch, ruling by his will. The will of one man expresses the greed and sin of that one man. His alternative, however, was the will and word, not of God, but of the majority. The majority, however, is no less sinful and greedy for being a majority. The rise of majoritarianism has given us a greater tyranny at times than the old monarchism in that the greed of the majority is potentially greater than the greed of one man and his circle of courtiers. Socialism and fascism give us the civil government of envy and greed, and hence they decapitalize and destroy society.

The power to rule, whether by one man, a minority, or a majority is a menace to society whenever and wherever it is separated from the objective and absolute law of God. It then becomes, not a government of justice, but of envy, greed, class conflict, and class and race hatred. The basic faith in all forms of humanistic political theory is that a selective rationality exists. This doctrine can hold that one man, a monarch, has divine rights and a rationality sufficient for his task. In other forms, minority and majority rule theories insist that this power of rational rule is compassed by their elite groups or numbers. For Marxism, rational rule is selectively incarnate in the dictatorship of the proletariat. For fascism, rational rule is the province of the elite party and its leader.

Hitler, for example, believed in neither God nor in conscience, which he called "a Jewish invention, a blemish like circumcision." Man's hope was for him in scientific reason. During the war, he stated, "The dogma of Christianity gets worn away before the advances of science . . . Gradually the myths crumble. All that is left is to prove that in nature there is no frontier between the organic and the inorganic. When understanding of the universe has become widespread, when the majority of men know that the stars are not sources of light, but worlds, perhaps inhabited worlds like ours, then the Christian doctrine will be convicted of absurdity . . . The man who lives in communion with nature necessarily finds himself in opposition to the Churches, and that's why they're heading for ruin — for science is bound to win." *Science is bound to win!* We cannot understand why the German universities so extensively supported Hitler if we fail to grasp this central aspect of Hitler's faith. Hitler's wartime plans for rebuilding Linz included a great observatory and planetarium as its centerpiece. It would become the center of a religion of science, and, Hitler said, "Thousands of excursionists will make a pilgrimage there every Sunday . . . It will be our way of giving man a religious spirit" (Alan Bullock, *Hitler: A Study in Tyranny*, pp. 389–390). There is no reason to believe that our universities will not be equally ready, throughout the Western world, to receive another Hitler or Stalin.

Having denied the sovereign God, men will locate sovereignty somewhere on the human scene, and close to themselves. Having transferred justice and righteousness from God to man, men will confuse their will with justice, and other men will be less than men in their sight.

If man is defined in terms of God and His Word, all men are created in His image; all men are alike sinners, and the call to redemption is extended to all men. If man is defined as a rational animal, then man is defined by his rationality. In campus discussions, I have been told by some who oppose me that my Christian position is totally irrational; for me, their unbelief (or, sometimes, heresy) is "totally irrational." We have here a flexible yardstick which depends on our presuppositions. Thus, whenever we begin with a humanistic definition of man, we dehumanize most men. They are then subhuman, and their consent is unnecessary, because they lack mental competence supposedly. The myth of consent is leading increasingly to no consent, and in socialism and fascism it redefines consent to make it a farce.

God having made us, defined us, and established us in our world and circumstances, reserves unto Himself the right to remake us. Any attempt by man to remake man in terms of a humanistic righteousness is usurpation.

132

CRITICAL ANALYSIS

Chalcedon Report No. 138, February 1977

When the first academician, Satan, confronted Eve, he challenged her to abandon her naive faith and to subject the word of God to critical analysis. He raised the question, "Yea, hath God said?" (Gen. 3:1). Every word of God, he held, was a partisan and subjective word and should be given the careful scrutiny of critical analysis. Only then, he held, can man determine what the objective content of any word from God can amount to. And so was born modern education.

I recall during my university days one elderly professor who held that poetry was to be enjoyed, and any study of poetry should have as its purpose our greater appreciation of it. He was regarded with amusement by the other faculty members who were busy training us all to sit in judgment as little gods on Shakespeare, Milton, Donne, and others. The more apt we were in critical analysis, the better our grades, and the faculty's opinion of us.

Our seminaries today do not really train pastors, although this is their formal function, and even though they do include a number of trash courses which are supposed to fulfil that purpose. What they do educate for is the production of an effectively trained group of critical analysts who can dissect Scripture but never or rarely see its relevancy to the real world.

Thus, all too often, churchmen not only are deeply imbued with an apologetics which has as its first principle autonomous man, but they also apply that autonomous man's basic tool, the idea of critical analysis. Critical analysis brings all things before the bar of man's autonomous mind as judge and arbiter of all things. Christian analysis subjects all things to the judgment of God's enscriptured Word as the standard. The distance between the two cannot be bridged.

Critical analysis is a weapon of impotence. It engenders nothing: it can only dissect. I am regularly told that, while Chalcedon is doing some very important thinking, in order to gain more academic attention, we should do something in the area of critical analyses. My answer is that we are in principle opposed to such thinking, and we gladly leave that domain to the intellectual eunuchs of our time. We are interested in thinking for action. St. Paul had this in mind: "Study to show thyself approved unto God, a *workman* that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth" (2 Tim. 2:15).

This is not all. Critical analysis is a form of retreat from the world. Man is not autonomous, nor is he God. All thinking which presupposes man as the basic judge and arbiter involves a flight from reality. It is no wonder that the world of autonomous intellectualism, the modern university, has had an ivory-tower reputation. Critical analysis makes one remote from reality.

This remoteness is never more apparent than when the critical analyst tries to desert the ivory tower. Karl Marx was savagely critical of the ivory-tower mentality and the world of critical analysis. In his *Theses on Feuerbach*, Marx attacked the abstractness of critical analysis and called for its replacement by the revolutionary or practical-critical activity he favored. In this scheme of things, autonomous man still remains. However, the critique is now no longer abstract and intellectual but intellectually and actively destructive and revolutionary. Autonomous man must smash and remake the world after his own image, analysis, and imagination.

These two concepts, on the one hand critical analysis, and, on the other, critical-practical revolutionary action, are basic to modern education. At every turn, the student is prepared to judge the world, and to require the world to meet his standards. Naturally, this involves judging his parents, teachers, and society. It also means passing judgment on the world, life, and God.

The implication of Christian faith and analysis is that it is man who much change and be conformed to the will of God, and then to bring all things under the dominion of his Lord and Christ. The implication of critical analysis is that God, man, and the world must be conformed to our will, because we are the center, judge, and standard.

It should not surprise us, therefore, that the major area of struggle in the United States today is between statist, humanistic schools, and the truly Christian schools. This battle is not a dramatic, front-page story in most cases, although it has such moments. It is being fought in the minds and hearts of men, and in the courts of law. Too long a compromise with humanistic education has given the church weak men, double-minded,

unstable in all their ways, incapable of receiving anything from the Lord (James 1:7–8), let alone acting ably for Him. Only as an education which assumes that every child is an autonomous mind, independent from God, and to be trained in a critical analysis, is replaced by an education which is in root and branch Christian, training and educating youth in the truly liberal arts (the arts of liberty or freedom in Christ, and dominion under His royal law), can we have an education which has a grasp on reality and trains men of power rather than eunuchs.

A society of eunuchs has no future, unless it makes eunuchs out of youth. A Christian society alone has an assured future: it has the certainty of the sovereign and omnipotent God who cannot fail, and whose every word and purpose shall be fulfilled or put into force.

Our interest is thus not in critical analysis but in preparing men for dominion.

133

DIDEROT: THE GARDENER AND THE WORM

Chalcedon Report No. 142, June 1977

HUMANISM exalts man as sovereign, but, in practice, this means that it is some men, an elite group, who rule as sovereign, as the working god of the social order. Most humanists are unwilling to state their case so baldly. Nietzsche, however, did. Among his manuscripts collected after his death was a piece of paper stating simply, "Since the old God has been abolished, I am prepared to rule the world." Nietzsche recognized that the growth towards democracy in his day was also the denial of God and the exaltation of man, which meant the great opportunity for the elite man, the tyrant. He held, "The democratization of Europe is at the same time an involuntary preparation for the rearing of tyrants taking the word in all its meanings, even in its most spiritual sense." Of men in general, he held, "One has no right to existence or to work, to say nothing of a right to 'happiness.' The individual human being is in precisely the same case as the lowest worm." If there is no God, then there is no absolute law protecting any man or anything from any use demanded by any power. As Dostoyevsky saw, if there is no God, then everything is permitted.

Earlier, the same point had been made in the 1760s by Diderot in *Rameau's Nephew*. In this dialogue, the nephew, a nihilist, gives us the thesis of the book: there is no difference between a gardener who prunes the garden and the worms who perform the same task by feeding on the leaves. The philosopher cannot say that the worm is not equal to the gardener. This short novel was translated from the French by Goethe. Hegel was delighted with it, and Marx found it a joy. Why? After all, these men were, in a sense, gardeners, philosophical gardeners. Were they demoting themselves? On the contrary, they were demoting God and absolute

law, moral standards and human integrity. By calling the worm equal to the gardener, the worm was not exalted; rather, all moral standards were subverted. The worm and the gardener were made equally meaningless and equally free from God's law. When a gardener and a worm are both cut lose from all restraints, considerations, laws, and standards, it is not the worms who win but the gardeners. This was clearly demonstrated by Robespierre and other "gardeners" in the French Revolution. Otto J. Scott, in *Robespierre: The Voice of Virtue*, has shown how the revolutionary gardeners treated their human worms. Humanistic democracy has moved very rapidly into fascist and socialist statism, with the masses of men being called sovereigns while disposed of as worms.

But this is not all. *Rameau's Nephew*, Nietzsche, and others, the Marquis de Sade included, all argued that, because there is no God, there is no law. This is not altogether an honest argument. What they meant, rather, was that, because there was for them no God, this meant that God's law was invalid. This cleared the ground for a new lawgiver, man. The "gardener" now made the laws, and the chief gardener, the dictator, legislator, president, prime minister, or chairman declared what law should be, and how his law would create a new Garden of Eden.

According to the Bible, the world is God's creation and totally under His law. The Garden of Eden was to be tended entirely in terms of His purpose and law and made the exemplar and testing area in terms of which the whole world was to be brought under dominion by man in terms of God's rule and law. The head gardener was thus declared to be God. In this garden, man is not a worm but a creature made in the image of God, created for knowledge, righteousness, holiness, and dominion.

Diderot's garden abolished God and instituted a democracy, but a meaningless one. Since gardener and worm are alike meaningless and the same, and no objective values exist, the only functioning and pragmatic value is power. The goal of Diderot's disciples thus became power, and the test of power was the ability to control and prune the garden and the worms, and to kill all who resisted. The original and full slogan of the French Revolution was thus almost honest: "Liberty, Fraternity, Equality — or Death." It should have read, "Liberty, Fraternity, Equality, and Death." When all values are reduced to nothing, then only power establishes value, and death is the means whereby this new value is applied.

Prospective gardeners over the planned humanistic Garden of Eden have since been busy defining who the worms are, depending on their particular humanistic starting point. For some, the human worms are the capitalists, for others, the lower classes. Others define the human worms as a particular race, nationality, or color, a religious group, or a vocation

(i.e., bankers, lawyers, doctors, or what have you). In any case, it is some men who become expendable in the name of freedom and equality.

Rameau's Nephew saw the whole world and life as absurd and meaningless. Nothing is more absurd in such a world as any attempt to maintain moral standards and values. Freedom means freedom from God's law. Camus, in *The Rebel*, drew the logical conclusion in the twentieth century. Freedom for atheistic, existential man is from God and from God's law, from righteousness and the idea of the good. It thus means freedom to do evil, freedom to create a demonic world. The "free" spirits of the modern world thus delight in evil, pornography, occultism, and Satanism.

For us, however, there can be no freedom except under God and His law. Life apart from God is hell, and man's pretensions to be god are insanity. Nietzsche was prepared to be god and to rule the world, regarding other men as equal to "the lowest worm." Nietzsche ended in a mental institution, hopelessly insane and under the jurisdiction of custodians with a better philosophy than Nietzsche's.

Because God reigns, His law governs, and His Kingdom shall prevail. If you live apart from God and His law, you will be living in Nietzsche's world. "Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord" (2 Cor. 6:17).

134

REASON AND POLITICS

Chalcedon Report No. 148, December 1977

The modern era has seen man, not as a religious creature made in the image of God, but as a rational and political animal. This has meant a warping of man, who is viewed, not in terms of the wholeness of his being and in terms of God's image, but rather in terms of reason. Moreover, reason took on a new meaning; it now meant an autonomous and final judge over all things, so that man became the working god of the world. Moreover, because man has been seen, not only in terms of this new view of reason, but as a political animal, man's answers and salvation take a political form.

Because of this new definition of man, the modern age began by excluding women from their newly defined "real" world. Man, the male, was defined as a rational and political animal; the rational and political aspects were man's male prerogatives because woman was essentially seen as irrational and hence basically as a human animal. She was thus in essence a household pet to be kept in captivity as a tamed animal. An untamed woman could be a social problem.

Biblical law had restricted woman's governmental role, not because of any incompetence, because Proverbs 31:10–31 makes clear her high potential, but because of a division of labor ordained by God. Moreover, the male spheres of church and state are in Scripture clearly subordinate to the female sphere of the family. The "limitation" thus has as its goal the maintenance of the priority of the family in society and in the woman's attention.

Now, however, new priorities prevailed. Earlier, the church had claimed priority. Now, the state made the claim, with far greater intolerance and insistence, and the new view of man meant the radical downgrading of woman. Moreover, the exaltation of reason and politics

limited the male priority to certain men alone, the man of reason and politics. This meant that Plato's philosopher-kings were the true humanity, because they represented reason and politics, and other men and all women were social cattle, animals. Not surprisingly, the modern age saw the worst development of serfdom since the fall of Rome. Serfdom became more oppressive, and the serfs of Europe more and more beaten down and treated as an almost subhuman species. When radicals began to champion "the common man," they did so with the basic assumption that these human cattle could only become "authentically human" under the guidance of the philosopher-kings. Basic to this conveyance of the gift of humanity to the peasant and working classes was the politicizing of man. This meant two things. *First*, man had to be separated from Christianity, "the opium of the masses." Since to be a man requires the conversion of man to reason and to politics, no poor peasant or worker could become "authentically human," to use a phrase dear to modern theologians, without a separation from his old-fashioned Christian faith. Hence, the dehumanizing "shame" of Christianity had to be wiped out. *Second*, the means whereby this fallen man was to be remade and rescued was seen as education. The move of the state, therefore, into education was a rapid one. To modern men everywhere, it had the force of an inevitable and necessary truth. It was seen as the mission of the state to re-create man by means of statist education.

Meanwhile, the life of reason was expanded to include science, and science became a great potential instrument in the remaking of man and society. In the theory of scientific socialism, all the basic elements of the new view of man were put together: the politicizing of man, man as reason, and science as the great instrument of reason in the new plan of salvation. The "real" world was now the world of science, politics, and autonomous reason.

Through these new instruments forged by reason, science, and politics, the excluded human "cattle" could now be let in, after being remade, "born again" by statist education, controls, and science. Peasants and workers were gradually separated from their old faith. Women were made to think that the once-prior world of the family was now a prison, or, at best, a stultifying and irrelevant domain. The goal of the obliteration of Christian faith and the family seemed closer to realization.

In the United States, where the roots of the past seemed least deep, the sharpest reaction began after World War II, the Christian school movement. The next decade will see bitter warfare between the modern establishment and the Christian school, a war to death. Similarly, the Christian family regained unexpected strength and priority with increasing

numbers, and modern youth, in considerable numbers, began to forsake the statism of their fathers for Christian roots.

All of this is a threat to the life of the modern establishment, and the battle is and will be a bitterly sharp one. The instruments of political and social power are almost all in the hands of the enemy, but it is in his camp, too, that disintegration is most dramatically at work. Moreover, in this battle, there is more involved than the two protagonists. The triune God is never absent from history: it serves His purpose, moves to His goal, and is absolutely governed by His sovereign power. The battle is the Lord's.

135

WOMEN

Chalcedon Report No. 147, November 1977

One of the consequences of the Enlightenment was the legal and social downgrading of women. Because the Enlightenment exalted reason to the place of God, it also exalted man as against woman. Man was seen as the vessel and voice of pure reason. Woman at best was practical reason, or, more commonly, emotion (or unreason). Legal discriminations aimed at enforcing the supposed incapacity of women to manage property began to proliferate. Because religion was seen by the men of the Enlightenment as emotionalism, religion was made the province of women, and philosophy the realm of males. These concepts, which began in Europe after 1660, reached America in the early 1800s.

The result was the deformation of both men and women. The sexes, instead of being complementary, were now seen as opposite, and the old pagan idea of conflict again predominated.

Man saw himself as reason and woman as a grown-up child, because she represented unreason. In some areas, as in England, "privileged" boys were early separated from their mothers for their better schooling, with unhappy consequences. In France, Bodin, with others, saw woman as closer to the animals.

A woman, if beautiful and witty, could be treated as a goddess, or a plaything, but her status was at all times made dependent upon a man's judgment, not God's ordination. Reason had become incarnate, and its name was man, and woman had better bow down to the new god of creation.

The Romantic movement exalted emotions, without surrendering man's priority and man's claim to be reason incarnate. All the same, the Romantic movement did give birth, by this emphasis on feeling, to feminism. In fact, in the nineteenth century, many women, imbued with

the philosophy of Romanticism, saw woman as a higher and purer being, because she was more emotional. The men of the Romantic movement, however, saw only one kind of relationship with woman as "exalted," safe, and Romantic, the adulterous relationship. The free expression of Romantic emotionalism meant a separation from the family and from responsibility. To be responsible was to be unfree. As a result, the feminist leaders, whether Mary Wollstonecraft or Victoria Woodhull, were "liberated" women, liberated from family ties and from responsibility. If any of these women began to make demands for responsibility from the male Romantics, they were dropped as goddesses who had fallen from grace.

The "freedom" of man which marks the modern age is freedom essentially and primarily from God. This also requires freedom from all forms of responsibility. The family is especially hated. In Nietzsche, this Enlightenment principle meant a ridicule of the idea that a philosopher could be married.

Instead of attacking modern man as insane and irresponsible, the feminists began to hunger for the same irresponsibilities, forgetting that it would only increase their vulnerability and victimization. This particular emphasis came to the forefront, although long present, in the 1960s, in the renewed feminist movement. Women, too, have to become reason incarnate; women, too, have the right to "freedom" or irresponsibility. If men can be playboys, women can be playgirls. So went the demands.

Liberation meant the same thing, freedom from God, and therefore freedom from all God-ordained responsibilities. It means antinomianism and unbelief.

St. Paul declares, "where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty" (2 Cor. 3:17). The modern faith is, where the spirit of unbelief and lawlessness is, there is liberty. The result is social suicide.

The rapid erosion of responsibility has meant an increasing social atomism and the stress on the radical autonomy of the individual. Classes now exist for women, to teach masturbation, so that they can dispense with men. Similar emphases are made for men, at home and abroad. Not only is God dead for these people, but all other men and women.

The insane can only exist in their withdrawal from reality if someone supports them in their flight. Without that support, they either perish or return to functioning. The modern state everywhere is attempting the impossible, to create a state which will permit all men the security of retreat from reality into cradle-to-grave security. The end of such an attempt is either disaster, or return to sanity.

The premises of modern man involve a flight from reality and delusions of deity. With his women and children now joining him in his

heedless course, modern man's days are numbered. His support from the stable elements of society is being endangered and progressively destroyed by his actions, and the time of collapse approaches.

What modern man forgets is that this is God's world. Because it is God's world, these are good days and good times. God's blessings and His judgments are alike good, and righteous altogether. Let us look forward to them.

136

EXISTENTIALISM

Chalcedon Report No. 169, September 1979

I was on the stand in a church and Christian school trial, and the church's attorney, Charles Craze, was questioning me about the Biblical doctrine of church and state, and its relationship to the First Amendment. The state attorney objected to the line of questioning and testimony as "irrelevant"; he remarked that it was interesting, but had no bearing on the case.

I suddenly realized how familiar this kind of objection had become to me, and how, in various conversations with civil authorities, the same point had been made. First Amendment questions were called "historical" rather than "legal."

One of our failures as Christians is to assume that the humanists think exactly as we do on everything except the Lord. However, the essence of unbelief is that the whole of life, the world, and history are viewed very differently. As practicing existentialists, these civil officials see the First Amendment as a part of the dead past: it must not bind them. Truth springs out of the existential moment, not from God. The past has meaning only for the past, not for the present. Hence, an argument which rests on a faith and on history, i.e., the accumulated victories of the faith in history, is to them irrelevant. The existentialist uses the past: he sees no binding force coming from above nor behind in time. Thus, in one ugly case, in California, the state has gone past the First Amendment to appeal to seven hundred years of precedent in English law, i.e., to tyrants like Henry II and Henry VIII and their controls over the church.

Where there is existentialism, there is no law, only the arbitrary acts of the moment. The existential moment makes its laws in terms of its present demands.

The nature of law has changed over the centuries, as faith has changed. In Western civilization, under Christian influence, the source of law was

God and His Word, the Bible. God being sovereign, He alone could be the source of law, because lawmaking is an attribute of sovereignty. This faith has never been more than partially prevalent, because, with the surviving paganisms, many held that the king was the lord or sovereign, and hence the source of law. Not the canon (or rule) of Scripture, but the canon of the king or state was held to be law.

With the Enlightenment, this faith triumphed, first, as the divine right of kings, and then as the divine right of parliaments, or of the peoples: "*Vox populi vox dei*," the voice of the people is the voice of God, and hence the source of law. The result was civil law replacing Biblical law. The state or civil order was seen as the lord, as sovereign. The French Revolution simply stated openly what had become an implicit fact.

Then, however, the socialists began to attack civil law as class law, as a means of war by one class (the capitalists) against another (the workers). Socialism openly calls for class law, and therefore class warfare. Civil law renounces God and God's jurisdiction. Class law renounces God and all men who are not of the "working class," and it reserves the right to define by death anyone who does not belong to that class.

The existentialists have had close affinities to Marxism, as well as family quarrels. Both are militant humanists, and the existentialists (or pragmatists, who are a branch of existentialism) are the more radical. The Marxists have been more brutal, but the existentialists have been more radical. The stronghold of existentialism or pragmatism has been the democratic Western nations. In the United States, John Dewey and all philosophers of state education after him have been existentialists or pragmatists.

The Marxist believes in a planned society; the existentialist believes in a planning society. For the Marxist, a plan exists, which must be enforced. For the existentialist, no plan exists; the moment and its needs determines the plan and its controls, but tomorrow another concept of planning must or may prevail. However, at all times, planning is an attribute of man. The Marxist believes in a fixed plan of humanistic predestination by law, whereas the existentialist believes in a moment by moment, pragmatic and instrumental planning or humanistic predestination. The result of existentialist planning and law is a destructive drift.

The Marxists thus usually gain the upper hand against the existentialists, who have disarmed themselves of anything which God, man, or history can teach them. But the logic of Marxism points towards existentialism and its anarchic world. Marx recognized this, and his most passionate and illogical work was his attack, in two volumes, on the anarchist, Max Stirner. He saw Stirner's logic as leading to the death of

humanism. Stirner limited meaning to man's arbitrary will; Marx wanted to retain enough meaning in history, but without God, to vindicate socialism and the dialectical process in history. Like King Canute, he tried to order the waves of an ocean of meaninglessness to stop short of engulfing Marxism and its world. His effort was futile. Without God, man is lost in a shoreless ocean of emptiness and meaninglessness.

Logically, Christians are, and always will be, "more than conquerors" in Jesus Christ (Rom. 8:37). Practically, most churchmen preach impotence by limiting God and His meaning to a single vessel on the ocean of history, the church. Recently, one very able European theologian sharply criticized all views of the book of Revelation which saw a meaning for all of history therein. It is a covenant book, he held, meaning a church book, speaking only about the life of the church, not the world! But the covenant of God in Adam is with all men, all men are thus covenant-breakers or lawbreakers. The covenant renewed in Christ requires all men to confess God, in every state and institution, or else be judged and broken by the King. When we limit the covenant to the church, we have no law and no gospel.

The word *gospel*, after all, was an imperial-political word, meaning that the Savior-King has ascended to the throne, and He reigns. If Christ does not reign, we are without gospel, law, or hope. But He reigns, and shall prevail, and the gates of hell shall not be able to hold out against His ecclesia or Kingdom (Matt. 16:18).

137

OUR FALSE PREMISES

Chalcedon Report No. 361, August 1995

When a new idea or faith has suddenly raced through a people, it is because their minds were ready for it, and someone brought it into focus. The thinking of Jean-Jacques Rousseau may seem puerile today to many, but in his day, it had the force of a revelation. It was what people wanted to believe clarified and expressed for them.

It was so with René Descartes, although to a minor degree. The focus and center of man's thinking had increasingly become *the mind of man*. Instead of beginning with God, thinking was increasingly man-centered. Renaissance man's stage was no longer the eyes of God but the eyes of men, important men. God was no longer central: man was. An intellectual revolution had taken place. The Reformation, in particular Calvinism, for a time arrested this, but the cultural momentum towards a radical humanism in time reasserted itself. As a result, Descartes' starting point, the autonomous mind and reason of the natural man, quickly had the force of logic to the minds of men. "*Cogito, ergo sum*," I think therefore I am, began to take over as the premise of philosophy.

William Occam, a medieval philosopher, had set forth a rule, known as Occam's razor, which held that in science and philosophy the simplest explanation should be preferred. In terms of this, Berkeley, in his philosophy, eliminated the physical world to replace it with sense impressions coming from God. Hume dropped God and held that only consciousness exists; we have no direct knowledge of either God or the outer world. Kant then held that the real world is the world of consciousness: "The understanding does not derive its law (a priori) from, but prescribes them to nature" (Norman Kemp Smith, trans., *Immanuel Kant's Critique of Pure Reason*, preface to 2nd ed., B-vii, p. 11). Since the real world was now the mind of man, Hegel logically held that the rational is the real.

Existentialism carried this to its conclusion: man's own being, when least influenced by parents, church, school, or society, best expresses existential reality.

One product of this philosophical development was rationalism. Rationalism means the exaltation of reason to the place of God, i.e., final judgment. The bar of reason became the testing place of all religions, revelations, and of God. E. J. Carnell, a churchman, insisted that reason is judge over all things. Biblical faith requires viewing reason as an ability of man under God, not as God.

Another product was Romanticism. The Romantic movement divinized feelings and emotions. The child came from God fresh with innocence and inspiration. Feelings were trusted by the Romantics, and past records of revelation were downgraded. Within the church, feelings were encouraged and cultivated as fresh outpourings of a divine will of being. The child became a prophet to some. This led to an inevitable conclusion, namely, that if spontaneous emotions in the child were from God, why not so also when adults freed themselves to impulsive emotional outbursts?

Some had held, the rational is the real. Now, many were ready to believe that the emotional is the real. Revivalism was a product of the Romantic movement because it stressed the centrality of an emotional experience to conversion rather than the sovereign grace of God. On a variety of levels, this caused problems. At revival and camp meetings in the American South prior to 1860, some slaves were "converted" who were soon no different after their "conversion" than before. More embarrassing to the churches, the same was true of too many white "converts." Some of the moral "side effects" of revivalism were especially embarrassing. Charles G. Finney reduced the Holy Spirit and the experience of Him to a human technique. Since then, men have been "converted," or "filled with the Spirit," by learned human techniques which are far from the third person of the Trinity. Too much of "charismania" is a product of the Romantic movement rather than the Holy Spirit.

Under rationalism, preaching became a series of logical propositions and arguments. People were to be "converted" by reason and logic, and the church became cold and formal. Many "conservative" seminaries teach homiletics in this rationalistic tradition. It is not a proclamation of *the Word* of God but a formal, rational statement of it. Others, in the traditional romantic mode, want the hearers emotionally moved, and nothing is held to be more satisfying than a flood of emotions. In the "laughing revival" services, much time passes without any intelligible statements being made.

When God summoned Bezaleel and Aholiab to serve Him in the making of the sanctuary, the tabernacle, He declared, "And I have filled him with the spirit of God, in wisdom, and in understanding, and in knowledge, and in all manner of workmanship" (Exod. 31:3). Today, for too many, to be filled with the spirit means to be bereft of wisdom, understanding, and knowledge.

We have the unhappy situation today of one segment of the church dedicated to reason, to evidentialism, to a trust in the mind of man as the decisive factor and agency.

On the other hand, we have others who are equally dedicated to emotionalism as the key power that captures the Holy Ghost. In either case, man chooses God, a blasphemous idea. Our Lord declares, "Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you, and ordained you, that ye should go and bring forth fruit, and that your fruit should remain: that whatsoever ye shall ask of the Father in my name, he may give it you" (John 15:16).

Our starting point cannot be the autonomous mind of man. It must be the triune God and His Word.

138

EVERYDAY ROMANTICISM

Chalcedon Report No. 341, December 1993

A number of excellent studies have been written on the romantic movement in the arts, politics, religion, and other areas of life. My concern is with everyday, popular Romanticism.

Geoffrey Grigson and Charles Harvard Gibbs-Smith, editors of *Ideas* (1957), wrote of romantic love that it "was the dream of a universe peopled by two alone, where they and time stood still. It began at first sight; it was an instantaneous spell. It was something to be *desired*, and not something to be *lived*; a possession, rather than a relationship ['Get me the girl,' said Faust to Mephistopheles]. It foresaw no development; it was complete in itself."

Romanticism wants no reality except that which it ordains. If the loved one does not please the lover, love turns to rage and hate. P. B. Shelley, his life and his poetry, give us vivid examples of this. Romanticism wants the world of one's imagination, not reality. In fact, romanticism imagines that man can do things better than God, if only God would permit it! Not surprisingly, romanticism readily decays into occultism and Satanism.

Romanticism must be recognized as the core of a very common problem in and out of the church. All too many pastoral problems have their roots in a romantic temperament among the people.

Men begin early with unrealistic romantic dreams. They study law, for example, with a storybook notion of dramatic victories before the bar, or journalism, imagining sensational newsbreaks of startling dimensions, and so on and on. The necessity of earning a living is an early cure for the romantic disposition, which, in men, is related to their vocational hopes.

With women, romanticism is related to the man-woman relationship, to love. It is more often a problem of middle age these days, and a very

sad one. For example, a middle-aged widow, left financially reasonably well to do and with a good, loving family, wanted a passionate, adoring man, she insisted. The men her age were out of passion and more interested in a comfortable life. Because of her obviously romantic disposition, she became a victim of every predatory male, young and old. Unwilling to give up her romantic dreams for reality, she became readily victimized.

There are too many romantic women ready to leave their husbands because these men do not become rapturously lustful at the sight of them. This is absurd and sad.

The Romantic temper and movement have a deep affinity to *revolution*. In fact, modern revolutionary movements are essentially related to Romanticism. What for Christians God can do through conversion, the romanticists believe Revolution can do for men and nations. The results are reigns of terror, blood baths, slave labor camps, and the like. Revolutions do not regenerate men and nations; instead, they kill.

Romantics insist, "Life on our terms only!" This is why Romanticism and tears are so commonly associated. The romantic refuses to accept God's reality and becomes enraged or grief-stricken when life frustrates him or her. There are two things that matter to the romantic: a dream and possession, that is, something desired, and its possession. Little thought is given to what intervenes in the real world, i.e., hard work, patience, respect, planning, and care. The romantic's perspective is, I want, therefore I must have.

I recall a very talented artist who became a failure because he refused to acknowledge that talent needs training, patience, and experience. He had rejected the reality of life in favor of his romantic dream of instant gratification and success.

This is the fairytale mentality. Fairy tales were reworkings of old folk tales by romantic scholars. Even then, because their appearance was early in the Romantic movement, they did reflect a world of problems, despite their fairytale endings. But the fairy-tale ending is what people want, not a story of work and patience.

But Romanticism is deeply entrenched in our culture. One mother, whose home is at times a gathering place of youths, both males and females, who came to be with her son and daughter, was startled on one occasion as she listened to their highly improbable ideas about their wants and wishes. She first told herself, "They are very young," but then, realized, they were at an age when serious, realistic thinking is most necessary. It frightened her to think that these young people were on a collision course with reality.

The world is a fallen realm. Too many people, old and young, demand that it satisfy them, forgetting that they are themselves fallen. Too many sinners see themselves as innocent and the world as the problem. And too many limit their world to themselves and a very few others. This is because Romanticism is a blinding belief. It refuses to surrender its illusions and confront reality with a Christian faith. In effect, it says to God, my dreams are better than your world, forgetting that those dreams are egocentric imaginations and are radically dangerous to us because they are false.

The definition of romantic love as "the dream of a universe peopled by two alone" is a kindly one. In essence, it is a world peopled by the dreamer alone. For Shelley, the dream woman was a goddess; when she became the everyday woman, she was a witch. There was no room in Shelley's world for anyone other than himself.

This is why Romanticism leads to disaster. It will not live with God's reality. Only a true Biblical faith can overcome the evil of Romanticism.

139

FROM APE MAN TO CHRISTIAN MAN

Chalcedon Report No. 382, May 1997

A few nights ago, I watched a videotape of *Tarzan,* the 1932 film with Johnny Weissmuller. The book, *Tarzan of the Apes*, was written in 1914 by Edgar Rice Burroughs (1875–1950). It is hard now to realize how successful the Tarzan stories were then. In the mid-1920s, in my school, all the boys were reading them; I read one and was not much interested. Until watching this film, I had seen only a few minutes of a later one, on television.

The Tarzan stories were later versions of Rousseau's "noble savage" myth. Tarzan was the natural man, reared by the apes apart from civilization and possessing a natural goodness and nobility. As against civilized men, he is the good, because the natural, man. Meeting Jane, he is the perfect gentleman to the manner born. The story of Tarzan was the myth of the noble savage for the masses. In various ways, the myth was continued: the criminal, as the outsider, became in the films of the 1930s the new victim of civilization and often the truly noble hero. Then, in the 1960s blacks were given that role by the media, not, of course, educated and successful blacks, but ghetto figures. The hero had to be outside of civilization!

But, some years ago, Mario Praz, in *The Romantic Agony*, demonstrated how this romantic notion had taken a downward trail from natural nobility to natural depravity. One novelist of 1974 has his character admit, "Conquest is all that concerns me. Hate is my aphrodisiac." The natural man was beginning to show his fallen stripes! Before long, the new cultural heroes in the tradition of Rousseau were homosexuals, one in Britain declaring that theirs was the truly free culture because it was totally artificial, ostensibly free of both God and nature.

"But he that sinneth against me wrongeth his own soul: all they that

hate me love death" (Prov. 8:36). We live in a death-loving culture which will in time destroy itself. The more it separates itself from God, the more it separates itself from life. In my student days, solipsism was a concern to many, i.e., the conclusion that one cannot know anything except one's self, and that knowledge beyond the self is not possible. Before too many years, existentialism embraced this conclusion triumphantly. As a result, the solipsist individual, as the only reality, was Rousseau's natural man, not only rejecting civilization but also proclaiming his barbarity as the new gospel in the 1960s. Rousseau's noble savage and Burrough's noble ape-man were becoming destroyers. Forbidden knowledge and forbidden experiences ceased to exist. The culture of death began to prevail.

At the same time, however, amidst the shambles of pietism and its evasions of reality, a Christian culture began to develop. Christian schools and home schools began to grow and spread rapidly. Surrounded by the evidences of a dying world, a new world is in the making. The old order is nearing death. Therefore, rejoice! We are moving from Rousseau's ape-man to the new man in Christ.

140

PSYCHOPATHS

Chalcedon Report No. 392, March 1998

Voltaire in *The History of Charles XII, King of Sweden*, concludes his introduction with these words, "If some prince and some ministers find some disagreeable truths in this work, let them remember that, being public men, they owe the public an account of their actions; that it is at this price they purchase their greatness."

These words indicated the great intellectual revolution underway with the Enlightenment. According to this new view, kings, prime ministers, and rulers were "public men" who were accountable to the people. Previously, rulers and all peoples were seen as accountable to God. Great men and small confessed their sins and did penance. Now, however, Christian man had been replaced by public man, a major and revolutionary change.

Accountability is now to man, to rulers, because both people and their rulers are seen as public men. The results are revolutionary and also deadly. Consider the implications: the great majority of Americans profess some kind of Christian faith, or at the least over 90 percent claim to believe in God. In spite of this fact, politics is now a religion-free realm. Religious symbols are barred from public places and the posting of the Ten Commandments in civil courts and state schools is commonly excluded.

Now, religious faith is the major motivating force in human life, and yet it is excluded from the affairs of state. The Ten Commandments are God's law, imperatives for Jews and Christians, and yet they are barred, while pornography, abortion, and homosexuality are legal.

Christian man has been replaced by public man, officially denuded of religion and morality. Is it any wonder that we see a proliferation of psychopaths, their serial rapes, murders, and other crimes, all committed without conscience? Having by laws stripped citizens and state of

Christian faith and morality, the psychopath is the logical result. It is an amazing fact that we do not have more psychopaths. The seeds thereof are to be seen in growing numbers of peoples.

Children are reared and educated in state schools stripped of Biblical faith and morality. They are taught that values are not eternal but self-chosen, valid only for themselves. This is the mental framework of the psychopath, a total irresponsibility to God and to man. He is the logical product of our schools and culture, and his numbers will only increase unless autonomy, self-law, is replaced by theonomy, God's law. Unless we have theonomy, men and nations will alike be governed by self-law, autonomy.

This leads to another implication. The modern state, by rejecting God and Christ, and God's law, seeks to impose its fiat will on everything, responsible to no higher power. The modern state has seen the rise of psychopaths because its stance is most conducive to it. Shortly after World War II, Frederick Moore Vinson, then chief justice of the U. S Supreme Court, held, "Nothing is more certain in modern society than the principle that there are no absolutes." For Vinson and others, moral and religious absolutes were replaced by fiat ones — their own words, laws, and decisions.

The implications of the position of the modern state have seeped down to school children, street gangs, criminals, business men, workers, and too many clergymen. An antinomian stance is now commonplace.

Voltaire held his anti-Christian views in secrecy, as it were, sharing them only with intellectuals. On one occasion, he silenced his visitors' anti-Christian talk when a servant entered the room. If his servant, he said, were to learn unbelief, what would keep him from cutting his, Voltaire's, throat some night and robbing him? The modern heirs of Voltaire are not as wise. They insist on de-Christianizing the world; they train up psychopaths, and they envision a great, new world order as a result of their policies! They shall reap the whirlwind.

141

NIHILISM

Chalcedon Report No. 84, August 1, 1972

One of the telling aspects of life and thought in Old Russia was the rise and prevalence of nihilism. The history of nihilism as a movement and a philosophy competing with populism, Marxism, and other movements, is an important one, but, even more important, nihilism was a mood and an outlook which infected more than those who called themselves nihilists. The philosophical nihilists bowed to no authority and accepted no doctrine unless proven to their satisfaction; they were the fathers of anarchism. Bakunin, the great nihilist, was an atheist who called for the abolition of church, state, marriage and the family, and private property. His thesis was, "Be ready to die and ready to kill any one who opposes the triumph of your revolt."

Very quickly, however, it became apparent that the nihilist-anarchist youth were persons, as one of their number frankly stated, who had a "psychological unfitness for any peaceful work." As a matter of fact, the anarchist Boris Savinkov made it as a test of membership "that only those psychologically unable to engage in peaceful work should enter the terrorist field and that, in general, one should not make the decision hastily" (Boris Savinkov, *Memoirs of a Terrorist* [New York, NY: Albert & Charles Boni, 1931] pp. 13, 77, 85). The nihilistic temperament was thus one of an apocalyptic love of destruction and an inability to work. It was a hatred of everything in the world at hand, and a lust to kill, maim, and destroy as the means to peace and freedom. The only joy was in cynicism and destruction, and activities were strongly suicidal. No law was recognized beyond their own will and desires. As Lida, by no means a philosophical anarchist, observed to herself in Mikhail Artsybashev's novel of the early twentieth-century Russia, *Sanin*, "she had a right to do whatever she chose with her strong, beautiful body that belonged to

her alone." The contemporary advocates of abortion hold to a similar faith; without being philosophically self-conscious, they have absorbed the same nihilism with the same corrosive effects. Earlier than in Artzibashev, who favored the new mood, Dostoyevsky had bitterly attacked the same temper, and its socialistic-anarchistic expressions, especially in his novel *The Possessed* (or, the devils).

This nihilistic mood in the people at large made the Russian Revolution possible. The socialists and communists were a very small minority; success would have been impossible had not the widespread popular nihilism made for a ready acceptance of destruction.

Today, a similar mood infects Soviet Russia's intellectuals and students. Petr Sadecky's *Octobriana and the Russian Underground* (New York, NY: Harper & Row, 1971) gives us a vivid and documented glimpse of this present-day nihilism. The communist leaders fear and hate this temper and recognize its danger. They maintain the false face of a happy puritanism in their empire, when the reality is a bitter and unhappy nihilism. Sadecky quotes one youth as saying that they indulge in no assassinations and no revolutions: "We're even milder than Gandhi — we don't even indulge in passive resistance." The words of Lermontov are again the words of youth: "All are alien to me and I to all." They believe "in nothing, past, present or future." Immorality, perversion, orgies, and insanity are their protest. As one girl remarked, "Life is an absurd torment anyway. We must simply get to the end of it, as pleasantly as possible. Whatever it costs. There's nothing to be done about it." There is a suicidal retreat from and hatred of reality. The idea that communism is the savior of mankind and the architect of a better world, one from which oppression, exploitation, and misery are forever excluded, is viewed with contempt and cynicism. The new nihilists of the Russian empire are the children of communism, and the true underground movement is the underground church, of which the Reverend Richard Wurmbrand has kept the Western world informed. The new nihilists are sufficiently numerous so that production lags in the Soviet Union, because nihilists are not psychologically suited for peaceful, productive work. The new nihilists make the older nihilists look like optimists by comparison. Artsybashev's hero Sanine did believe that a revolution offered hope. The modern nihilist has no hope.

Throughout the world, in varying degrees, the nihilistic temper is widely present. It is not as hopeless as the Russian variety, and is more destructive, as was the pre-1917 temper, but it is still nihilism. In travelling to many colleges and universities, I have found in secular and religious schools alike, a widespread belief that mankind has no hope unless a total destruction works a clean sweep. More than a few students from

good middle-class conservative homes have assured me that in twenty years people will be dropping dead everywhere from pollution and overpopulation, and the only hope is massive revolutionary violence to stop the Establishment in its tracks. After that, what? Here they grow vague: the basic impetus is a lust for nihilistic violence and destruction.

But there is a difference. Increasingly, the new nihilism is directed against the doctrine of salvation by the state. The older nihilism was directed against Christendom. Now the bastions of liberalism and socialism are attacked. Why, ask bewildered adults, do they attack the liberal Bank of America, the leftist universities, and a socialistic establishment? They attack it because it represents failure, frustration, and evil to them. Their contempt for Christendom is real, but the great enemy for nihilism today is the state and its gospel of salvation. They despair of and despise parliamentary government, but they also are cynical of Russia's dictatorship of the proletariat. There was a time when, under the influence of the Enlightenment, the words "priest" and "pastor" meant "deceiver"; man's hope was in the state and its plan of salvation by the rational actions of political man. Now the word "politician" gets the same unreasoning hatred that the word "priest" and "preacher" once aroused, and the same slander is applied to the new scapegoats of society.

The nihilists believe in nothing except destruction and the apocalyptic value of destruction. By destroying, they hope somehow to bring in a paradise in which all dreams are suddenly realized. The new nihilists of Soviet Russia, despite all their nihilistic passivism and contempt for life, still can write about the "One Salvation — the horizon. The longing for the horizon and what is waiting beyond it" (*Octobriana*, p. 75). This is a fantasy-oriented perspective, as is all nihilism. The nihilist denies reality and seeks to destroy it in the name of fantasy.

For youth today the hated reality is the state, the state and its allies who together make up the "Establishment." The state drafts youth into warfare; the state is the new god whose "Thou shalt nots" confront rebellious youth at every turn. The state and the family represent authority, and nihilistic youth is at war with authority. An Air Force officer has reported to us that one of the principal manifestations of psychological disorders encountered in the service is father-hatred. To be under authority, to be indebted to any man or institution, is, for would-be gods, the ultimate in indignity. The state has become the target of most of this hostility, and the state has only succeeded, with all its efforts, in creating more hostility. Never before has the state subsidized more people with more benefits, benefits for child care, education, health, welfare, and much more, and never before has the state been more resented and hated.

The state requires recognition of its authority to survive, but, by undercutting Biblical faith by means of a humanistic and statist education, the state has undercut not only the authority of the family and the church, but also and most of all its own authority. The more the state increases its power and services, the more it diminishes its authority. The age of the state is climaxing in the crisis of the state and its authority.

The only valid alternative to nihilism is a Biblical faith. The Westminster Confession defines faith thus: "The grace of faith, whereby the elect are enabled to believe to the saving of their souls, is the work of the Spirit of Christ in their hearts; and is ordinarily wrought by the ministry of the Word: by which also, and by the administration of the Sacraments, and prayer, it is increased and strengthened." Without faith, man lives in a flat, one-surface world, the world of time. Because in such a world time itself is meaningless, and a nihilistic cynicism reduces the world to change alone, even that world is lost to man: he despises the reality around him. The man of faith lives in a world of time, against the background of eternity. Time rests in a cosmos of meaning and has implications in and from eternity. There is thus depth and perspective in such a world, and, above all, meaning. Humanism (existentialist, rationalist, empiricist, etc.) always ends in a nihilistic denial of and hatred for reality. It believes in "nothing, past, present or future." It holds that "Life is an absurd torment," and the beginning of wisdom is to believe in no truth or wisdom. Sadecky observed, of the girl in the communist youth underground who held life to be absurd and pushed the idea to the limits, that this "brought her to the edge of insanity and finally to the psychiatric hospital" (*Octobriana*, p. 30). Men cannot live without faith, and the collapse of false faiths is productive of strongly suicidal tendencies in modern man.

The communist world is aware of this suicidal loss of faith in communism; it does everything possible to disguise and to conceal it. It cannot overcome it. The hatred for Christians, who are too helpless to be a revolutionary threat, is governed by a fanatical and vicious hatred for the hope, love, and faith which marks the believer. The most unspeakable tortures and indignities are perpetrated on Christian prisoners, as Wurmbrand and others have reported. How dare the Christians have faith when others have none? How dare the Christians hope in God rather than the dictatorship of the proletariat, and how dare they seek to bind man to man in the love of grace and the grace of godly love, when only the state should provide social cement?

Here is the irony of the Soviet empire: the well-paid nihilistic youth and intellectuals, who are the elite of the regime and live in material

comfort, are going out of their minds, or, are living in nihilistic despair and helplessness, whereas the brutally tortured and persecuted Christians live and pray in the assurance of God's victory.

Here in the West prayer can be backed by work, by Christian Reconstruction. In every area of life, there is an urgent need to rebuild all things in terms of Biblical faith. Humanists gravitate to statist action because they can only believe in "starting big," big expenditures, big schools, big organizations. We have a generation of men who fall under God's judgment: "For who hath despised the day of small things?" (Zech. 4:10). Only as men value, honor, and work to establish small beginnings will great results ensue. The idiots of our day waste their time and money on beginning big, a national impact, a demonstration of epic proportions, and so on. They have the statist mentality even in their hostility to the state. God's people work in terms of small beginnings and great results under God.

They work in terms of reality because they work by faith. The nihilists, who believe in nothing, also believe in everything. By reducing all reality to nothingness by cynicism and doubt, they make all things equally meaningless, and therefore equally valuable. The door is then opened to superstition, magic, occultism, and witchcraft as in every era of nihilism. People who believe in nothing make all allegiance a matter of taste, and their taste runs to the occult and demonic. Those whose faith is in the God of Scripture have a standard and a grasp of reality to preserve them from the superstitions of nihilism. They look "for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God" (Heb. 11:10). Men of faith cannot tell what the future will bring to them, but they know who brings it, and they know that God makes all things work together for good to them that love Him, to them who are called according to His purpose (Rom. 8:28).

The nihilists are all around us, and they are dangerous, as are all suicidal people, but they are also futile, because they have lost their hold on reality. They are in flight from life. As against them, the people of God must stand, not in terms of the past or present, not in terms of what they like, nor in terms of conventions, but in terms of the truth, Jesus Christ. As Tertullian wrote in *On the Veiling of Virgins*, "Christ did not call himself the conventions, but the truth." The conventions will go: the truth will endure and prevail.

142

GENIUS

Chalcedon Report No. 78, February 1, 1972

The idea of *genius* is an important but too little studied aspect of Western history; it is an important pagan concept which still governs our thinking. We can begin to understand what *genius* means if we recognize that it is basically the same word as the Arabic *jinn* or *genie*. The word *genius* comes from the Latin, and the idea is Roman, but it is hard to distinguish it at times from the Arabic idea, because the two are so similar.

The idea of *genius* comes out of pagan animism and ancestor worship. The *genius* of a family, house, group, or state was the protecting, guiding, inspiring supernatural spirit which took care of it and was also the object of its worship. All good Romans therefore worshipped "the genius of Rome." "The genius of Rome" was the divine power protecting Rome, the Roman mission, Rome itself ("divine Rome"), and its heroic leaders and emperors. Godlike men were believed to receive from the gods a special destiny above that of ordinary mortals. These men became the *Lares* or *genius* for their time.

With the coming of Christianity, the idea of *genius* receded, as did the related Greek idea of the hero. The hero was a great protector of men who was descended from the gods, or born of a god, and he was worshipped as a god after His death. Because Biblical faith makes a sharp and clear distinction between God and man, between the uncreated and divine being of God, and the created and creaturely being of men, the idea of the *genius* (and of the *hero*) was for some time in the background. With the revival of Greek philosophy, of Aristotle and of Plato, the idea of the genius again came to the fore, especially with the Renaissance. The *hero* or divine leader of men came to be a leader of the state. The leader or hero now became a commanding and totalitarian figure. The

Genius, the man with divine powers of insight and guidance, came to be the artist. Previously, in Christian Europe, the artist was *not* an artist in the modern sense. He was a craftsman, an artisan, and a businessman who was a specialist in his field. (In recent years, one composer, Igor Stravinsky, specifically denied being an artist in the modern sense and saw himself as an old-fashioned semi-Christian artisan, an opinion for which he was widely attacked.) The Christian artisan did his work like any other skilled specialist, without any pretensions. With the Renaissance, the artist was not only regarded as a man of genius, but also called by extravagant names, "the divine Aretino," "the divine Michelangelo," and so on.

But this was not all. In paganism, the genius had been essentially a political figure in the developed form of the idea of genius. The medieval artisan was essentially related to the faith, and his greatest work was in the church. After the Renaissance, the artist associated himself increasingly with the state. The church continued to be a great patron of art, and, in the following eras, such creations as baroque church art certainly represented very great outlays of money, but artists found their *chief* voice and their *best* self-expression in works done for the royalty and the nobility, for the state. The neo-pagan genius and hero were working together.

The artist, and especially the writer, began to see himself as a genius, producing for the ages. He was thus an *elite* man, but he was more than merely an elite man; the elite are the pick of society, the choicest part. The genius is much more than that: he is a supernormal and somewhat supernatural breakthrough into society and thus above even the elite.

The literary elite at first identified themselves with the nobility and with royalty, with the great heroes of the arena of politics. With the Enlightenment, however, the artists, especially the literary and pseudophilosophical ones, began to turn against the nobility and royalty even while often fawning on them.

The French Revolution was preceded by a long war by men like Voltaire, Diderot, and others on church and state alike, with a new concept of society vaguely imagined as the true and coming order. In the French Revolution, men who believed in their genius overthrew a social order and began the ruthless destruction of all things which ran counter to their "inspiration." Because the middle class had been held back and hindered by the monarchy, the literary elite briefly championed the middle-class cause as a useful weapon towards overthrowing the old regime. Very quickly, however, they turned on the middle classes with venom.

In the nineteenth century, the idea of the hero as the organizing principle of society (together with his instructor, the artistic genius) became

very common. It was widely taught by such men as Carlyle, Nietzsche, and Wagner, and, in the twentieth century, by Spengler, Stefan George, D. H. Lawrence, and others. The world, they held, cannot be understood by the faith and creeds of Christianity but only by intuition, history, and the hero. The evolution of things in history is in terms of the hero, who acts without being hindered by old moralities and creeds. He incarnates the true evolution of the world and brings in a new order as the next step of evolution. His attitude is pragmatic, not dogmatic. He has his roots in the folk or people, and he moves them into the future and progress by his ruthless, powerful drive. The hero is a realist who is not afraid to kill or to sin in order to further his cause. As Bentley summarized Carlyle's view, "The man who is undefiled by pitch . . . must be in the wrong, for he has not been willing to sin and compromise. He has not seized reality by its filthy hand" (Eric Bentley, *A Century of Hero-Worship*, 2nd ed. [Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1957], p. 56). The ideas of the men of "genius" of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries helped produce the "heroes" they imagined, men like Lenin, Stalin, Hitler, and Mao.

Moreover, the genius, having broken quickly with the middle class, then turned against the middle class savagely for failing to bow down to him and to recognize his genius. He called, therefore, for the liquidation of these insensitive clods who could not appreciate genius and were too much concerned about business and profits. The "genius" class or elite turned now to the working class, the proletariat, as a new hope for society, as a people who would follow the leadership of genius into a brave new world. The Russian Revolution was the longed-for proletarian revolution. The workers, however, failed the artists and writers: they did not appreciate genius. Only by a dictatorship could the state proceed with its plan for a new society. In the twentieth century, and especially with the 1960s, the men of "genius" began to look for a new class to overthrow workers and the middle class alike, the *outlaw*. The existentialist genius in particular began to see the criminal as the true hero (and this criminal-hero definitely includes the homosexual in the forefront), and prison riots became revolutionary events in which men of genius located new heroes. (Remember too that the prison days of Lenin and Hitler were widely hailed as a part of their heroic history.)

For some time now, the men of genius have been in search of a society to lead. Some have dreamed of a society of programmed men, as in B. F. Skinner's intellectual nightmare, men with electrodes in their brains to obey the commandments of heroes and geniuses. The genius has been increasingly a man with a pathological hatred of society, of normality (of the "squares"), of a world which rejects his privileged and superior

wisdom. He has not found that world in the nobility and royalty, nor in the middle and working classes, nor will he find it among the outlaws, who, like him, are incapable of true loyalty and allegiance, let alone subservience. The genius believes that he is beyond the law, that he should, in fact, be the organizing force in society today, even as in ancient Rome the genius was worshipped, and, in the person of the emperor, ruled. By the 1830s, the writers of France had come to a logical conclusion of the doctrine of genius: "everything is permitted to men of intelligence" (Cesar Grana, *Bohemian versus Bourgeois* [New York, NY: Basic Books, 1964], p. 42). Their hatred of the normal world was so great that one writer of that era said, "I would give half my talents to be a bastard" (ibid., p. 145). In his excellent study of Sartre, Molnar has shown how the idea of bastard and intellectual came to be identified; the bastard-intellectual is a heroic outlaw at war with middle-class society and culture, deliberately at odds with normal, well-integrated people (Thomas Molnar, *Sartre: Ideologue of Our Time* [New York, NY: Funk & Wagnalls, 1968], p. 5ff.).

The bastard-intellectual genius is in search of a society to lead, but he can only disintegrate society: he can neither create nor lead one, because the essence of his inspiration is destruction. He no longer looks for a hero, because, in his pretensions, he no longer needs the hero, but only followers. Such ideas were prominent in Nietzsche, who wrote to his sister in December 1888: "You have not the slightest idea what it means to be next-of-kin to the man and destiny in whom the question of epochs has been settled. Quite literally speaking: I hold the future of mankind in the palm of my hand." Everything was settled, if only the world would recognize it! But what the world recognized and learned from each bastard-intellectual genius was the corrosive, burning hatred of man and society, the radical contempt of all things save its own superiority and genius. Carlyle said, "There is nothing else but revolution and mutation, the former merely speedier change." The goal, thus, is perpetual revolution for perpetual destruction. The state must obey genius and must liquidate all things in terms of a gospel of perpetual revolution or destruction.

The idea of genius in the modern world gained much from Rousseau. Among other things, Rousseau, in his *Social Contract*, held that, "Whoever refuses to obey the general will shall be compelled to do so by the whole body. This means nothing less than that he will be forced to be free." As Andelson has pointed out, this is echoed in the slogan of Orwell's *1984*, "Freedom is Slavery." The general will is not merely the democratic majority, it is the genius-intellectual's interpretation of what the general will of the whole body or country should be. Robespierre, as spokesman for the Jacobins, said bluntly, "Our will is the general will"

(Robert V. Andelson, *Imputed Rights* [Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1971], p. 8). The old Latin expression, *vox populi, vox dei*, the voice of the people is the voice of God, now had a new development: the voice of the genius-intellectual is the voice of the people and of the gods.

As against the idea of the genius, Biblical faith offered and offers to men the idea and office of prophet. Most people make central a secondary aspect of the office of prophet, namely, one who foretells the future. The primary function and office of a prophet is to speak for God and to represent Him in total faithfulness to His law-word. This is the duty of *every* man in whatever calling he has. His reliance must not be on his word, or his idea of truth, or his concept of good and evil, but on the absolute and unchanging Word of God. That word must be applied to church, state, school, science, all society and all learning, and its implications faithfully developed. The Christian must work for the liquidation of the idea of genius and its replacement by the calling of the prophet.

But this is not all. The believer has a priestly office. In his priestly office, the believer must dedicate himself, his social order and institutions, his family, work, and all things to the glory and service of God. "Man's chief end is to glorify God and to enjoy Him forever," the Westminster Catechism tells us; this is a priestly calling and task, and its emphasis is on joy. The priesthood of Israel was radically separated from death and mourning; it could not indulge in grief as could other men, because the priesthood set forth not only the triumph of God but joy in Him. Nehemiah told a sorrowful people, "This day is holy unto the Lord your God; mourn not, nor weep . . . for this day is holy unto our Lord: neither be ye sorry; for the joy of the Lord is your strength" (Neh. 8:9–10). The priestly calling of man brings him joy and peace.

Man also has a royal calling in Christ, to be a king under God and to exercise dominion over the earth, by knowledge, authority, science, invention, farming, and in every other way. As kings under God and His law, we must oppose the lawless idea of the hero, the fuehrer, the dictatorship of the proletariat, and all like variations of the pagan faith. This dominion under God means the development of all things under His law, and it is a mandate for orderly progress and advancement. It means culture. The word "culture" is related to cultivate and agriculture, it means tillage, development, improvement. Culture requires time, capitalization, and work. The bastard-intellectual genius program of revolution is also a war against culture and calls for the destruction of culture, which can only thrive with time, capitalization, and cultivation. Culture cannot be limited to the arts; it is a myth propagated by the artists of the modern era that culture means what they do. Culture, however, is the faith or

religion of a people externalized in their total activities. True culture is today being warred on, and many people travel widely to see the relics of culture which are surviving our age of revolution.

The state as the apotheosis and incarnation of genius is proving to be an anticultural, antihuman ideal, a destroyer of man and society. When the Bolsheviks were accused of being anticulture, they answered the charge by turning to the past: they revived the tsar's ballet! This is the way of the Yahoo, on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

If our hope is in a hero or in genius, we will wait for such a leader, and we will get a fuehrer or dictator, and we will deserve him. If, however, we see our calling as prophets, priests, and kings under God and in Christ, we will begin the task of reconstruction wherever we are, because we are the future. The Christians of the Roman Empire were ready to swear allegiance to the emperor, but they refused to swear by the genius of the emperor, and for this they were persecuted (Tertullian, *Apologeticus*, p. 32). Under God, they could not surrender their own calling under God to the will of a man, nor commit their future to the will of man.

The culture of tomorrow will not come from the state and the bastard-intellectual genius elite of the state. It will come from us who are prophets, priests, and kings under God, who are doing our duty under God and to His glory. St. Paul's counsel still stands: "Therefore, my beloved brethren, be ye steadfast, unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labour is not in vain in the Lord" (1 Cor. 15:58). The world of the hero and the genius will disappear. Good riddance.

143

POST-CHRISTIAN ERA

Chalcedon Report No. 87, November 1, 1972

An idea very heavily promoted by humanists in recent years, and, unfortunately, picked up by all too many Christians, is that we are moving into a post-Christian era. According to this belief, the Christian centuries have come to an end, and we are now moving into a new age. Some call it the era of scientific humanism, others of scientific socialism, and still others call it the Age of Aquarius. For the occultists, as of old, this is the "third age" or third-world era. The occultist, Foster Bailey, in *The Spirit of Masonry* (1957), wrote that "the Jewish dispensation came to an end, and the Christian dispensation began with the passing of our sun into the sign Pisces, the Fishes . . . Today . . . we are passing rapidly into another sign, the sign Aquarius." The theologians who get their doctrine from the popular press and the streets have echoed this humanistic chorus, and they tell us we are in a post-Christian era. Is this true?

With the waning of the "Middle" Ages, Europe moved into an anti-Christian era which culminated in the Renaissance. The church was largely captured by cynical humanists who treated it as a prize to be exploited. The Reformation and the Counter-Reformation were reactions against this, and they strove to recapture church, state, school, and society for Christian faith. In varying degrees this was done. Humanism, however, was revived in the Enlightenment; it began its conquest of Christendom; it embarked on a deliberate and determined anti-Christian and post-Christian era. Historians have long masked and underplayed the militant anti-Christianity of the Enlightenment thinkers and their successors; it is to the credit of Peter Gay's work, *The Enlightenment* (2 vols.), that he develops this aspect of their thought. It was clearly central.

With the eighteenth century, Europe moved steadily into a post-Christian era. Every area of life was steadily divorced from Christianity and

reinterpreted in humanistic terms. True, there were Christian countermovements against the humanistic culture, but, because these were largely pietistic, they did not challenge humanism as such. In fact, because pietism came to emphasize soul-saving above all else, it became thereby humanistic also: it put man at the center of its gospel, whereas Christ said, "But seek ye *first* the kingdom of God, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you" (Matt. 6:33; emphasis added). The Shorter Catechism had taught, "Man's chief end is to glorify God and to enjoy Him forever." Now humanism and religion had come to agree that the glory of man is the end and purpose of all things.

The eighteenth and nineteenth centuries were humanistic and anti-Christian in their *basic* motives, and yet they were very largely influenced by still-powerful Christian standards also. In the sciences and in various other areas of study, not only did Christian scholars predominate, but the idea of an ultimate and God-created order still governed men's minds. In philosophy, God had been abandoned; in everyday life as well as the sciences He was still the ultimate power, although receding in centrality. With Darwin and Freud, humanism abandoned the God-concept and at the same time committed suicide. For Darwin, not God but chance is essentially ultimate, although traces of providence still are strong in his system. The basic emphasis, however, was away from God's design to chance variations and natural selection. Instead of an ultimate mind, man lived against the background of an ultimate meaninglessness, and man was depreciated. If all the area surrounding a man's house is suddenly turned into a dump, then that man's house is not only depreciated but possibly rendered untenable as rodents take over the area. Similarly, humanism, as it dispensed with God dispensed also with the meaning, purpose, and dignity of life. Freud furthered this process, knowing full well what he was doing to humanism thereby. However, holding to an evolutionary position, he reduced mind to a frail latecomer whose every working was an outcropping of primitive motives from the unconscious. Philosophy could not very well survive under this premise. Darwin himself wrote in 1881 that "with me the horrid doubt always arises whether the convictions of man's mind, which has been developed from the mind of the lower animals, are of any value or at all trustworthy. Would any one trust in the convictions of a monkey's mind, if there are any convictions in such a mind?" (Francis Darwin, ed., *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, vol. 2 [New York, NY: Basic Books, 1959], p. 285). The effect of this collapse of humanism was apparent in every area of life. Prideaux has observed, of Delacroix, "He was the last painter in whom the humanist Renaissance conception as a totality manifested itself with poetic fervor" (Tom Prideaux, *The World of*

Delacroix, 1798–1863 [New York, NY: Silver Burdett Press, 1966], p. 12). Since Delacroix, humanists have presented us with a limited world, then a fragmented world, and now an exploded and dying world. Suicidism has possessed the humanists. Fiedler has cited this weariness with life which marks humanistic writers. "There *is* a weariness in the West which undercuts the struggle between socialism and capitalism, democracy and autocracy; a weariness with humanism itself which underlies all the movements of our world, a weariness with the striving to be men. It is the end of man which the school of Burroughs foretells, not in terms of doom but of triumph." The writer William Burroughs, to whom Fiedler refers, gives us a "vision of the end of man, total death" (Leslie Fiedler, *Waiting for the End* [New York, NY: Stein & Day, 1964], p. 168). Fiedler is right: modern humanistic man is "waiting for the end."

The end of every age is marked by certain recurring interests. As meaning from God is abandoned, meaning is sought by man from below, in occultism, Satanism, magic, and witchcraft. Rome in its decline was marked by such interests. As Christendom collapsed after the thirteenth century, these same movements revived and with intensity possessed the minds of despairing men. The same interests are again with us, not as signs of the birth of the Age of Aquarius, but as evidences of the dying agony of humanism.

Are we facing a post-Christian era? The men who so declare are as blind as that false messiah, Woodrow Wilson, who believed that he had a better way than Christ, who held that a war could be fought to end all wars and to make the world safe for democracy, and who felt that paper documents could harness and control the evil goals of men and nations. Wilson's great crusade did not usher in a new world order of peace and prosperity; rather, it inaugurated the Armageddon of humanism. Franklin Delano Roosevelt embarked on a similar crusade in Europe, and the breakdown of humanism was only hastened.

It is not a post-Christian era that we face but a post-humanistic world. Every thinker who evades that fact is past-oriented and blind; he is incapable of preparing anyone for the realities of our present situation. Humanism on all sides is busy committing hara-kiri; it is disembowelling itself with passion and fervor; it needs no enemies, because humanism is now its own worst enemy. We have lived thus far in a post-Christian era, and it is dying. The important question is, what shall we do?

We must recognize that this is one of the greatest if not the greatest opportunity yet to come to Christianity. This is a time of glorious opportunity, a turning point in history, and the wise will prepare for it. True, the church is remarkably incompetent and sterile in the face of this crisis.

It has very largely joined the enemy. This, however, has happened before. In the fourth century, the church repeatedly condemned St. Athanasius, as the state listed him as a wanted outlaw. He was accused (by churchmen) of trying to stop the food supply to the capitol. He was accused of murder (but the dead man was proven to be alive). He was charged with magic and sorcery, and much else, and his life was lived in flight, with five periods of exile. All the same, it was Athanasius and not his enemies, nor the powerful churchmen of his day, who shaped the future. History, then as now, is not shaped by majorities but by men who provide the faith and the ideas for living.

Smith has said of modern man, "How may we describe the present situation? Man is his own master, and thus aware that there are no bounds to his powers. He can do anything that he wishes to do . . . He is free, and come of age, but he is also the slave of ideologies. He recognizes that his existence as a man carries with it the demand to be himself, as a single personal being (in Kierkegaard's phrase), and at the same time he finds himself continually threatened with immersion in the life of the collective — and he even desires this, in order that he may evade the hard demand to be a single person" (Ronald Gregor Smith, "Post-Renaissance Man," in William Nicholls, ed., *Conflicting Images of Man* [New York, NY: Seabury Press, 1966], p. 32). This is an interesting admission, coming as it does from a modernist position. It is an indication of the paralysis and helplessness of humanistic man. Men who are at war with themselves, and resentful of life and its requirements, are not able to command the future: they cannot even command themselves.

Every day our problem is less and less humanism and more and more ourselves. Is our life and action productive of a new social order? Are we governed by principles and ideas which will help determine the new direction of history? Is our thinking still directed by sterile statism, and do we believe that the answer to man's problems is to capture the machinery of the state, or do we recognize that we must first of all be commanded by God before we can effectively command ourselves and our futures?

Leslie Fiedler aptly titled his study of the modern mood as reflected in literature *Waiting for the End*. We can add that it also involves waiting for a ready-made answer. The temper of our radicals is a demand for total solutions *now*; quite aptly, they call themselves the "now generation." Quite logically, magic and witchcraft are very closely tied to the "now generation." Magic and witchcraft offer a mythical alternative to patient work and reconstruction. A few words and formulae, and, presto, the desired thing supposedly appears. In the politics of magic, a few catchphrases are endlessly repeated, some laws passed or some revolutionary

action paraded, and, presto, paradise should suddenly come, but for the nasty work of the vile reactionaries. Push the right revolutionary button, such is the faith of the "now generation," and the dream world will emerge: no sweat, only revolutionary heroics in terms of the late, late movies our radicals and their babysitters grew up with.

This generation would do well to remember the words of Christ concerning the Kingdom of God, words too rarely if ever preached on: "For the earth bringeth forth fruit of herself; first the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear" (Mark 4:28). There is a spontaneity of growth which is not dependent upon man: the earth brings forth growth. But man must sow the seed, till the field, and work to bring forth the harvest. There must be, *first*, faith that results will come, and, *second*, work to plant and till for that harvest. Men doubt today that God brings forth His purposed results, and they refuse to work for any goals. We live in an age when men want to harvest corn before they have planted it. We live, briefly, in a political or statist era, a day when men believe in the ability of the state and its politicians to solve problems by means of their legislative hocus-pocus, when the desperate need instead is for faith and work. The important question for a "now generation" becomes the search for a politician with the right hocus-pocus.

But "first the blade," and the blade cannot appear without a planting. This is the time to create new and free schools, Christian hospitals, independent professional societies, Biblically principled, and new enterprises of every kind. The time is now. I recall the words of a supposedly intelligent man, speaking in 1939, holding that it was "too late." No doubt those words are as old as man, and still a mark of defeatism and stupidity, still a mark of waiting for ready-made, push-button answers. I recall vividly as a schoolboy being told of automatic, thermostat-controlled heating systems, then a new thing, as the forerunner, it was held, of a push-button, automatic world, in which all answers came freely. Nothing was said about the work that went into producing the thermostat, nor the new industries it furthered, nor the new kinds of work it made possible. It was seen only as a step forward towards the dream of instant paradise in a ready-made world. I did not know it then, but those teachers were preparing the way for the return of a faith in magic and witchcraft.

But, our Lord said, "first the blade"! Done any planting lately? Or are you waiting for someone with the right hocus-pocus? If so, you will die with this dying non-Christian era. Don't count on us sending flowers.

144

DISPOSABLE MAN

Chalcedon Report No. 124, December 1975

Alexander Dolgun's Story: An American in the Gulag (New York, NY: Knopf, 1975), reports a fact referred to by many prisoners of Marxist regimes. On trying to correct blatant misrepresentations by his inquisitor, Dolgun was told, "You say we have made a mistake. I tell you we never make mistakes" (p. 18). We cannot grasp the direction of modern statism unless we recognize that this declaration, openly stated by Marxism, is basic to all humanistic statism.

Humanistic sociology since Comte has denied the validity to modern man of the idea of *meaning*. *Meaning* belongs, it is held, to the old world of religion and myth, and to the more recent but now dead world of philosophy and the metaphysical quest for understanding. In the new era, there must be no concern with meaning; man's society must not be religious but technological; things must be judged, not in terms of good and evil but in terms of utility and pragmatism. All things are relative to the purposes of "society." If society, redefined as the state, says that you and I are better off, for the general welfare, in a prison camp, there is then no mistake, because there can be no standard or criterion above the actions of the state to judge it. *Meaning* is declared dead, and therefore good and evil are nonexistent as anything beyond and over the state.

Modern art has adopted this same faith. As a result, it renounces all objective meaning and protests against it. We are told that we must not ask of any work of art, "What does this mean?" but rather, "What personal or social experience does it evoke in me?" There can thus be no lasting works of art, in terms of this theory, but purely contemporary ones. The art world is thus moving towards a theory of disposable art, which, like paper tissue, is to be used when needed, and then discarded.

But, in such a world, all meaning is denied, and therefore man too is

disposable; man is there to be used by the state when needed, and then promptly discarded. Alexander I. Solzhenitsyn, in *The Gulag Archipelago, 1918–1956* (New York, NY: Harper & Row, 1973), is really telling us about the Marxist application of this modern theory, *the doctrine of disposable man*. If people were needed for a new construction plan in Siberia or elsewhere, as much as one-fourth of Leningrad was arrested and transported to the slave labor camps (pp. 13, 58). The people were impotent in the face of this: they tried to find the meaning of their arrests, but there was no meaning! There was only pragmatism, utility, and terror.

Since Darwin, meaning is dead in the modern world, and with it, all ideas of good and evil. This is the same as proclaiming *the death of man*, because man cannot live without meaning. All attempts to cope with the growing collapse of the modern age are futile, because there is nothing in humanism and the doctrine of evolution which makes possible a restoration of cosmic meaning. As a result, man becomes more lawless, anarchistic, and senseless as he accepts the modern worldview's picture of himself. He becomes in his own eyes only a meaningless bundle of urges and drives seeking existential satisfaction. Disposable man then lashes out at the world and civilization around him: if man is disposable, then all things else must be made disposable, and must be smashed.

As against all this, St. John declares of Christ, "All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made. In him was life; and the life was the light of men" (John 1:3–4). Not disposable man, but religious man, not a meaningless world, but a universe of total meaning, this is the teaching of Scripture and the reality of the cosmos. Because *all* things were made by Him, all things, being totally the handiwork of an absolute and perfect purpose and decree, have a total meaning. There is not a meaningless nor a disposable fact in the universe. Everything has meaning, God's meaning, and the direction of all things is neither death nor meaninglessness, but the triumph of God's glorious purpose and plan.

The doctrine of disposable man is suicidal, and the art and culture of such a doctrine races into disaster and death. It has no future. The idea of a future belongs to the world of meaning, purpose, and direction. For this reason, humanism, and its age of the state, is doomed. It builds on sand, and creating its own storms of judgment, collapses under the storms. Only men and civilizations which build on the Rock, Jesus Christ, can endure (Matt. 7:24–29). As men become more epistemologically self-conscious, the only possible post-Christian "culture" is the graveyard, because culture is a religious fact and presupposes faith, meaning, purpose, and direction. Thus, as the old pagan forms of humanism erode, the only

possible form of civilization and culture is increasingly manifest: it can only be a Christian culture, one firmly rooted in the whole counsel of God and His law-word. If you are not working to reconstruct all things in terms of the Word of God, you are headed for the graveyard of history and God's judgement.

145

PROVIDENCE

Chalcedon Report No. 131, July 1976

As was pointed out earlier (report no. 123), Christianity establishes distinctions and requires a division in terms of God between sin and righteousness, good and evil, and between the saved and the lost (Matt. 10:34–35). There is a required line of separation, but the line must be God's, not man's. As humanism flourishes, however, the exaltation of man leads to a progressive equalization of all men, the criminal and the law-abiding, the rich and the poor, the intelligent and the dull-witted, and all others are levelled into one common status in the name of democracy and equality. For humanism, all things are relative to man, so that no standard can be allowed to judge man, who is himself the only standard.

Whenever man is affirmed as the standard, life and the world (as well as God) are negated. If man is his own god and law, no outside standard or law can judge him. The result is the collapse of all standards and of society's ability to progress. If man is his own god, then, because there is no need for a god to improve, progress, or be educated, there is no need for man to change or improve himself.

Early in man's history, the Far East developed the great civilizations, reached a high estate, and then stagnated or collapsed. Why did Asia lose its eminence? From an area of growth and vitality, it turned into an area of decay and of defeatism. Its philosophies uniformly came to a position of world and life negation. The reason for this decay was the triumph of humanism and the negation of all absolutes other than man. Kwan-yin, the Chinese goddess of mercy, typified this triumphant humanism: she refused to enter heaven, supposedly declaring, "Never will I receive individual salvation" until every last man born or to be born is received into heaven. This equalitarian creed means no heaven, and no peace on earth.

Heaven can only be heaven if all are saved, and earth can be good only if all are held to be equally good and equally deserving of the best. But this is impossible, and the result is cynicism, despair, and pessimism. Without standards and with only a total democracy of all men and values, not only are good and evil equal, but all men, and life and death are also equal. Nothing has meaning, and the result of all this democratic faith and love of all things was the equal hatred of all things, and, in the end, a belief only in nothingness. As a result, Asiatic thought and life decayed: its basic premise was in effect the exaltation of nothingness.

This strain of thought invaded Greece and contributed to its decay. This same nihilism was a factor in the fall of Rome. The Middle Ages decayed as the same humanistic relativism became again prominent, and wandering folk singers and student-rebels propagated the faith from place to place, and churchmen echoed it from the pulpit.

Today, the same situation confronts us. The logic of modern humanism has led to the same collapse of values. As a result, modern men find the old faiths of Asia, a while ago rapidly being tossed onto the garbage piles of civilization, suddenly very attractive. Their nothingness finds an echo in modern man's emptiness. Zen Buddhism, Taoism, Hinduism (Transcendental Meditation), and much more are being dragged out, dusted off, and pressed into reuse for the funeral of modern man.

In these faiths, there is no providence, only nothingness and the lonely thoughts of man projected against an ocean of meaninglessness. Love is affirmed, and a vague hope that there is some kind of impersonal tendency in the universe which is congenial to man's ideas, but this is only a profession of desires, not a description of reality. How long can a man under pressure be sustained by a vague belief in a mindless "goodness" of sorts?

A universe stripped of providence is a universe stripped of God and meaning. Love and hate, good and evil, and life and death are then equally meaningless. When man makes himself god, he not only robs the universe of meaning, but also himself. The line between man and the animals is broken down, and the line between organic and inorganic becomes also vague and indistinct.

When God declares, "Ye shall be holy: for I the LORD your God am holy" (Lev. 19:2). He is declaring Himself to be separate and calling upon us to be separated in terms of His law, calling, and covenant. The principle of His creation and re-creation is holiness, the separation of all things in terms of His creative purpose and calling. Man is called to understand the meaning of God's holiness and to develop that line of division in all creation. A line must be drawn between the holy and profane, that which

is brought under the dominion of God's Kingdom (or temple) and that which is outside of it. Because of the fall, the world and its peoples are profane. *First*, they must be made holy by God's grace, which we must proclaim. *Second*, in terms of His law, all things and men must be developed in terms of their potential and dedicated to the purposes of God's Kingdom. *Holiness requires dominion*: no dominion means no holiness, which indicates a profane estate.

The modern forms of the Kwan-yin philosophy indicate that ultimate profanity is exalted into ultimate bliss and salvation. All things must be separated from God, according to this faith, in terms of the equality of nothingness. The Kwan-yin faith is hostile to separation and to progress: the idea of "advance" it promotes is a levelling of all things to the lowest common denominator. As a result, the modern devotees of Kwan-yinism are hostile to Christianity, progress, technology, freedom, and all things else which further the line of divisions among men and nations. All must be levelled.

Let us remember, as we see this exaltation of levelling, that, for the Middle Ages, quite rightly the great symbol and illustration of equality and democracy was death.

146

LOCALE OF MEANING

Chalcedon Report No. 172, December 1979

William J. Brandt, in *The Shape of Medieval History* (1966), wrote of the new sense of meaning which marked the passing of the medieval era. In such men as Shakespeare and Marlowe, a new view of man and history was apparent. The older view (often marked by Hellenic influences) gave way to "the conviction that meaning lies within the relationship of events." Such an understanding is so natural to modern man that it requires some reflection to see the error in it.

For Biblical faith, the source of all meaning is God the Lord; because He is the Creator of all things in heaven and on earth, all things have their being and meaning only through His eternal counsel and decree. The true meaning of all things is the God-ordained meaning. Moreover, because God is totally God and totally self-conscious, there are no gaps in His world of meaning. In other words, there is not a meaningless moment in our lives or experiences, nor a meaningless, purposeless atom or second in all of creation. In Him there is no darkness at all, and we live in a universe of total purpose and meaning. Thus, while there is a meaning in all events, and no event is empty or purposeless, the meaning thereof lies, not within the relationship of the events, but in God the Lord.

The modern age, by shifting the locale of meaning from God to the events, also thereby shifted the determination of events from God to nature and man. If God establishes the meaning of my life, it is because He creates and determines it; if I establish the meaning of my life, then I declare that I make and determine my life. If I am a Christian, I develop the meaning of my life under God and in terms of His Word; if I am a humanist, I claim to develop the meaning of my life in terms of my word.

This same principle applies in the area of law. Humanism seeks to develop law within the relationship of events, and in terms of them. Law

is then a product of man's history, not God's revelation. Law, then, can be, as some once commonly held, a product of man's logic. Law as logic is man's analysis of the meaning of events in terms of his autonomous reason. From Plato on, we have had a very widespread emphasis on law as logic, the product of man's critical analysis and summation.

In this century, the stress has been on law as experience. Man's social experience enables him to see what his problems are and then how to answer them. Laws are then framed to give authoritative expression to the wisdom of experience.

Other relational views of law are possible. The Marxists see law as the instrument of class power and an expression of class-created meanings. One way or another, humanism sees law and meaning as forthcoming from the relationship of events.

This is, of course, a clear-cut manifestation of humanism. For man to admit that meaning and law are alike derived from the God of Scripture, and only derived from Him, is to admit that he must believe in the God of Scripture, and he must obey Him. Such a confession is anathema to the humanist, and he will not make it.

Rather, the implicit humanist confession is that I, man as god, make all meaning, and I create law. This is a logical confession for humanism. It is, however, no confession for a Christian. Unhappily, too many churchmen make it. They go to the Bible for salvation, to the sociologist for meaning, and to the state for law. Not surprisingly, their doctrine of salvation is soon compromised, weakened, and broken. A god who is a god over only a sliver of life, the salvation realm, cannot save and really has no realm.

The modern age, both in and out of the church, sees man as god and lawmaker, man as the determiner of meaning. Of course, this doctrine had deep roots in the medieval era. The game of chess was very popular with the aristocracy then, because it allows the human will to plan beforehand the sequence of events as against other wills. In effect, the appeal to the medieval aristocracy was the hope that, by his own determination, man could say, "I prevail." On the other hand, autonomous man, then and now, does not like our Lord's words in Matthew 6:34; "Take therefore [by seeking first the Kingdom of God] no thought for the morrow: for the morrow shall take thought for the things of itself. Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof." God determines all history; His law decrees the future of our events and relationships. If we believe and obey the Lord, and walk in his laws, we are blessed, and our future is as God has declared it (Deut. 28); if we sin, the wages thereof are death (Rom. 6:23). God's law-word sets forth the meaning of all events.

147

WOLVES

Chalcedon Report No. 173, January 1980

While at the University of Colorado recently, I picked up a copy of the independent *Colorado Daily* because a front-page article caught my eye. Its title is one which reflects a now common opinion: "The wolf: a victim of bad publicity." More than a few naturalists assure us that the wolf does not attack human beings, and they cite their work with wolves as an example. (Of course, they work with well-fed wolves.) A few days previously, I had finished reading a very interesting family history of Michael Charnofsky, *Jewish Life in the Ukraine: A Family Saga* (1965). The book describes an experience, on a cold night, driving home with horses and sleigh, of an attack by a wolf pack; escape came at the price of tossing overboard, one by one, the load of prepared geese for Passover.

Again, the October 10, 1979, *Time* reported on a book by anthropologist William Arens, *The Man-Eating Myth*, which states that cannibalism may never have existed anywhere as a regular custom. Of course, many explorers and missionaries have given eyewitness accounts of cannibalism as a regular practice, but they were not anthropologists! The October 1979 *American History Illustrated* carries a letter of August 5, 1782, by Louisa Cheval, describing her experience with Indians, cannibals, in Spanish Louisiana. The poor woman lacked the insight of modern anthropologists and thus, did not assess her experience properly!

Why such skepticism about well-documented events and practices? Some years ago, one man, an anthropologist, remarked by way of rebuke to me for an observation I made, that all our records of past human experiences are distorted and false. The reason for this, he held, is that so much of all our historical data came to us through the filter of religion. Christianity in particular, he said, has distorted all data by seeing man

in terms of "the myth" of the fall, and Calvinism especially, with its doctrine of total depravity, has led to falsification of all records concerning man. The great task of "science" in the next generation, he held, would be to undo that false picture of man and history, and especially of "primitive" man and nature.

Well, the revisionism is now under way, and wolves are very dear, loving creatures; cannibals are really vegetarians; and criminals are really abused and misunderstood peoples, hurt and in need of love! The law still believes in punishment, but now it seeks to punish Christian schools, godly men, Christian families, and the like. A new doctrine of man is the presupposition of our laws now, and nothing is more reprehensible to the new lawmaker than Christianity.

It is not surprising that a growing but largely unpublicized problem in the national parks and forests of the American West is the attack on and maiming of human beings by animals. A generation reared to think of bears as sweet, cuddly animals acts with a foolishness around bears (and other animals) which makes it very susceptible to serious injury. (On top of all this, we have evidences of a vocal minority who are ready to defend the rattlesnake, but not, of course, these horrid Christians!) A generation brought up on television cartoons in which animals are fine, sensitive souls has little sense of reality. It leads to the kind of insanity which led an army officer to express shock to a rancher who spoke of shooting and poisoning squirrels and other varmints. What kind of an army can we have, when an officer bleeds for a rodent pest? And what kind of laws and society can we have when men hold such opinions?

The answer is that we will have the kind of society we are steadily getting, from San Francisco to New York, and around the world. Man's vision of life is a false, distorted one, and, "Where there is no vision, the people perish: but he that keepeth the law (of God), happy is he" (Prov. 29:18). A man's ways are now right in his own eyes, and men insist that man's will must replace God's law. Nothing is sacred, and everything is permitted, in this new faith (which is like the faith of the Assassins of old). Reality now comes, for more and more people, from drugs, hashish, marijuana, opium, heroin, and the like, all of which are used to blot out God's world and "free" man's mind to remake reality in the dreams of drugs.

But the issue is not drugs: it is false religion. Humanism requires a drug culture. A world under God's law does not need it. Which world do you live in?

148

THE NEW IDOLATRY

Chalcedon Report No. 222, January 1984

At the heart of every evil and all sin is false religion. The original and continuing sin of man is set forth in Genesis 3:5, man's desire to be his own god, knowing or determining for himself all good and evil, all law and morality. Because sin has a religious root or foundation, it is especially urgent that we be more alert to false thinking on the religious root or foundation, and it is especially urgent that we be more alert to false thinking on the religious scene than anywhere else.

Two areas of such false thinking which are very influential today are current ideas about truth and history which have a strong following in theological circles. The *first* of these is the concept of history as myth. The adherents of this view see the universe as essentially meaningless and history therefore as devoid of meaning. If meaning exists, it is man-made; man's faith, ultimate concern, or first principles constitutes his myth. Event and interpretation are one, because nothing with meaning exists apart from man. Nietzsche said, "There are no facts, only interpretations," and this is basic to this contemporary theological perspective. The language of Scripture is used, but God is quietly held to be a limiting concept, not a real person who is Lord over all. Man's "only hope" of freedom for such thinkers is to "recognize ourselves as standing within the myth of history" (W. Taylor Stevenson, *History as Myth* [1969], p. 122). The goal of such thinkers is to demythologize the Bible and to free man from the idolatry of a mythological objectification of God and history. Such a position is logical if humanism is true, for, if man is god, to believe in the God of Scripture is idolatry.

The *second* variety of false thinking, very popular in liberal circles of Dutch religious thought, is the hostility to "propositional thinking." Propositional truth is simply the view that God so created the universe

that reality can be, within limits, understood by reason under God. Granted that there are non-Christian views of propositional truth and of reason, the fact remains that this concept affirms that reality is not meaningless, lawless, disjointed, and absurd, but rather that it is created by God's design and purpose and is a realm of total meaning. Opposition to rationalism, which exalts man's autonomous mind over God, is necessary, but opposition to reason or to propositional truth is not. Language is propositional, as are words themselves. The attempt of Marcel Duchamp to create a God-free, propositional truth cannot be equated with positivism, as these thinkers claim. Such men deny that what they call a "gaze-on-God" revelation of truth can be found in Scripture; they do insist on presenting a clear vision of God in their theology! This is idolatry. Supposedly, to insist on propositional truth is to turn the church from a convicted, heartfelt knowledge of Jesus Christ to an intellectual assent. By seeing a distinction between heart knowledge and head knowledge, these men are falling into an ancient and Greek mode of dialectical thought.

By separating propositional truth from the Bible and limiting it to a heart knowledge, they are also limiting God and His Word. The Bible is clear that it is not Scripture which is clouded and limited, but our understanding, our being. Sin clouds and blinds us so that the perspicuity of Scripture eludes us. The answer is not to limit God in His Word but to limit our sin and pride by repentance. To call the "theory of knowledge and truth yoked to the Word of God" unchristian and pharisaic is amazing blindness. It says, let God and His word be limited, and man free!

Not surprisingly, these enemies of propositional truth are hostile to theonomy, but not to man's word and law. They construct authoritative theological edifices on the basis of some special word which God has communicated to them through a Bible that speaks *à la* Barth apart from its plainly written text. The result is idolatry.

Given these and other like evils in theological circles, should we be surprised at what nonsense politics, economics, and science produce?

149

THE MYTH OF NEUTRALITY

Chalcedon Report No. 224, March 1984

One of the most pernicious and evil myths to plague the human race is the myth of neutrality. It is a product of atheism and anti-Christianity, because it presupposes a cosmos of uncreated and meaningless factuality, of brute or meaningless facts. Because every atom and fact of the cosmos is then meaningless and also unrelated to every other fact, all facts are neutral.

The word *neutral* is a curious one. It comes from the Latin *neuter*, meaning neither the one nor the other, and has original reference to gender, i.e., neither male nor female. It still has that meaning: a neutered man is a eunuch, a castrate.

It now has also the meaning of not taking sides, and, supposedly, the law and the courts are "neutral." This in itself is nonsense. No law is ever neutral. The law is not neutral about theft, assault, murder, rape, or perjury: it is emphatically against these things, or should be. Again, no good court or judge can be neutral about these things without destroying justice.

Moreover, neither the law nor the courts can be neutral with respect to a man charged with any of these crimes, or others. Rather, a good court "suspends judgment" pending the testimony. Neutrality posits an indifference; a suspended judgment means that any conclusion must be preceded by a rigorous examination of evidence.

The myth of neutrality prevents justice because it ascribes to the law and to the courts a character very much in conflict with their very natures. Moreover, it gives to the courts the power to falsify issues, as the United States Supreme Court habitually does. For example, in dealing with educational issues, the Court, which has declared humanism to be a religion, will not acknowledge that humanistic education, i.e., our state

educational systems today, is not neutral religiously. Christian schools are held to be "religious" and "non-neutral," but the humanistic state schools are seen as "neutral."

There is a reason for this willful blindness. To admit that education is inescapably a religious task and is always non-neutral means that state schools violate the First Amendment. They are religious establishments which teach a religion alien to most citizens, and they do so with public funds. Few things in the United States are more in violation of the First Amendment than the public schools. From its inception, the public or state school system has been destructive of civil liberty and, increasingly, of Biblical faith.

For the Court to recognize this fact would require a radical redirection of life in America. It would, moreover, require a radical change in the Court. The U.S. Supreme Court has become the Sanhedrin, Vatican, or national council of humanism in America. It is a militant and fanatical agency of humanistic religion, and it uses its power to suppress and punish the rivals of the federal religion. The sessions of the Court constitute a modern version of "the holy war" against Christendom.

At the same time, the myth of neutrality has been used to castrate theology and the churches. The American Educational Trust of Washington, D.C. recently published an atlas and almanac by John C. Kimball, *The Arabs* (1983). Kimball writes: "Muslims have always believed strongly that religion concerns not only what a person believes but what he does and the interrelationships of society. Unlike Christian thought that sees a clear distinction between the secular and religious dimensions of life, Muslim thought holds that ideally the secular and spiritual belong to the same sphere" (p. 5). This, of course, is the Biblical position, that all things are under God's law and rule, and any division of life between the religious and the nonreligious is false. Because God is the Lord and Creator of all things, there is no sphere of life and thought outside His jurisdiction, government, and law. To hold that there is means to deny God and to affirm polytheism. And this is precisely what all too many theologians have done. The resurgence of Islam is due to the revival of this premise.

The myth of neutrality is most congenial to man's fallen nature. Dr. Cornelius Van Til has pointed out that, if there were one button in all the universe, which, if man pushed, would give him a small realm of experience outside of God and in freedom from God, fallen man would always have his finger on that button.

The tragic fact is that all too many churchmen assume the existence of such a button! They hold that most of life is outside God's law, and even deny the validity of God's law. They believe, in effect, that man

must be saved in the church but can be unsaved outside of the church, in education, politics, economics, and all things else. They literally posit that most of the world is by nature to be and to remain a godless realm.

The Gilgamesh epic of the Babylonians held that only a small area of life is the concern of men, who are inescapably ignorant of good and evil because the gods "withheld in their own hands" knowledge of most things. This was clearly an expression of religious cynicism. Modern theology goes further: it sees God as unconcerned about most of life, and limits the province of the sacred to a small realm. In Babylon, the laws of "justice" came from the king, not the gods. In modern Western civilization, the laws of "justice" come from man, from the state: Babylon the Great is in process of construction.

Philip Lee Ralph, in *The Renaissance in Perspective* (1973), said: "Together with other thinkers of the age, Erasmus, More, and Machiavelli shared a conviction that, without any change in human nature or any drastic altering of institutions, the political order could be made to serve desirable human ends" (pp. 75–76). In other words, the whole world is outside of God and neutral to Him, and therefore the good society can be created outside of God's salvation and His law-word and in indifference to Him. In the United States, this is the assumption of every state-of-the-union presidential address, and it is everywhere the premise of modern politics. By beginning with the premise that there are neutral spheres outside of God, man ends up by declaring God out of bounds as a concern to men. We are told that it is a matter of neutrality whether or not men believe or disbelieve in God and His law. In all such thinking, man is operating on the assumption that, by pushing this intellectual button of neutrality, the claims of God are eliminated and disappear.

The fact is, however, that God controls all the buttons! And His verdict on the myth of neutrality and all its adherents can only be judgment.

150

EXPERIENCE

Chalcedon Report No. 107, July 1974

Among the cultural motives which dominated Western man when, after 1660, the structure of Western civilization began to shift from a Christian to a humanistic basis was *experience*. A new idea began to emerge, *the truth of experience*, which was to supplant progressively the idea of objective and absolute truth. In the church this meant experiential religion, priority given to experience rather than to the facts of doctrine, priority to the individual and his experience rather than to God. A modern evangelical has summed it up thus: "The most important thing in the world is to experience Christ as your Savior." Clearly, any experience cannot be more important than, for example, the incarnation, not even *for me* can it be more important without turning a cosmic religion into an egocentric concern. However wonderful or necessary my salvation may be, it cannot take priority over God and His total purpose even in my own mind without sin.

To cite another example: In speaking a few years ago of the consequences of inflation, I cited the German monetary collapse of 1923 as one possible consequence. One man immediately objected: "That's impossible. The German experience cannot be the American experience, because the Germans believed in gold and distrusted paper. Americans do not believe in gold and there can therefore be no bad results with our currency." In such thinking, the truth of experience has replaced objective reality.

To cite still another example, last night an outstanding and superior Christian layman told me of a sermon he heard preached by an evangelical pastor. Experience was made so basic that the experience of love made the objective facts of a marriage license and ceremony unnecessary and superficial. This is not a new attitude: the stress on experience has

made the church, modernist and evangelical alike, antinomian, anti-law. With this stress on experience rather than God and His law-word, it should not surprise us that mass evangelism, by its own statistics, leaves 95 percent of its supposed converts unchanged in their lives. Its audiences are largely experience-mongers.

This stress on experience has a related motive, a stress *on quantity, on numbers*. Experience is a visible thing; so is quantity. I have often heard it said that criticism of this or that mass evangelist is wrong: "Think of the numbers of people he reaches." Such people assess any and all things by this same quantitative approach: How many people read him? How many people hear him? How much press does he get? By their logic, these people should have been pro-Hitler and pro-Stalin, and today should be pro-Mao and pro-Brezhnev. To stress quantity, numbers, is evidence of radical humanism (and of stupidity as well). If our faith is in man, it will show. Our criterion will be, how much appeal does one have with man? For the orthodox Christian, the criterion of judgment is faithfulness to God.

One consequence of this emphasis on quantity and experience has been the debasement of the pulpit. From 1660 to the present, the calibre of preaching has declined in content, and the emphasis has shifted from solid thought to popular appeal and entertainment. With a few exceptions, the larger the church, the weaker the content of the preaching.

In politics, the consequence has been crowd-pleasing of the most blatant sort. Justice has come to mean giving the most handouts to the most people by robbing those who are the targets of envy. The logic of the emphasis on experience and quantity makes socialism or communism the natural and inevitable faith of a culture which stresses their centrality.

Basic to this stress on experience and quantity or numbers is *relativism*. All things are made relative to man, to mass man. Truth is made relative to man, not to God. Things are important if man so regards them, not because God has established a priority.

Because all things are made relative to man and man's experience, things are unimportant unless they command masses of men. God's warning against despising "the day of small things," i.e., small beginnings (Zech. 4:10), is regularly despised by modern fools. They see a thing as good only as mass man takes to it, not because it is good in terms of God and His Word.

The implications of all this is that the supreme good is man, and the more men who approve of something and experience it favorably, the closer that thing or cause is to the supreme good. The logic of total democracy is that man is the ultimate standard, law, and good, and the more men there are who approve of anything, the better it must be.

Humanistic culture is collapsing, however, and its elite now have turned on man. The fewer there are who appreciate an avant-garde art form, the better it must be! If the crowd-man takes to it, that art form is dropped for another. The fewer people there are who go to a resort, the better it is, and, however bad the food and beds, and however flea-ridden, that inn is "quaint" and "unspoiled." The humanistic mass-man stupidly follows the crowd, and the crowd is his standard of judgment. The humanistic elitist avoids the crowd and stupidly assumes that what the crowd ignores must be good: his standard, as against mass-man's judgment, is private judgment and is humanism still. God's truth is not in the picture for either as they blindly stumble towards the collapse of their culture.

I may believe without any doubt that the lights will go on when I flip the switch, but the lights only go on when all is well with the power. Modern man assumes that he is the power plant. Reality, however, is not a product of man's faith in himself.

151

TOTAL MEANING

Chalcedon Report No. 380, March 1997

Because all things were made by God, "and without him was not any thing made that was made" (John 1:3), we live in a world of total meaning. As Cornelius Van Til stated it, there is no brute factuality, there are no meaningless facts in creation. All facts are God-created, God-ordained facts. We find them meaningless because we choose to ignore the fact of sin and its distorting nature. Facts do not derive their meaning from man but from God. If we insist on being the judge of their meaning, they will indeed be inexplicable and meaningless to us.

Original sin is our desire to be our own god, to determine or know good and evil, law and morality, in terms of our will rather than God's Word (Gen. 3:5). Men want to know and determine all things by themselves, without reference to God. Their epistemologies, or theories of knowledge, are man-centered, not God-centered. They will not have life on God's terms. I recall one man who insisted that no meaning could be acceptable to man unless it were a man-centered one, which is another way of saying that no answer is valid unless man gives it. We must begin by recognizing that our man-centered answers are corrupt and fallen ones and that our Lord's, "not my will, but thine, be done" (Luke 22:42), must be our answer also.

History is a struggle to establish meaning: whose shall prevail, God's or man's? Some humanists, like Camus, were ready to deny any and all meaning in the universe in order to establish man's purely personal and existential meaning. In existentialism, the Death of God school of thought, and like currents of modern thinking, we see the extent to which humanism has gone. To escape from God, a cosmic meaning is denied in favor of a purely personal one. This is, of course, the logic of Genesis 3:5, every man as his own god and his own private world of meaning. In such

a literary interpretation as deconstructionism, we see this retreat into a purely personal world of meaning played out to its insane end.

Because we are created in the image of God (Gen. 1:26–28), we cannot rest content with a purely biological view of life, i.e., as simply physical and no more. In Augustine's words, "Our hearts are restless until they rest in Thee." An existential meaning is an implicit form of suicide.

The first Adam sought the wrong meaning: "to be as god" came to be the death of man, the entrance of sin and death into the world. The fallen sons of Adam, then and now, love preaching that is anthropology, i.e., the word about man, or psychology, i.e., the word about man's psyche, but not theology, the word about God. When did you last hear a sermon about the doctrine of God, of Christ, of atonement, and so on? For a people most interested in themselves, theological sermons are offensive. Is it any wonder that the churches are weak?

A world of total meaning, God's meaning, calls for total dedication and total service. There is no pastime Christian service or living. God's world of total meaning surrounds us. We are called to an unequivocal faith and service. Our Lord tells us that the essential requirement of us is this: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbor as thyself" (Luke 10:27). The word "all" seems to be replaced in current thinking! Where there is total faith and service, total meaning follows.

152

SCIENCE AND MAGIC

Chalcedon Report No. 370, May 1996

One of the persistent aspects of human history has been the recourse to magic and to science. Both have their power over man because both are concerned with power over men and things, and both deal with an impersonal and amoral world.

Biblical faith begins with the totally personal God. It holds that we are personally accountable to Him and that a moral accounting and judgment are required of all men.

Science and magic, on the other hand, see the world as one of impersonal powers which must be harnessed, and morality, if admitted at all, is peripheral if not nonexistent. The goal is to control things and peoples, and power is always in view and among the various motives. Not surprisingly, earlier in this century some radicals saw the dynamo as the most fitting symbol of science and of Marxism. As a result, science has done much to revive the ancient tyrannies of magic and occultism because science, without Christian faith and restraints, is amoral and can be dangerous.

As against this quest for power, Christianity stresses redemption and submission to God, and, in Him, service to God and man. It means not only our spiritual regeneration but also practical changes in our day-by-day living. In 1968, when Eugene A. Nida wrote *Religion Across Culture*, he cited a response in West Africa to the question, "Are you a Christian?" One response was, "No, I don't boil water" (p. 19). However superficial a description of a Christian, it was still a revealing one. A Christian protected his family and guests by boiling otherwise germ-laden water. His faith made a difference.

The Christian exercises responsible *dominion*, something very different from amoral power because it means bringing everything into

captivity to Christ as King. Instead of being amoral or antimoral, dominion means living life in terms of God's law, in terms of the enscriptured word of righteousness or justice, the Bible. Dominion means the rule of justice and morality rather than power.

Science *should* serve God's purposes, but it has chosen to eliminate the "God-concept" from its thinking while using the fact of God's order, a presupposition, in order to think and experiment.

Science as we see it today depersonalizes the world and man. It studies man in impersonal terms and categories. Now, such an approach, i.e., depersonalization, or impersonalization, eliminates morality from consideration because morality has to do with acts and relationships between persons. With a humanistic scientific approach, an objective morality disappears because the criteria of judgment are all impersonal. The world and man are thus dehumanized. God is replaced with natural *forces*.

If there is no objective moral law, if God is not our King and Lord, then *crime* loses its immoral character and becomes simply a violation of a state law or regulation. What we do see is an increasing rise of crime together with a lessening of its seriousness. Without a return to Christian faith, crime will grow in its scope, and there will a lower view of its seriousness. We tolerate much today that sixty and seventy years were viewed with horror.

Henry James Sr. (1811–1882), father of the novelist Henry James and William James, psychologist and philosopher, saw freedom as liberation from the confining text of the Bible. Adam's "fall" was upward, and Eve "had a regenerative influence upon Adam, starting him on the path to true manhood" (Dwight W. Hoover, *Henry James Sr., and the Religion of Community* [1969], pp. 58–59). For James, "evil was harmless." Today, however, men fear the evil that surrounds them and increasingly commands our civilization. But science does not enable us to cope with sin and evil because it cannot identify them correctly as a revolt against God and His calling and law. Moreover, criminals have the same goal as our other humanists, power, and, like our scientists, they deny God's moral law.

As long as man's goal is power, he will create a criminal culture. Only through Jesus Christ can our personal and societal goals be reordered by God's moral law. And the only way men gain that purpose is through Christ's saving power.

153

INNOCENT III

Chalcedon Report No. 151, March 1978

DISASTERS are often the works of able men who, seeing a problem more clearly than others, try to solve it dramatically, but with the wrong answers. In the twentieth century, we have seen the damage done by such solutions as World War I and the Versailles Treaty, the League of Nations, World War II and its treaties, the United Nations, Korea, Vietnam, Keynesianism, and much more. It is not enough to condemn sins and errors: it is necessary to understand what wrong religious premises went into them.

One of the ablest men of history was Innocent III, who in 1198 became pope. He was faced with a serious problem: Europe was nominally Christian, but in reality had relegated Christian faith to a formal and irrelevant position in political and social life. In Frederick II (1194–1250), the Holy Roman emperor, this indifference to the faith was more openly expressed, because Frederick's power gave him the freedom to do it. Frederick ruled more like a Muslim sultan than a Germanic king. He kept a harem, guarded by eunuchs, a troupe of Muslim dancing girls, and was generally skeptical about religion. Frederick spoke fluently in German, French, Italian, and Arabic, read both Greek and Latin, and was widely read in ancient and current works of scholarship. He moved with an indifference to moral and religious considerations and held to a humanistic perspective.

Most Europeans were either not as "advanced" in their skepticism, as was Frederick II, or not as vocal, but most churchmen and laymen shared Frederick's indifference to Christian faith. Innocent III thus was the spiritual head of a Christendom seriously adrift in its moral and religious foundations. Innocent had the power to assert authority in one realm after another, enough to break rulers, and he had the power to institute

reforms. Both answers he felt were insufficient, however necessary, and not to be neglected. What was needed above all, he felt, was a revival of religious fervor. This he believed could best be generated by a crusade, and the result was the preaching of the Fourth Crusade. This was begun in 1199, and every effort was made to keep this crusade under control and strictly Christian in purpose. The result was one moral disaster after another. One of the worst consequences was the sack of Zara and then of Constantinople in 1202 and 1204, and, in 1212, the horrors of the Children's Crusade. What was begun as a means of reviving Christian faith and fervor became a powerful instrument for unleashing evil and destructive forces on all of Europe and the Byzantine Empire. The Albigensian Crusade in 1208 plunged southern France into blood, and Innocent's dream began to unravel.

Innocent was an Italian patrician of Germanic blood; eight popes came from his family. He sought to make Europe a single moral and religious community under his spiritual leadership. An able administrator, his reforms and reorganization of the papal chancery greatly improved and strengthened papal government. His idea of reviving faith in Europe, however, led only to disasters and griefs. Reform by new action is not reform when the old man is still involved; all of Innocent's efforts only gave morally indifferent and evil men new scopes for the enactment of their greed and evil.

Innocent's program, which has roots in old Rome, is still very much with us. From Woodrow Wilson to the present, the Innocentine idea of moral revival and accomplishment has led the United States into one crusade after another, with results even more deadly than those of Innocent's crusade. All over the world, indeed, men share this same faith: institute a good program of moral action to save the world. From wars, to leagues and unions of nations, from army corps to peace corps, the plan is put into action, and things somehow grow worse. No moral cause can survive immoral men, nor can the world and history be regenerated by unregenerate men.

The difference between Innocent's day and ours is that then the crusades were launched in the name of Christianity; now they are launched in the name of humanity and the religion of humanism. In either case, the implications are not Christian.

Crusades now are as religious as ever, but they are proclaimed by politicians, not by popes. Men run for political office, and gain control of nations, by promises of another crusade, this time, the candidate in effect declares, with the right spirit. A new and "innocent" group of men will supposedly lead us into a true crusade.

The Children's Crusade, in which tens of thousands of children ended as slaves, prostitutes, or dead, began with such a faith. The average age of the children was twelve; their belief was that their "innocence" would lead to miracles and deliver the Holy Land to them. Many ended in massive corruption, cannibalism, and horrors, only a minority retaining their faith. Other and minor child pilgrimages occurred later, all evidences of the humanistic faith in the natural innocence of children, and the power of that innocence. This same faith in the untainted innocence of youth marked the student movements of the 1960s: like the pretentious youth of the Children's Crusade, the Youth's Crusade of the 1960s pitted its ostensibly holy innocence against the corruption of the establishment; the confrontation showed the prevalence of sin on all sides. Another crusade failed, but not man's faith in crusades.

For us as Christians, the crusade offers no hope. It is a costly evil. The crusade puts its hope in some men's innocence and action, and it leads to Phariseeism, hypocrisy, and the brutalities of self-righteousness.

For the Christian, the answer begins with regeneration, and it continues with obedience to God's law. It means restitution, Christian education, the increase of godly knowledge and dominion, and the centrality of the family as a unit under God and to His purposes.

When Innocent came to office, indifference and hostility to the church were common among lay people, and prevalent in all circles. During his eighteen-year pontificate, Innocent punished two emperors and seven kings; he acted with vigor, and fearlessly. All the same, he left the situation worse than he found it: power had been countered with power, sometimes wisely, sometimes wrongly, but the faith was not advanced, and indifference only grew. The crisis was not resolved but only aggravated.

Men can be indifferent to problems; they can aggravate them; or, by the obedience of faith to the law of God, they can take steps to resolve them as He requires it.

154

CHILDREN'S CRUSADE

Chalcedon Report No. 152, April 1978

Because of his humanism, modern man believes strongly in the innocence of children and their natural goodness. It is the world, the environment, which is sinful, whereas, as Wordsworth wrote, in his *Ode on Intimations of Immortality*, of children it must be said that "trailing clouds of glory do we come" into this world; unhappily, "Shades of the prison-house begin to close upon the growing boy." These ideas were not new with Wordsworth; in the modern era, they went back to at least John Locke, who borrowed them from Aristotle and the Scholastics.

The medieval version had led to the Gospel of the Child, a heresy culminating in the disaster of the Children's Crusade in 1212. Adults believed in the child and the power of the child's purity, and children learned this new faith from their parents and fervently preached it. The children actually believed that their "innocence" would result in miracles to transport them over the sea to the Holy Land. "Who would remain here, when there lies a path in the sea, between emerald walls, to the land where glory waits us?" They declared, "Between waters, which are to be to us as a wall on the right hand and the left, are we to cross the untrodden bed of the sea, and, with dry feet will we stand on the distant beach by the walls of Acre of Tripoli. We bear no weapons and we wear no armor! The pathway of other Crusaders may be marked by the stain of blood and the glitter of steel, and martial music may have timed their many steps, but our pilgrim's robes are our armor, our Crosses are our swords, and our hymns shall time our march!" (J. Z. Gray, *The Children's Crusade* [1870, 1972], pp. 86, 108). What the children gained was either death, slavery, venereal diseases, or, at the least, disillusionment. Of nearly 100,000 children, one-third never returned home.

The Student Crusade of the 1960s was another like movement. The

students began with a belief in their holiness and the evil of the world. It was their mission to bring the world to peace by imposing their holiness upon it. One scholar dates the origin of the movement in October 1955, when Allen Ginsberg read his poem, "Howl" at the San Francisco's Six Gallery. Its message was simplicity itself: the world is like a madhouse because of the evil establishment, whereas everything is in and of itself holy; it is the duty of youth, before all are driven mad like young Carl Solomon, to redeem the world. Ginsberg said, "I'm putting my queer shoulder to the wheel." Soon many more young shoulders, queer and unqueer, were being put to the wheel.

The results were even more disastrous than in 1212. In the conflict with ancient evils, the Youth Crusade invented its own variations. It raged with Phariseeism against all evil outside itself and failed to see that, in the process, it was compounding evil with evil. For most, the movement ended with disillusionment, narcotics, disease, or a retreat into the pleasure principle of the sexual revolution. Others, more hardened in their self-righteousness, went underground to make up various worldwide terrorist groups. Its gospel of love, innocence, and change had hardened into murder.

The above-ground movement is even more ominous. It has taken a new form, the Children's Bill of Rights movement, an effort in varying degrees all over the world, to "free" the child from parental and church controls and give him the right to govern himself as he pleases. The child, it is believed, will somehow still save us.

What is surprising is that these movements did not come sooner, and more drastically. Their basic principles have been taught for generations (as I pointed out in *The Messianic Character of American Education*). Most graduation speakers, from grade school through the university, have been preaching the Gospel of the Child for generations. Sooner or later, this was bound to produce action and results.

Rousseau, of course, was one of the great earlier preachers of this faith, and we have a series of revolutions to thank him for! Friedrich Froebel (1782–1852), an educational philosopher of very great influence, had warbled, "Dear little children, we will learn from you." If children feel they know better than their parents, and are rebellious, they do so with good reason: our humanistic schools have taught them to think so. Nora Smith, a theorist of the kindergarten, wrote in a *Ladies' Home Journal* book, *The Kindergarten in a Nutshell* (1907), that mothers had a rare honor in carrying their children: "like St. Christopher, we have borne the Christ upon our Shoulders." When the educator and kindergarten theorist Emma Marwedel lay dying in 1893, she said, "I believe in

the power of the Kindergarten to reform the world." Since 1893, we have been seeing more and more of the meaning of that "reform."

The spirit of crusades is to locate the holy, good, innocent, or pure class in society, or age group. This pure group has been variously identified as the upper class, the middle class, the lower class, the workers, the capitalists, the intellectuals, the children, women, and so on. The quest goes on. It has also been sought in various nations and races. Where is the Sir Galahad to find the Holy Grail and change the world and recharge it with his purity?

All such crusading is an implicit or explicit denial of Jesus Christ and His Word. It looks for a redeemer other than Christ, and a plan other than God's law and Kingdom. Such quests and crusades glorify self-righteousness and Phariseeism, and they are uniformly blind to their own sinfulness. Their failures are always blamed on an evil world and an evil establishment. The world was not ready for their purity and wisdom!

The disillusioned ranks of the crusaders keep looking for another leader, another charismatic figure, one who can charm the snakes of evil out of their fangs and poisons, part the waters or walk on water, and somehow deliver mankind. The enthusiasm and fervor of political campaigns tell us that men are looking, not for sound and godly administration, but for miracles and miracle workers. It is their passionate hope that this new man might be the real one.

Meanwhile, they turn their backs on God the Savior, and the only means for man's redemption, Jesus Christ.

155

CRUSADING

Chalcedon Report No. 153, May 1978

One of the marks of the crusading temperament is the desire to reform everyone except one's self. The crusader has a simple solution: to remake the world after his own image. Crusading thus fosters self-righteousness, and self-righteousness promotes and feeds on hypocrisy.

Modern warfare is a form of crusading, and hence its particularly intense form of horror. It is total war, because the more clearly it becomes a crusade, the more it works for obliteration. At its worst, we see this total warfare in the various forms of international and national socialism, but it is present in all modern states.

The first great rehearsal of total war was the American conflict, 1860–1864. Before the United States of America and the Confederate states joined battle, both had developed a crusading fervor and a radical blindness to evil on their part. The horrors of the battle for Kansas by slave and antislave forces begat moral monsters like John Brown and William Clarke Quantrill. The war itself led to insanities of men like Major General David Hunter, a Virginian who fought for the North. Like Quantrill, Hunter majored in terrorism, although the regular army exercised some restraint on him, whereas Quantrill, as a guerrilla, had none. In Virginia, Hunter burned his own cousin's home, and he refused to allow Mrs. Hunter or her daughter to save their clothes and family pictures; Andrew Hunter, named after Major General Hunter's father, and a civilian, was imprisoned.

Quantrill, a twisted mind, criminal, suspicious of all kindness shown to him, took no prisoners, waged total war, and often used the war as an excuse to settle personal hatreds.

Northern troops, under the vicious Colonel Strachan, executed ten men as a gesture of revenge against Quantrill. The response of "Bloody

Bill" Anderson and Quantrill was the slaughter of Centralia and the sacking of Lawrence.

Early in the war, Confederate authorities praised Quantrill, while Northerners condemned Strachan. By the end of the war, the North chose under Sherman to wage total war, and men like Lee and Jackson seem remote and alien in their Christian standards amidst the prevailing horrors. Each side saw evil in the other as justification for an evil crusade, and self-righteousness became a governing temper.

Since then, two world wars, several smaller wars, and many revolutions have developed and refined the crusading temper, and the world has gone from horror to horror as total war has become a principle of action in both war and peace, in politics and in life.

The crusader does not build: he wars. The crusader does not seek to convert but to destroy. His answer to problems is militancy, suppression, chains, hatred, and obliteration. In the mouth of the crusader, the word "love" becomes a self-righteous weapon. The crusader says in effect, I am love, truth, and goodness, and all you say and represent is hatred and hate-mongering, a lie, and evil. The crusader hopes for a better world through a better organized suppression of all opposition, through gaining political power, control of wealth, and of peoples, and through a domination of society in the name of his "good."

Crusaders can be found on most sides of every issue, and it is their activities which reduce their cause to impotence and the world to a shambles. Crusaders want to accomplish great things with other people's lives and money, and control of the machinery of state is a constant goal of all crusaders. They do not see politics as a question of good government but as a means of power, the power to compel people.

For crusaders of all kinds, good and evil are in essence humanistically defined, or else, if they appeal to a Biblical basis, it is an appeal to a limited segment of Scripture. The Bible, in its totality, takes both authority and justice out of the hands of crusaders and places them in God's law. Whereas the crusader indicts a segment of humanity, God's law indicts all men, everywhere, every man without exception. God's law-word requires the condemnation of all, and it provides also for redemption and regeneration through Jesus Christ and His atonement. It then requires the redeemed man to believe and obey by bringing every area of life and thought under Christ as Lord. This means the reconstruction of all things in terms of the law-word of God.

Deuteronomy 28 makes it clear that irresistible blessings follow obedience, and irresistible curses follow disobedience.

Our Lord indicts the whole crusading mentality as one of hypocrisy

and blindness, because it seeks an outward conformity and cleanliness rather than true justice and faith (Matt. 23:13–33).

Total war presupposes the validity of this emphasis on externals. As Tung Chi-Ping, in his very telling account of Red China, *The Thought Revolution*, points out, hypocrisy succeeds best in such a regime. Because humanism in all its forms, as well as the crusading mentality, sets a priority on outer controls, a premium is placed on surfaces rather than meaning. Communist ideology, says Tung Chi-Ping, believes "that human nature can be changed by changing the environment." Conformity is thus rewarded, and thinking distrusted. The answer to each crisis is another planned crusade, massive demonstrations, testimonial meetings, and dramatic gestures. Faith and work are replaced by power and appearance, and so, the more the society crumbles, the greater the monuments to itself that it raises.

Where environmentalism replaces regeneration as the salvation of man and society, there power must prevail as the saving agency. In regeneration, God's power is at work, to create a new man who is then commissioned to exercise dominion in terms of God's law by rebuilding all things on the foundation of Jesus Christ. The key power agency is in God and His Spirit. Where environmental faiths govern, a human power agency must do all the changing, and the means is not by an inner conversion but by an outer coercion. The "tactic," then, is not faith and obedience but power and coercion.

Because we live in a crusading era, we live therefore in a highly coercive era, one in which compulsion replaces freedom, and power replaces the Spirit. Men may regret the consequences of our present course, but they will not change them until they themselves are changed.

156

DOING NOTHING

Chalcedon Report No. 159, November 1978

Alexander I. Solzhenitsyn has distressed many segments of Western society since coming to the West. The liberals had mistakenly assumed that Solzhenitsyn was one of them. To their shock, they found him speaking from a Christian perspective. Others had become upset at his criticism of the West, of democracy, capitalism, the press, and more. What is an anti-communist doing, criticizing democracy and its press, capitalism and socialism, and more?

This misunderstanding of Solzhenitsyn is part and parcel of our misunderstanding of the problem of our time. Moreover, the cause of this misunderstanding is a religious and moral failure, not an intellectual problem.

All too much anti-communism is not only shallow but also involves a surrender to the basic evil. If we agree with our enemy on six to nine points out of ten, our quarrel is a family fight for power, not a principled conflict. Most Westerners agree with most of the *Communist Manifesto*, and much of it is now law.

This still does not get to the root of the matter, however. The root cause and foundation of Marxism is humanism, and humanism is also basic now to most of the politics, economics, capital and labor, education, churches, and press of the West. As a result, the disagreements between the Communist and the democratic powers are in essence a family fight, because both are agreed on the ultimacy of man. In practical terms, this means the sovereignty, not of God, but the state.

Franklin L. Baumer, in *Modern European Thought: Continuity and Change in Ideas, 1600–1905* (MacMillian, 1950), has a chapter on modern man's faith in the state as lord or sovereign. The title of the chapter is very apt: "The Mortal God." As faith in God gave way to the

Enlightenment, faith in the state replaced it. The state was seen as the lord over every area of life, including religion, and hence the state as lord and sovereign has the supposed right and duty to control every area.

Solzhenitsyn, in *The Gulag Archipelago* (Harper & Row, 1973), speaks with intense feeling of the Soviet tyranny. One of the moving charges of his narrative is the horror of Baptist children being separated from their parents because their parents had given them religious instruction, i.e., Christian teaching.

But consider this fact: in state after state in the United States, Baptist parents have been hauled into court and threatened with the loss of their children because their children were in schools which refused to submit to statist and humanistic controls. The charge against these parents? Contributing to the delinquency of their minor children! It has been demonstrated repeatedly that the results of standard testing show that the children in Christian schools are markedly in advance of children in state schools. The state is not impressed: the children are "deprived" of humanistic religious teaching, a "democratic" environment, and so on.

Why do the Soviet citizens do nothing about the persecutions there? Most know little about them, and it is safer to know nothing. The Soviet regime does not publicize its evils.

Why do U.S. citizens for the most part do nothing? Most know little about the persecutions and prefer to know less. Others, evangelical, Lutheran, Reformed, and modernist, will even appear in the courtroom or elsewhere to oppose those of us who make a stand. The press gives little publicity to these trials, on the whole.

Where humanism prevails, whether in the pulpit, classroom, or court, God will be denied, and Jesus Christ despised. They will say, like the men of old, "We will not have this man to reign over us" (Luke 19:14).

The issue in the Christian school trials, in the various church battles, with respect to Biblical law, in the church and state conflicts, is the reign of Christ. Humanism in its every form requires the reign of man and battles against the freedom of true faith.

Solzhenitsyn speaks of the ruthlessness at the heart of the Soviet authority. What it does not create and rule, it works to destroy. This should not surprise us: the lords of humanism cannot bear to see or tolerate the work of an alien God. Only that which they create and govern can thus be tolerated. As a result, isolated groups in the Siberian forests are hunted down and destroyed.

Humanism everywhere works toward the same goal. Only that which it creates and controls must be allowed to exist. All who do not conform are deformed in their eyes and must be controlled, remade, or punished.

This means that Christ's redeemed people are the enemy, and it means that we are at war. In that war, there are no neutrals. The power of humanistic statism looms very large and dangerously, but only Jesus Christ is the Lord, King of kings and Lord of lords. He alone shall prevail, and we only in and through Him. The tombs of His enemies are all over the world, and death and hell await the current crop. His is the empty tomb, and the victory. As for us, "whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world: and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith" (1 John 5:4).

157

DREAM OF TOTAL JUSTICE

Chalcedon Report No. 180, August 1980

One of the most dangerous of ideas that have dominated men's minds is the dream of total justice. This is a humanistic dream. The humanist has only one world, this present life, and he is determined to make a heaven out of earth. The result is consistently hell on earth.

The menace of the dream of total justice is that it requires perfect people and a perfect social order and state to establish itself. The fact is that man is a sinner; he is also unwilling to change, content with himself although discontented with the world, and, by virtue of his fallen nature, a slave to sin and hence a slave by design (John 8:31–36). As result, every dreamer of a world of perfect justice, a habitation for supermen, and a realm of triumph for humanistic dogmas of justice, must begin to eliminate men as they are to make way for men as they should be. The French Revolution planned the reduction of France's population to a malleable fraction of what it was; Nietzsche called for the death of man to prepare the world for superman; the Russian Revolution and its exported revolutions have meant the planned murder of all who represent the old order. In Cambodia, since 1975, half the nation has been killed to eliminate all who cannot be reshaped in terms of the Marxist dream of a perfect order. The Cambodian Khmer Rouge leaders have killed off all who worked for the old order, all Christians, all who were educated, all who lived an urban life, all who had been abroad, and all who had worked for foreigners.

No more murderous force has ever been unleashed by man against man than the humanistic dream of justice. Tyranny and evil have governed most of history, but never more rigidly and thoroughly than by those who bring in totalitarian controls in the name of total justice. In 1931, Charles Pettit's *The Impotent General*, a brief and light novel, was

translated into English. When the old warlord is replaced by an ideologue, the peasants are unhappy. A peasant is asked if it is because of affection. "By no means... Tan Pan-tze was an infamous robber, who shamefully harassed the countryside, thrashing inoffensive folk and raping women of all ages and conditions...;" "Then may I ask why you appear to mourn him?" The peasant replied: "Simply because his successor, General Pou, is very much worse than he was... he extorts his tribute methodically, which is even harder to endure... and, moreover, he now exacts the death penalty for nonpayment and he does so in a legalized manner which has multiplied the executions" (p. 171).

It is not surprising that, in the quest for total justice, the humanistic regimes have instituted total terror. The people are whipped into line "for their own good." They are ruthlessly subjected to savage repressions and forcible changes, all designed to make them conform to the new model man for the new model society.

All this is logical. A better world does require better men! The question is, how to get better men, how to produce them? In the final analysis, two choices appear before men as the instruments whereby men can be changed: revolution or regeneration.

If men deny the possibility of regeneration then their only logical option is revolution. Since 1660, and the birth of the Enlightenment, the logic of humanism has moved the world steadily and more deeply into revolution. Every continent is now in the grips of a faith which demands the coercive remaking of men.

But total justice on earth is an impossible dream. Man does not have God's omnipotence nor omniscience: he cannot control nor see all things. Lacking total knowledge, his institution of justice, even in godly hands, is at best partial and incomplete. Not every wrong can be righted, nor every balance restored. Men can live, under God, in a just society, but never in this world in a totally just society. For the humanistic state to seek total justice means claiming God's omnipotence: the state must exercise total power for total justice. Likewise, it must claim God's omniscience: it must have total knowledge of all people, institutions, and things. A bureaucracy is created to exercise these "divine" powers.

In the Biblical perspective, man as sinner needs regeneration. As a sinner, he cannot establish a just order, only an evil one. By the regenerating power of God in Christ, he is a new creation. He is now able to serve God, to institute an order in terms of God's law, and to know what godly justice is, and to pursue it. He knows that only in God's eternal Kingdom is total justice attainable, so that, even as he strives to obey God in all things, he knows that he cannot expect of imperfect men and societies a

perfect and total justice. All the same, only a new creature can make for a new creation.

A law order and state dedicated to a humanistic faith in total justice will create total revolution. An order dedicated to the whole Word of God and Christ's regenerating power can give justice, because it rests on a new man of God's making, not man's.

158

ANTI-CHRISTIANITY ON THE RISE

Chalcedon Report No. 334, May 1993

About 1952, the U.S. Supreme Court began to dismantle the Biblical premises of American law. By the mid-1970s, the prosecution of Christian schools, churches, and home schools was under way.

Now, in the 1990s, with great venom, anyone defending Christianity and Biblical morality is likely to be the target of malicious attacks. It is now held that *chastity* cannot be taught in state schools because it is "an establishment of religion." The children of darkness are indeed wiser than the children of light! Humanism is naturalism: with the Marquis de Sade and Kinsey, it holds that whatever can occur in nature (sodomy, bestiality, etc.) is therefore natural and right. Humanism is rapidly being made the established religion of the United States.

Fanaticism? Intolerance? We see it now in a remarkable hatred of any who are not "politically correct." The media in state after state are hostile to Christians and churches. In recent years, we have seen people hounded out of office, or denied the use of their property, for telling stupid jokes held to be "politically incorrect." Is this freedom of speech? If immorality in humor is a ground for penalties, then these humanists should run out of office all whose sexual conduct is immoral! After all, is not conduct a more serious matter than jokes?

America has had, despite its failings at times, a long history of patience and freedom. Early in our history, there were communistic colonies, and "free" love colonies. Christians, then in control, did not destroy these groups, however great their disagreement. Now, in our supposedly more enlightened and tolerant era, only anti-Christianity and humanism are tolerated. The move towards the suppression of dissent increases. I regularly hear of distressing cases of persecution.

These humanistic persecutors are harsh and savage while insisting

that we Christians are "judgmental." In the name of love, they are passionate haters.

Sadly, too many in the churches become nervous if any Christian suggests that something must be done. They want to pretend that nothing is happening, and they resent all who try to awaken them. Besides, some say, the "Rapture" is about to take place!

Christians *must* be in prayer about this matter. They *must* tell their church organizations and denominations to go on record against this anti-Christianity. They *must* let the media and politicians know of their anger and alarm over these things.

The culture of victimhood is all around us. Too many so-called "Christian" psychologists have made it the new (and false) gospel. Our calling, however, is to be "more than conquerors" in Christ (Rom. 8:37). It is time for us to pray and *to act*. "Arise, O LORD; let not man prevail" (Ps. 9:19). "Put them in fear, O LORD: that the nations may know themselves to be but men" (Ps. 9:20).

159

LOSS OF THE PAST

Chalcedon Report No. 320, March 1992

A great many familiar names from my school days are now disappearing from the textbooks, men once highly honored and now forgotten. Patrick Henry (1736–1799) made possible the United States in more ways than one. With the War of Independence nearing an end, Governor Henry sent Virginia troops under George Clark over the mountains to clear the British out of the Midwest. The Battle of Vincennes (in Indiana) on February 29, 1779, is one of history's most decisive battles. Governor Henry recognized that the United States would remain forever a country on the Atlantic shores unless the British were defeated in the Midwest, thereby opening a front to the Far West for the new country. The victory is a key even in world history, but is today forgotten.

Stephen Decatur (1779–1820), an America naval commander, was the remarkable leader of American forces in the war against Tripoli and then against Algiers. The Barbary pirates were preying on the shipping of all nations, seizing the cargo, holding some men for ransom, and sodomizing and enslaving the others. The European powers did little or nothing to defend their own ships until the young United States, under President Thomas Jefferson, decided: millions for defense, not one cent for tribute. Later, France followed up on the American initiative and occupied the area, colonizing it and bringing freedom to the natives who themselves were oppressed by their vicious rulers. The area was made a part France. The bitterness of many Frenchmen over the loss of that area in recent years (many generations of Frenchmen had lived there), *and* the accusations that they had been guilty of evils in a land whose history was a most notorious one before the French took over, is a lingering one.

We are also given lurid tales of imperial abuses in Africa, some true, but the fact remains that there, as in India and elsewhere, the European

powers suppressed many evils. Their participation in the slave trade was evil, but we must not forget that the major part of the slave trade was out of Zanzibar and the Indian Ocean, not in the West. Today, according to Gordon Thomas, in *Enslaved*, there are now over 200,000,000 slaves in the world, but we go on acting as though only the European world engaged in this evil.

Of course, the year 1992 is a time of Columbus-bashing by people ignorant of history. The charge by one person is that Columbus enslaved some Indians; Philip Powell, in *Tree of Hate*, gives a balanced picture of the era. But let us say the charges against Columbus are all true: remember, however, that he stopped the Carib Indians from eating one another. Look up the word *cannibal* in an unabridged dictionary; you will find that it comes from the word *Carib*, and it was originally *caribal* and was corrupted in time to *cannibal*. The Caribs were not the only tribe with such a habit.

Does this mean that the Europeans were superior peoples? The first Christian missionaries from the Mediterranean and the Near East found the North Europeans practicing all kinds of evil, including human sacrifices; some of these missionaries wondered when such debased peoples would be converted and civilized. Anyone who romanticizes the pre-Christian past of Europe is both ignorant and foolish. It took centuries of patient Christian teaching to produce a great European culture, now in the process of destruction by the present-day Europeans. They are like pygmies too often when compared to their ancestors. We dare not confuse the present-day Europeans in the streets with the cathedral builders, nor the present-day Americans with their ancestors. The Lilliputians now rule the world, and badly, but they swagger as though they are giants.

Because we have no sense of history, we have suffered from a loss of the past, hence an ignorance about the realities of the present, and therefore the erosion of the future.

All this is compounded by the loss of a Biblical sense of sin. Without a belief in the depravity of man, people demand a perfection of men and nations which is unreasonable and unrealistic. Without this sense of sin, they become Pharisees, sitting self-righteously in judgment on all others.

On one trip, I had a woman, only married two or three years, come to me to ask a moment or two of my time. She then proceeded to complain in detail about her husband. I told her that I was in no position to give godly counsel, since I only had her side of the story, and I was leaving in the morning. For example, I said, I did not know whether or not she was meeting her day-by-day obligations, cooking, keeping house, and so on, let alone her personal relations to her husband. Her response was anger;

it was obvious to her that I would only favor men, and so on. Sin for her was what other people, notably her husband, and now me, were guilty of in relation to her.

But sin is against God. It is the transgression of God's law (1 John 3:4). We can never cope with sin in ourselves or in others unless we see it as essentially an offense against Almighty God and His law. When churches reduce sin to an offense against the church, and when men and women reduce it to an offense against themselves, it is no wonder that society decays. The modern state similarly sees all crime as an offense against its laws, not God's. As a result, administrative law, which refers to infractions against statist regulations, increasingly dominates the legal scene.

Sigmund Freud found that the sense of guilt is a universal phenomenon, common to all men. He saw the origin of guilt in man's primordial past and in man's unconscious, not in sin. As a result, he saw no cure for guilt, and he believed that man's will to death would triumph over his will to live. Given Freud's premises, he was right.

But we must affirm that sin is against God, and that the forgiveness of sins is the gift of God through Christ's atonement. We are then free from the burden of past guilt, and we are able to make the past, however bad, into a blessing, because in Christ all things work together for good to them who love God and are the called according to His purpose (Rom. 8:28).

Such a faith and freedom puts our lives and all history under God and His perspective. It gives us humility and grace.

It is amazing to see some of the evil characters of our time condemn Columbus! They are paragons of Phariseeism. They think that they can gain virtue by damning long-dead men while they themselves are an evil plague to all around them. They are remarkable in their blindness. As one university student, busily damning his father and mother for their middle-class morality, said, out of the blue, "I suppose you even think Columbus was a good man!" This was to express scorn for their stupidity and blindness. I have had similar strange questions thrown at me by critics and reporters, totally irrelevant but somehow designed to affirm their moral superiority!

Without a sense of sin, we lose perspective on history and ourselves. We become pompous Lilliputians, pygmies with delusions of grandeur. With a sense of sin, and gratitude for our salvation, we can say with the psalmist, "Through thy precepts I get understanding: therefore I hate every false way. Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path" (Ps. 119:104–105).

160

HISTORY

Chalcedon Report No. 108, August 1974

A partial definition of history is that it is the remembered past. Whereas heredity is genetic, history is cultural, religious, and emotional: its roots are in memory, meanings, and faiths. A Tatar child adopted at birth by an English family will show Tatar features, but his history will be English. History thus is a roadblock to those who wish to remake man. Historical memories and meanings are not rational, i.e., they are not products of logical thought but of acts of good and bad faiths. Hence it is that, in the age of statism, educators and political theorists have been hostile to history and have replaced it with "the social sciences," whose purpose is to study the control of man by man. Not surprisingly, some thinkers have dreamed of some means of electroshock "therapy" to destroy history in the individual. More practically, modern education has dedicated itself to the clean-slate theory of the mind: the child can be best educated if his mind is swept free of the influences of home, church, community, nation, and faith. As a result, statist education is antihistorical and alienates children and youth from their past, from *roots*. The goal is to produce a rootless person who will then see issues in terms of science and reason.

Existentialism and pragmatism have been logical philosophies in terms of this trend, in that they require a separation from all past influences and history and see freedom as a conditioning in which man is determined solely by the biology of his being without reference to the complex of history. The demand is for rootlessness as freedom.

As a result, roots are seen as slavery. As a university student, I recall how professors regularly denied value to any pro-Southern points of view in historical research, making it the butt of jokes, and concluding with the remark, "They're still fighting the Civil War." Any anti-communist

books or articles by refugee scholars were similarly discounted: these men were involved and had historical memories. All primary sources thus, while basic to research, had to be treated with a radical suspicion.

Clearly, it is true that involvement in history can lead to distortions. I recall vividly an old Paiute Indian talking about the Padicap War (so "minor" that many specialists in Western American history are unaware of it) as though world history had to be understood in terms of it: for him, it had to be. I have had the same experience with Central Europeans, Near Easterners, Basques, and others. I have heard scholars dismiss such historical memories as "living in the past." Some people do live in the past too much, some live only for the moment, and some, most foolish of all, think they live only by reason.

The fact is that peoples with long memories have long lives, as witness the Jews, Armenians, and others. Basic to that long memory is a hard core of faith. Moreover, justice and memory have a necessary relationship. Men to whom past evils are nothing, and present rational considerations everything, will do evil to eliminate the present nonrational problems. For the social scientists, the nonscientific and the nonrational are virtually identical with evil. After World Wars I and II, the peace treaties realigned the world in terms of political, statist considerations, and ensured injustice and war. Had they been more scientific, the evil would have been greater, because history would have been even more flagrantly denied.

Such a destructive course would logically follow from the premises inherent in the modern perspective. For Karl Popper, for example (in *The Open Society and Its Enemies*), "History has no meaning." There are interpretations of history, and they vary from group to group, but history as such has no objective meaning. There is no predestinating God to give an established meaning to history. Only man can do that. For Popper, "although history has no meaning, we can give it a meaning." This is the key to humanism and the age of the state. God's meaning is denied, and the meaning of the scientific planners is progressively asserted. This requires the denial of God's history, and the suppression of historical memory, so that a new history, a social science, can be created. As a result, the modern state is progressively perverse, to anyone with an historical and Christian perspective. It denies Gresham's law, and it denies the faith and tradition of peoples. These are all irrelevant considerations to scientific reason.

The meaning of history, as created by such thinkers, is known only to them, because *they* "give it a meaning." State schools and massive brainwashing are necessary to convince the people of this meaning. God's

meaning, however, is known to all men, although they suppress it in unrighteousness (Rom. 1:17–21). It is the meaning in terms of which we were created, and apart from which our lives disintegrate into meaninglessness.

The more nearly the age of the state comes to realizing its meaning, the more radical the revolt against it grows. Men are not yet turning in great numbers to Christian faith, but they are turning against the bankrupt modern establishment: it has bred emptiness, not meaning, the experience of nothingness rather than faith. Its new order is turning out to be death.

161

JUSTICE AND AUTHORITY

Chalcedon Report No. 109, September 1974

According to Norman Zacour, in *An Introduction to Medieval Institutions*, "The idea that where there is no justice there is no authority was firmly entrenched in feudalism." Thus, despite the common violations of law, there was a principle of justice in terms of which judgment and progress were possible. With Niccolo Machiavelli and then Thomas Hobbes, a new idea began to develop, one which John P. Roche, in *Courts and Rights*, summed up as holding in effect that "[l]aw is the command of the sovereign," whether the sovereign be the ruler, parliament, or, later, the people.

For some time, these two ideas, however contradictory, coexisted. Rulers and people were, in varying degrees, Christian. They believed in common ideas of right and wrong, and they were agreed as to what justice means. As a result, the sovereign's law was still to a large degree tied to an essentially Biblical framework. This framework was entirely subject at first to the ruler's choice. The people were Lutheran, Catholic, Episcopal, or Reformed in terms of the ruler's choice: his word was law, and his religious preference was the people's church, and no other legal choice was possible.

The result was the development of *civic religion*, a religious foundation for a purely national state, or for the ruler's state. The God of the state was the ruler's choice, and the ruler's supposed ally. The belief of the rulers was that God should be grateful to the king for keeping the realm in the camp of the church, whatever the true church was held by the king to be. Thus, in 1706, after the defeat of the Battle of Ramillies, Louis XIV said, "God seems to have forgotten all I have done for Him."

As time passed, however, this civic religion became less and less concerned with theology and church and more and more concerned with

maintaining the bare bones of Biblical morality. A nation was held to be God-fearing if it had an occasional prayer and Bible reading at official (and educational) functions and vaguely upheld a minimal view of the Ten Commandments and a few other things. Even this minimal civic religion declined to the point where the regents of New York composed, as Roche noted, "a nonpartisan prayer essentially addressed 'To Whom it May Concern' for daily recitation in the public schools"; then this prayer was invalidated in 1962.

Since then, civic religion has become even broader. In 1965, unbelievers who were pacifists gained the right to affirm and maintain with civil sanctions a totally private religion as the basis of their morality.

Meanwhile, the old feudal idea that, where there is no justice, there is no authority, was revived in terms of Thoreau and Bakunin to give a moral basis to civil disobedience. A key problem of the modern era was thus brought into sharp focus. The foundations of all law are in essence religious and theological: they are questions of ultimacy and moral necessity. Law without faith is an impossibility. Every law order is a moral and a theological order, a structuring of society in terms of a fundamental faith. If the faith dies, the law order dies also.

Earlier centuries had insisted, erroneously, on identifying faith and the church, limiting the faith to a particular form of the church. Later, the faith was identified with the state, and now, with the purely personal tastes of the individual, for whom the faith is existential, not something beyond man but totally of man. The consequences of all three positions have been destructive of social order and of Christian faith. To make either the church, the state, or the individual the voice of God is to limit God and absolutize the human order.

The old pagan Roman maxim was, "What pleases the prince has the force of law." To reduce the law to an institution or person is destructive of law, in that law then is tyranny. If ultimate law comes from man, or an agency or institution of men, then I have no appeal against its arbitrariness except my personal dislike and dissent. I have no religious or moral stand against the law. If I have an appeal to supernatural and ultimate law against all that man may do, then I have a basis for resistance and for reconstruction.

Because relativism has so long prevailed, men no longer affirm as a society any faith in an absolute right and wrong. The result is an erosion of the idea of the rule of law, and the normality now of the rule of political pressure.

Kant reduced law to a humanistic moral imperative: "Every formula which expresses the necessity of an action is called a law." But where is

necessity in the modern point of view? It was clearly formulated in the 1960s, by the hippies, thus: "Do your own thing." Necessity is no longer cosmic; it is no longer a part of the essence or nature of reality: it is entirely personal and anarchistic. The result is a breakdown of the very idea of law. Increasingly, there is neither justice nor authority.

When such a situation prevails, darkness settles in, because there is no light of justice to illuminate society and to give authority. The psalmist's words stand confirmed: "Except the Lord build the house, they labour in vain that build it: except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain" (Ps. 127:1).

162

DEPENDING ON EVIL

Chalcedon Report No. 112, December 1974

Not only has man, during his long history, distrusted freedom and feared it, but he has also distrusted righteousness. As a powerful American monopolist said of a politician, at the beginning of the twentieth century: I like a man who, when you buy him, stays bought. Evil can be depended on to be for sale.

This preference for evil has been basic to the diplomacies of states in the modern era. The more evil a state becomes, the more readily it is trusted by the various international powers. A classic example of this is Turkey. By the mid-seventeenth century, over 300 years ago, it was apparent that the Turkish Empire was corrupt and ready to fall if attacked by any major power. Its collapse would have freed the Christians of central Europe, the Near East, and North Africa. When the powers of Europe realized this weakness of Turkey, they immediately came to its defense. Control of the Dardanelles means control of the Black Sea, the Danube, central Europe, and the Near East. More shipping and commerce, then and now, is controlled by this key area than any other point in the world. None were willing to place this power in the hands of even slightly principled power: Turkey alone was "dependable," because, by its very corruption, it could clearly be bought and controlled.

When the Hungarians, under Prince Eugene of Savoy, shattered Turkey at Zenton in a battle in which 3,000 Turks perished, including the Grand Vizier and four other viziers. Europe sprang to Turkey's defense. The result was a treaty hammered out at Carlowitz in 1699. Austria was able to keep two-thirds of Hungary, and the Russians gained Azov and the area north of the Sea of Azov. The peace conference, led by Britain and Holland, made Turkey the concern and in a sense ward of all Europe. In the Congress of Vienna in 1815, this principle was more bluntly

formulated: Turkey must never pass into the hands of any one power. However, earlier, in 1774, in the Treaty of Kuchuk Kainarji, Russia had been able to wrest a concession from Turkey: "Turkey promises to protect constantly the Christian religion and churches and allow the ministers of Russia at Constantinople to make representation on their behalf." A check was to be placed on the Turkish savagery towards Christians. This was too much for Europe. In the Crimean War, Europeans, led by Britain, treated the Turks as great and heroic men and fought with them against Russia, and, in 1856, in the Treaty of Paris, Russia was compelled to abandon her religious concern for Christians in Turkey. (One result was that Turkey now had a free hand to plan the total extermination of Armenians and other Christians, culminating in the massacre of nearly two million Armenians alone in World War I and after.) Queen Victoria's hatred of Russia was so intense that she despised Gladstone, the champion of Christian minorities, and was ready to listen to the Sultan as a brother ruler. Earlier, before Britain's entry into the Crimean War, she had issued an ultimatum in writing to the prime minister: "If England is to kiss Russia's feet the Queen will not be a party to the humiliation of England and would lay down her crown."

After World War I, except for Britain this time, the powers conspired to revive Turkey as against Greece, leading to the massacres at Smyrna. The full story of the massacres was suppressed everywhere, and the American high commissioner at Constantinople, Admiral Mark L. Bristol, sent out anti-Christian reports. (Standard Oil, American Tobacco, and Chester Concessions had large commitments in Turkey.)

In World War II (and thereafter), Turkey received huge sums in aid from various powers, on both sides, and its role as a necessary power was strengthened. In fact, the break between Stalin and Hitler was the result of their conflict over Turkey: both wanted it for themselves. In the 1970s, Cyprus or any other area is readily sacrificed rather than allow anyone to touch Turkey. If any power, no matter how slightly principled, should take over Turkey, every modern (and Machiavellian) state would feel threatened.

The thesis is simple: evil is trustworthy and can be bought and controlled. Better a Turkey, and better a Marxist Russia and a Red China, than freedom there or elsewhere. This is power politics, with its balance of powers ploy, its readiness to deal with corrupt regimes and to treat them with dignity, with its collectivism, its humanism, and anti-Christianity. It governs the modern age and is destroying it. It is becoming its own judgment and nemesis. All its efforts to patch and prop up the decaying international order only aggravate the problem.

The shattering of that order will come as the new wine of Christian faith returns, shattering the old bottles (Matt. 9:17). The Word of God stands: "Except the LORD build the house, they labour in vain that build it: except the LORD keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain" (Ps. 127:1).

The rebuilding of Christendom can only come as men are regenerated and are faithful to the law-word of God, only as once again men put their trust in God's law rather than man's evil. The modern motto seems to be, "In evil we trust"; men being themselves evil can better understand and trust in evil, and will continue to do so, as long as they continue in their own depravity. The psalmist said of idolaters, who worshipped the evil they imagined and fashioned, "They that make them are like unto them; so is every one that trusteth in them" (Ps. 115:8).

Where is your trust? What power do you believe dominates the world, God or Satan, righteousness or evil? You will stand or fall in terms of your answer.

163

HOSTILITY TO CHRISTIANITY

Chalcedon Report No. 155, July 1978

As Otto J. Scott has pointed out, in *Robespierre: The Voice of Virtue*, the abolition of Christianity was a goal of the French Revolution. With the Russian Revolution it was again a major objective.

However, what is too seldom recognized is that the abolition of Christianity was an Enlightenment goal which was quietly being made a polity of state well before the outbreak of the French Revolution. The revolutionary regime in France made public and open what had long been held in private, namely, that the "superstition" of Christianity needed to be eliminated from civilization.

In some events, this hostility was openly manifested. One of the very much neglected aspects of the War for American Independence was the British war against the churches. This savage assault is excused, when mentioned, on the grounds that the involvement of the Puritan clergy in the American cause angered the British. True, the British resented the stand of the clergy, but, even more, they were represented by officers and men who represented the European spirit of contempt for Christianity. Their hostility was manifested against the Bible itself. Churches were turned into stables, a prison, or into firewood. Desecration of churches was so routine that in some cases townspeople burned their own churches to prevent blasphemous usage and desecration by the British. Bibles were systematically destroyed. Pastors were sometimes murdered. On Sundays, British regimental bands played outside existing churches to disrupt the services.

Little of all of this is mentioned by historians, who, being "freethinkers," see no harm in the destruction of Christianity. (Most people in England had little or no knowledge then of what was going on. Over half of Parliament then was elected by less than six thousand voters, and the war lacked popular support.)

The bias of historians is obvious in the treatments of Major Andre and Nathan Hale. John Andre, despite a godly rearing, was a humanist and an unbeliever. He took part in the Paoli Massacre, and, as John R. Terry noted, in *America's Revolutionary Spirit*, "he was convinced that if a few more Yankees were stuck like pigs, they would surrender quickly." Before his execution as a spy, the Americans offered to provide a chaplain; but Andre rejected this as a freethinker. Historians still regard Andre as a noble soul, failing to add that it is his lack of faith that ennobles him in their eyes. Had he as a Christian been involved in the Paoli Massacre, it would be a different story!

Nathan Hale, the American spy, gets less favorable treatment. We are not told of his strong faith, nor is it mentioned that the British rejected his request for a pastor, or a Bible to read before his execution. In this refusal of the British to allow a condemned man to have a Bible, we see the intensity of this hatred of Christianity.

Was it then only, or does it exist now? Roland Huntford, in *The New Totalitarians*, sees two kinds of totalitarianism in power today. The older form is embodied in Marxism, in Russia, and its method is open hostility and terrorism. It is, however, the new totalitarians who are increasingly dominant all over the world, and their social order is best epitomized in Sweden. (Even the Soviet Union is beginning to imitate this new model tyranny.) Instead of terrorism, education is used, and the radical state control of all education. Instead of open hostility to Christianity, there is rather a multitude of regulations designed to strangle it slowly to death. On the one hand, there are state churches, and, on the other, a government legal expert says plainly, "our aim is to remove all traces of Church morality from legislation" (Alvar Nelson). The Swedish state is not against the church; it is against Christianity.

In the rest of the world, the same process is under way in varying degrees. One nation after another would profess shock if charged with being anti-Christian, but one after another is stripping its laws of all traces of Biblical law and also introducing a multitude of rules, regulations, and licenses designed to make the Christian community, church and school, a puppet and a pawn of the state.

Crudities such as burning churches and Bibles are part of a less enlightened era, or a more backward part of humanity. The enlightened anti-Christians profess to believe in religious liberty: their self-professed noble concern is to prevent irregularities and to establish "reasonable" rules and boundaries for Christian functions.

This strategy of the new totalitarians is a very shrewd one. It enables them to wage total war against Christianity in the name of peace,

friendship, and legal concern. It enables them to declare the supposed lordship of Caesar over Christ in the name of legal order and common sense. The argument carries weight, except with those who know Christ as Lord.

Because Jesus Christ is Lord, His sovereignty cannot be infringed nor usurped by any man or institution. He alone is Lord over all things, and church, state, school, family, vocations, the arts and the sciences, and all things else, are under His dominion and subject to His law-word. God's warning from of old still stands: "Be wise now therefore, O ye kings: be instructed, ye judges of the earth. Serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice with trembling. Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little. Blessed are all they that put their trust in him" (Ps. 2:10–12).

164

THE DISASTROUS WAR

Chalcedon Report No. 369, April 1996

PERHAPS the greatest and most tragic disaster in the history of the United States is the Civil War, or, the War Between the States. The whole country is still paying for that evil war.

It is still difficult to speak or write about it without angering someone, blacks, Northerners, or Southerners.

A few years ago, I followed a black speaker at a conference who demanded reparations for all blacks by American whites. I had first met that young man after his graduation, and he then spoke excellent English. At this conference, he spoke black English! I said that, as one born of immigrant parents who only reached the United States at the end of 1915, I felt no guilt whatsoever. Speaking for my wife, a descendant of Scots who came here early in the colonial era, members of her family, and of countless other white families, gave their lives in that war to free the blacks. What guilt did they have? The guilt was his for such immoral premises. That man was not pleased.

I have, always reluctant to argue over that unpleasant subject but unwilling to be silent when there is a need to speak, told Northerners that it was less a moral concern and more economic and sectional hatred that governed the North. The rhetoric of a sizeable minority, the abolitionists, was anti-Christian and Unitarian. They were intensely interested in destroying the South, and their moral claims were questionable.

The Southerners were also ready to allow, as did the Northerners, the extremists and hotheads to lead the way into an unrealistic war. The war came when the churches were at a low ebb theologically, although the South saw a major revival among the troops during the war. While the South was staunchly Christian, its leaders, especially secessionists, were not.

Some significant facts must be remembered about the South. Savage called attention to a neglected fact: "Of the hundred and thirty antislavery societies organized in the country, more than two thirds were in the South" (Henry Savage Jr., *Seeds of Time: The Background of Southern Thinking* [New York, NY, 1959], p. 62). There were good reasons for this. *First*, slavery was a very present fact to all Southerners. *Second*, Puritan faith had then centered in the South and, deeply resented by Unitarians, strongly influenced many Southerners, although not very many of their politicians. *Third*, only one of every sixteen Southerners owned even a single slave (ibid., p. 82). There were various reasons for this. Some of the fifteen Southerners who did not own slaves could not afford it. Others were against slavery. Other than South Carolina, Southern states favored abolition *provided* that the slaves could be repatriated somewhere, and, with some, their owners compensated. *Fourth*, many Southerners resented the power and pride of the slave-owning aristocracy.

Even then, secession was not popular when first propounded by John C. Calhoun. Calhoun was a Northerner by education, a Yale man whose goal was to have Yale educate his sons (Charles Maurice Wiltse, *John C. Calhoun: Nullifier* [Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1949], pp. 31–32). Calhoun himself was at Yale in Timothy Dwight's day, whose faith Calhoun rejected. Calhoun would not join the church, nor profess Christianity, nor even join the Moral Society. In the classroom, his disavowal of Christianity was open (Margaret L. Coit, *John C. Calhoun: American Portrait* [Boston, MA, 1950], p. 27). When in politics, in Washington, D.C., he gave money to help build the Unitarian Church, and his name is found among the original members. Although he attended his wife's Episcopal church when in the South, he bluntly announced on one occasion, "Unitarianism is the only true faith and will ultimately prevail over the world" (ibid., p. 508). In his last days, with an echo of his childhood Calvinism, Calhoun spoke of his "unshaken reliance upon the providence of God" (ibid., p. 509), but not of Jesus Christ.

Calhoun's perspective was important. More than a few prominent Southerners sought their education in New England colleges which were openly or tacitly Unitarian. The Timothy Dwights of the early years could not stem the tide.

Unitarian and Transcendentalist thinking was either Hegelian or shared common roots with Hegel. Such thinking represented a major intellectual revolution in Europe, with deep roots in the Enlightenment. Hegel best expressed the thinking of his and the previous era, namely, a radical belief in the conflict of interests. With the French Revolution, the Western world entered into the age of revolution, which is very much

with us still. As against the Biblical faith in an ultimate harmony of interests for the godly (Rom. 8:28), this new belief was in a radical conflict of interests. Thus, the way to progress was revolutionary violence, creative destruction. The resolution of problems called for conflict, and the need was for war to create peace, violence to establish justice, and hostile confrontations to resolve problems. Not moral suasion but bitter conflict was seen as the ethical course of action.

This faith marked the abolitionists in the North, most of whom were Unitarian. In the South, Unitarianism was not an organized ecclesiastical or intellectual cause as much as the tacit premise of the secessionist leaders. Calvinist leaders in that cause were, at the best, rare. However, Enlightenment premises were popular among gentlemen, and these persons were receptive to the Unitarian developments thereof. The secessionist leaders were not Calvinists, and they did share in the growing and tacit Unitarianism of the leaders of the day.

Those men, North and South, who were not Christian, were not thereby neutral but rather were deeply influenced by a common media that prevailed in all of the United States. That media represented the culture of Enlightenment humanism. The philosophy of the modern era began with Descartes, whose "*cogito, ergo sum*," I think, therefore I am, was the starting point of philosophical inquiry. The Cartesian premise at once created a division in man's perspective between body and soul, between perceptions and reality, and between the inner and the outer worlds, so that the concern was to bridge two realms. With Kant, the real world became the realm of the mind, and reality was what the philosophical mind declared it to be. Thus, the real world was not the creation of God but the creation of the philosopher's mind. It followed, then, that the *rational is the real*.

But what if some refuse to recognize that reality is what they define as real? What if, as with the abolitionists, the reality is human freedom for all? Or if adherents of slavery see it as a condition inherent to slavery? What happens then? Without God and His law, man's recourse is to himself, or to his creature, the state. Reality is then not God, nor His created order and His law; it is instead what man declares is right. The new reality is man's declared law, and the non-Christians in both North and South had their own vision of the right and the real. God was not in their picture. To read through the edition of John C. Calhoun's *Works*, in the Crallé edition, 1851–1856, or the more recent and more extensive collection edited by W. Edwin Hemphill, is a chilling experience: there is no evidence of Christian thinking. In the North, the abolitionists *wanted* conflict, not resolution. Slavery could have been abolished had the North

been ready to take practical steps, such as compensating the slaveowners and some kind of plan for the future of the slaves. The abolitionists, however, wanted conflict, as did the secessionists by 1860. Lincoln, without war, would have been a stalemated president, with a hostile Congress in power. The demand in the radical circles both North and South was for conflict as the solution. Otto Scott has pointed out that, at about the same time, many countries with a higher percentage of slaves freed them all peaceably; only the United States had a war over the matter. In the United States, more than anywhere else, the common man was reasonably well informed and attune to intellectual trends. In a travel essay written for a French magazine on his return from the United States, Alexis de Tocqueville wrote, of frontier Michigan:

> When you leave the main roads you force your way down barely trodden paths. Finally, you see a field cleared, a cabin made from half-shaped tree trunks admitting the light through one narrow window only. You think that you have at last reached the home of the American peasant. Mistake. You make your way into this cabin that seems the asylum of all wretchedness but the owner of the place is dressed in the same clothes as yours and he speaks the language of towns. On his rough table are books and newspapers, he himself is anxious to know exactly what is happening in old Europe and asks you to tell him what has most struck you in his country. One might think one was meeting a rich landowner who had come to spend just a few nights in a hunting lodge.

This was in 1831. One can say that de Tocqueville found a superior settlement without invalidating his point that the Americans in the most remote areas were not peasants but citizens of the Western world. This made them more readily susceptible to currents of thought than were rural peoples in Europe. There was another factor. The War of Independence had been a legal factor. The American War of Independence had been a legal break. The colonies were not under Parliament, but under the Crown. They were chartered colonies. Under law, the agents of the Crown, held by the ailing George III, were violating the charters and placing the colonies under Parliament. King George III was king of England, king of Scotland, king of New York, king of Massachusetts, and so on, all separate realms. Their powers were subverted, and the colonies were subjected to an armed invasion by Parliament.

In 1863, a monthly journal, *The Old Guard*, began publication in New York, dedicated to the defense in effect of secession. *The Old Guard* cited publications of the 1776 era as justification for 1860 and secession, and tellingly so.

At the same time, however, a subtle shift had taken place. The War

of Independence had become known as the American Revolution. Jacobinism flourished in the United States with the French Revolution, especially in Democratic circles. A legally faithful course of severance became confused with revolution. Alexander H. Stephens, the Confederate vice-president, in his great *Constitutional View of the Late War Between the States*, defined the legalities of the war. But it was not Stephens who precipitated the war but men like Edmund Ruffin, known as a firebrand.

The roots of that war are with us still. North, South, East, and West, the belief in the conflict of interests is very great, and it still predisposes Americans to senseless divisions.

The conflict-of-interests concept is born of a worldview which is implicitly evolutionary, posits the struggle for survival, and sees that struggle as inherent to life, i.e., as metaphysical rather than moral, although the struggle can borrow moral coloration. The Calvinistic insistence on the moral antithesis seeks its resolution in conversion, in a new creation. The conflict-of-interest belief seeks its "resolution" in the obliteration of the opponent. It has led to the doctrine of total war in the military sphere and elsewhere. Not surprisingly, the modern military strategy of total war began in the so-called Civil War with men like Quantrill in the South (a guerilla), and General Sherman in the North. Its history is a grim one.

165

EXAGGERATION AND DENIAL

Chalcedon Report No. 422, September 2000

RELATIVISM is central to the myth of neutrality. Modern reporters go to great lengths to legitimize the opposition to every idea or action, no matter how inane. A tiny handful of pickets will be given equal time with a crowd of thousands, such is the imperative to appear neutral and objective. This has led to a vicious cycle of exaggeration and denial, both legitimized by the media's professed desire to "present both sides."

In recent years, the American press lionized the late Croatian ruler Franjo Tudman, a man whose writings attempted to employ Biblical grounds for ethnic cleansing. Later, these same news agencies would recount "reported mass genocide" by Serbians against ethnic Albanians.

It is difficult to imagine that anyone can deny the reality of the mass slaughter that has characterized the twentieth century, whether it be the Armenian millions murdered by the Turks, the Jewish millions murdered by the Nazis, or the untold millions murdered by the communists in China, Russia, and Cambodia.

In my *Institutes of Biblical Law*, I noted that the scope of such mass murder had so numbed the modern conscience that the murder of a "mere" thousand, or ten thousand, no longer shocked, tempting some to inflate the scope of lesser atrocities, lest they not seem sufficiently horrific.

It was not my purpose to enter a debate over numbers, whether millions were killed, or tens of millions, an area which must be left to others with expertise in such matters. My point, then and now, is that in all such matters, what the Ninth Commandment requires is the truth, not exaggeration, irrespective of the cause one seeks to serve. It is as wrong to exaggerate in order to shock, as it is now clear happened in early reports of Serbian "genocide," as it is to deny the reality of what the Nazis did, and, in the case of the Communists, what they are still doing.

Historical revisionism condemns the future to play by the dangerous rules of exaggeration and denial. As I noted then, this will inevitably lead to even greater horrors as the bar of the capacity to shock is continually raised. This is the true danger of the myth of neutrality, where God's law is viewed as merely "one side of the debate."

166

HUMANISM AND EDUCATION

Chalcedon Report No. 54, February 1, 1970

When a religion begins to die, the people begin to turn against it. Mobs ransack and burn the temples, mock, defy, and express contempt for its priests, and hurl stones and abuse at its defenders. Religions die hard: their hold on people is profound and far-reaching; when disillusionment sets in, and the once faithful believers suspect that the god is dead and the priests are deceivers, their bitterness is intense. They may be better off materially than ever before, but, because man does not live by bread alone, the death of man's gods is always a painful thing.

We are living now in the last days of a powerful religion, humanism, and we are experiencing the bitterness of its disillusionment. We are witnessing the death of its god, man as god, and this god dies with real blood.

Horace Mann, the founder of the state-supported public school movement in the United States, saw the public school (and university) as man's true church and his great hope of salvation. As I pointed out, in *The Messianic Character of American Education*, Mann saw the school as "the agency which can change society and create a true Utopia, paradise on earth." In Mann's own words, "Let the Common School be expanded to its capabilities, let it be worked with the efficiency of which it is susceptible, and nine-tenths of all the crimes in the penal code would become obsolete; the long catalogue of human ills would be abridged; men would walk more safely by day; every pillow would be more inviolable by night; property, life, and character held by a stronger tenure; all rational hopes respecting the future brightened." This was in the early 1830s; by 1886, Zach Montgomery, prominent attorney and assistant attorney general of the United States, had pointed out, in *Speech on the School Question*, that a rising crime rate followed the introduction of the public schools in

every state. Even the conservative statist education of that day could not give the moral discipline and the faith undergirding that discipline which Christian schools had given.

Not too many years ago, criticism of the public schools and universities was tantamount to blasphemy, and indeed it was blasphemy to the humanists. Anyone criticizing these "sacred halls of learning" was regarded as either dangerous or stupid. Ironically, today it is the children of humanism who are destroying their own temples. The *Los Angeles Herald-Examiner* (Robert Knowles, "School Vandals Cost Whopping $2.4 Million," January 25, 1970, p. A-8) gives us a sorry picture of the cost of vandalism in Los Angeles County's eighty-six elementary and high school districts in fiscal 1968–1969: $2.4 million. At that, Los Angeles County got off lightly when compared to other major urban schools. The attacks are largely motivated by sheer hatred, by a desire to destroy a symbol of a failing faith, the public school.

The same is true in our colleges and universities, virtually all of which are controlled either by state or by federal funds. The "private" university has virtually ceased to exist. Stanford, for example, recently had between $40–42 million per year in federal funds, as against $29 million from private sources. Since much of the $29 million represented endowed funds, the actual amount from living donors was very much less. Stanford thus is better described as a federal university than a private one, and the same is true of all our major older universities of supposedly "private" character.

In these colleges and universities, the hatred and contempt for administration and faculty is often intense. It is a hatred shared even by those who do not demonstrate and riot. The faculty, bewildered priests of an old and fading cult, cannot understand why they are hated and despised. Their hope is that somehow the mood will change, and the rites of the temples of learning will return to their old established authority.

But humanism has on its hands a dead god who cannot be resurrected, and it has bitter worshippers whose hopes have been confounded. Humanism has not brought in an age of peace but rather the era of total war. It has not made man more peaceful but rather more radically at war with all things and with himself. It has not solved man's basic problems but rather aggravated them. Malaria and smallpox have been largely eliminated in its central areas, but ulcers and heart attacks have replaced them. Man's growing inner pollution has been progressively matched by a radical pollution of his world. Now the grim fact has been discovered that the plankton of the ocean, source of 70 percent of the earth's oxygen, are being killed by pesticides, and humanistic man is afraid and angry. Like the angry and disillusioned believers of old, he turns on his

priests, the educators, and on his temples, the schools. He turns on the world of humanism, and its great cities, and cries, "Burn, baby, burn!" Men of faith build; men whose faith is dying, and they dying with it, have instead an urge to destroy. The vandals now destroying the Rome of humanism are its own sons.

Men of faith build. The era of humanism culminated in a time of dissection; scholarship came to mean endless analysis of a dissecting variety. Psychology replaced faith, and self-analysis, action. Ulcers became the hallmark of a humanistic culture, man destroying himself. Then came the days of burning, when schools, state buildings, and cities became the targets of destruction.

In a time of destruction, growth is not too conspicuous. In a forest being cut down or newly burnt over, the little sprouts of fresh growth do not loom too large, but they are there.

The new growth is definitely all around us. The Christian school movement is the most conspicuous example. Since covenant children belong in covenant schools, Christians are steadily creating a new society by means of Christian education. A highly disciplined, better trained, and truly educated youth is in the making.

The Christian school is based on the logical premise that, while the gods of humanism are dead, the Christian God is not dead. Our choice of schools indicates our faith. If our God is left out of every area of life, or virtually every area, then we subscribe to the death of our God, or at least His basic irrelevance to our world. The growth and popularity of Christian schools means that, for more and more people, the God of Scripture is alive. Even as the growing collapse of statist education signals the death of the religion of humanism, so the growing strength of the Christian-school movement heralds the fact that God is alive and strong. By faith in Him, a generation is growing strong and holds a promise of reconstruction.

But the death of humanism in the days ahead will take down with it all those institutions associated with humanism, and today that includes virtually every church. Humanism has deeply infected and captured Eastern Orthodox churches, the Roman Catholic Church, and Protestant churches, including "evangelical" churches, and they will pay the penalty for their infection and surrender.

Men of faith build: their eyes are on the future, not on a return to the past.

One of the tragic examples of a man looking backward was the great Roman general, Stilicho. He was born a Vandal, became the highest officer under the emperor in Rome, and married into the imperial family.

Stilicho was deeply moved and impressed by the past glory of Rome: it was his life's hope to restore and strengthen Rome's glory. Again and again, Stilicho, a Vandal of humble birth, saved Rome and stopped the invading Visigoths under Alaric. But within Rome the decay was deep in men's hearts, and as a result Stilicho was hated for his barbarian origin and his power. As a result, the emperor was prevailed upon to sentence Stilicho to death for high treason. Although innocent, according to Giorgio Falco, he did not resist. He could have counted on the soldiers to defend him, but, in loyalty to Rome, he refused to start a civil war and obediently bent his head to the executioner's axe. As a result, Alaric, on August 24, A.D. 410, entered Rome and sacked it.

Stilicho was a very great man, but he could build nothing, because his vision was geared to the past, to a dying order, not to the future.

Somewhat later, Theoderic the Great (A.D. 455–526) failed for the same reason. His very able mind and his exceptional powers made him a remarkable monarch of an Ostrogothic kingdom in Italy. Few men have seen the issue with respect to law more clearly than Theoderic. He wrote to the Provencals, when he annexed them to his kingdom, "Here you are then by the grace of Providence back in the Roman society and restored to your ancient liberty. Take back then also customs worthy of the people who wear the toga; strip yourselves of barbarity and ferocity. What could be more beautiful than to live under the rule of the right, to be under the protection of the laws and have nothing to fear? Law is the guarantee against all weakness, and the fount of civilization; individual caprice belongs to barbarity." Few men have equalled that insight, but it was misdirected in Theoderic. Although he gave Italy in his thirty years reign a peace and prosperity it had not enjoyed for centuries, his life was a failure, because his vision was directed also to Rome's past glory, and the old Romans rejected him. Even more, Rome was dead. The future belonged to Christ.

The future always belongs to Christ, because He is always Lord of history, the maker and sustainer of all things, and their absolute judge. Christ's words to us in a time of burning, and of dying gods, is still this, "Follow me; and let the dead bury their dead" (Matt. 8:22). Nehemiah, when he began a work of reconstruction among the ruins, wasted no time in negotiations with the men of the past. He continued working on the walls, declaring, "I am doing a great work, so that I cannot come down" (Neh. 6:3). The schools, churches, and institutions of the dead must not hold us: we have a great work to do, reconstruction under the mandate of the sovereign and living God. Certainly, there is destruction and burning all around us: the modern Baal worshippers are turning on their gods.

And their gods are destroying them. Isaiah long ago warned his generation, saying, "Cease ye from man, whose breath is in his nostrils: for wherein is he to be accounted of?" (Isa. 2:22). But faith in man is the essence of humanism, and it is the foundation of modern politics and economics. God as sovereign Lord is able to create out of nothing. In humanism, statist man is given credit for the same power, the ability to create out of nothing, or so the humanist believes. John Law, the father of the economics of virtually every civil government in the modern world, believed that money and wealth can be created out of nothing. "I have invented a new kind of currency," John Law wrote. "What is this coin you are holding in your hand at this moment? It is a piece of metal which bears an impression. What are you now in need of? Cash. I cannot create metal, but I am able to multiply the impression by having it put upon paper. And for my own part I maintain that it is the impression that is the cash. Just reflect! Yesterday, when the last of the cash in the Bank of Scotland was paid out, there were people who said 'but the bills are still in circulation.' I pledge my paper money on land, and I might pledge it upon the wealth contained in the ocean. The ideal method would be to pledge it upon nothing at all... But human beings have not yet reached such an advanced stage that they can accept *confidence* as their only guarantee. You are poor because you have no cash. I am giving you some. My paper currency can and must be always equal to the demand made for it. Thanks to it the inhabitants of this country will have employment, manufactures will be greatly improved, home and foreign trade will be extended, and power and riches will be gained."

Law stated it honestly, this modern faith. Man the creator can create instant money and virtually instant wealth. The basis of this money is "confidence," trust in man, trust in the state. But Isaiah warned against trusting in man, and he called attention to the debased coinage of his day as an offense against God's order (Isa. 1:22).

Paper money is a fitting symbol for the dying world of humanism; like the temples of humanism, it too is being burned, in this case by inflation.

Wise men will keep the smoke out of their eyes and build. The whole world is ours to conquer in Christ. This is our duty and our calling, and we shall do it.

167

BLIND FAITH

Chalcedon Report No. 419, June 2000

I was in the eighth grade when I read Charles Darwin's *On the Origin of Species*. I read it at first receptively and then with shock. It was difficult reading because it demonstrated nothing, but was written as an act of faith, a colossal and blind faith. It was widely accepted when first published in 1859, and the first printing sold out in two days. As George Bernard Shaw, who accepted Darwin, observed, the book was seen as man's liberation from the God of Christianity.

Today, this false liberation continues to dominate civilization. Men want freedom from Christ, not truth. They will not consider alternatives to their blind faith in Darwinism. We live, therefore, in a culture based on this. Many civilizations have done this before us, and their end has been death. Since roughly 1660, humanism has dominated the Western world, and now most other areas. Since the rise of public education, it has been extended to all classes and is now dominant in virtually all major churches.

Despite high hopes for the twenty-first century, its prospects are very bad unless it returns to Christ. The twentieth century has been called by able scholars the bloodiest and most evil of all centuries. Without a return to the faith, the twenty-first will be worse.

A common view in many churches is that the Christian gospel is comprehended by being born again. This, however, is the beginning, not the end, of faith. When it becomes the totality of the faith, it is a departure from Christ. Its goal is then self-centered and wrong.

The triune God redeems us to fulfill Adam's calling to exercise dominion, and if we fail to do so, we leave all things under the dominion of the fall. Our faith becomes a man-centered one, and we sin against our Lord.

What direction will the church take in this century?

MORALITY

168

ABOMINATIONS

Original publication date unknown; included by the author in Roots of Reconstruction, *1991, pp. 539–540*

The Lord God uses strong language throughout Scripture to tell us how He views sin. We must recognize that there is a difference between strong language and profanity. Profanity is a sign of weakness and impotence; profane men cover up their inadequacies by the use of profanity; they present a pseudo-manliness in place of the realities of quiet strength. God's strong language reveals His nature, justice, and power.

One such word is *abomination*, which appears repeatedly in the King James Version. It is a translation of several Hebrew words, all similar in meaning: *sheqets* means filthy, idolatrous; *towebah* means disgusting, abhorrent, idolatrous; *taab* means to loath or detest; *piggul*, to stink; *zaam,* to be enraged, to foam at the mouth; and so on. Homosexuality (Lev. 18:22) is described as disgusting, idolatrous, (*towebah*), and Leviticus 18:30 applies this term to the entire catalog of sexual evils and to Molech worship. In Leviticus 11:10–13, 20, 23, 41–42, the term *sheqets*, filthy, idolatrous, is applied to forbidden foods.

Sacrifices offered to God in a false spirit are called an abomination (*towebah*); Proverbs 15:8; Isaiah 1:13, etc.; and lying lips and false weights are so designated in Proverbs 12:22; 20:23, and elsewhere with the same word.

Two basic stresses in the words used in the Greek and Hebrew and translated as *abomination* are that an abominable thing is, *first* of all, idolatrous. It is idolatrous because it is contrary to God's law. The Greek word for *abomination* (Acts 10:28; 1 Pet. 4:3) is *athemitos*, meaning unlawful (*themis* being the word for law). Another Greek word, *bdelyktoi*, appears in Titus 1:16 to describe men who profess to know God but deny Him by their works; such men, Paul says, "profess that they know God;

but in works they deny him, being abominable, and disobedient, and unto every good work reprobate." It is this same word, in its nominative form, which is used to describe the "abomination of desolation" (Matt. 24:15), the epitome of false religion. In Revelation 21:27, all such are barred from the Holy City, the new creation. Thus idolatry involves despising God's law and pretending to have faith while being disobedient.

Second, the words for *abomination* also indicate that there is filth, stench, and repulsiveness inseparably connected with what God abhors. Paul says, "Whether therefore ye eat, or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God" (1 Cor. 10:31). We cannot do anything to God's glory if it is not in faithfulness to God's law-word. Scripture asserts the unity of things physical and spiritual, so that the unity of both is apparent both in faithfulness and disobedience. That which is lawless and idolatrous is also repulsive and filthy in God's sight, and it therefore should be so in our eyes also. God, who does not change, does not call something an abomination at one time and good at another. What disgusts God should disgust us.

The word *abomination* does not describe something which is "particularly offensive to the religious feeling," as one scholar has said, but something which is totally abhorrent to God. Different cultures have had different ideas on the subject. Genesis 43:32 tells us that the Egyptians would not eat with the Hebrews, "for that is an abomination unto the Egyptians." Herodotus said, "no Egyptian man or woman will kiss a Grecian on the mouth," because it was an abomination for them to do so. Differing cultures have had varying ideas on the subject, but our view must be Biblically, not culturally, governed. It is what is an abomination to God that must govern us.

Thus, when we encounter the word *abomination* in Scripture, we should take warning. God is using strong language, and He expects us to take a strong stand in obedience to His Word.

169

THE SMILING FACE OF EVIL

Chalcedon Report No. 252, July 1986

When I was about four years old, a handsome older man stopped to smile at me, pat me on the head, and tell me what a fine boy I was. I learned from the remarks of my elders that he was a "bad man." Some years later, as I purchased stamps at a post office window, the man behind me patted Mark, then about three, and told him what a fine boy he was. I turned and recognized the reputed head of that north county criminal syndicate, Al Capone's brother-in-law.

One of our persistent problems is our inability to recognize and cope with evil. It so often wears a smiling face. The devil does not wear horns; he looks like a good and helpful friend. In fact, the devil is the original public-relations man, using words not to express the truth but to provide a false front.

The devil appears in history as a helpful friend of man, ready to call attention to God's shortcomings and to help man realize himself. Shortly after World War II, one humanistic intellectual, a member of a fashionable church, wrote of Christianity's wonderful dream of a new creation, which sadly, had "failed." The City of God was for him a failed dream. He offered a better one, less parochial and more inclusive, the City of Man. The United Nations he saw as the great step towards this new and true Eden. He used Biblical terminology to present an anti-Christian hope, and he did it with much pride, hope, and self-righteousness.

Not long after that, a Catholic layman who tried to break the power of our north county racketeer wound up in prison; the key testimony against him came from the racketeer! He found quickly that ungodly judges are not fond of justice: it threatens them.

Paul tells us in Romans 6:23, "The wages of sin is death." What this means is that people earn hell; they work for it, sacrifice for it, and get

the payoff they have labored for all their days, plus separation from God. There are no evangelists in hell, none to nag anyone about their ways, only the payoff of a hard life in the service of evil. (The world and the nations are working hard to earn hell.)

Here, however, evil has a smiling face. It claims concern, as did the tempter in Eden, over man's welfare. It summons us to work together for a better world (in terms of man's laws, not God's). It is idealistic and speaks much of peace, brotherhood, and love.

Next to the devil, who in the temptation of our Lord was full of pity for the poor ("Turn these stones into bread"), God looks hard-hearted, and Jesus Christ appears indifferent to the "real problems of mankind." Over the years, many "scholars" have called attention to Paul's supposed arrogance and bad disposition. What people then disliked (and still do) in Paul was his habit of being absolutely truthful. As Paul asked the foolish Galatians, "Am I therefore become your enemy, because I tell you the truth?" (Gal. 4:16).

We have a problem today, because the smiling face of evil is preferred to the voice of St. Paul. Kindness and smiles have a very important place in life, but not as a mask for evil. Pulpits are regularly filled with good public relations men who can smooth the ruffled brows of evildoers and make them feel good. As in Isaiah's day, the churches are full of people who say in effect, "Prophesy not unto us right things, speak unto us smooth things, prophesy deceits" (Isa. 30:10). The road to hell is not only paved with good intentions but good words, smiling faces, and high ideals. God's reality is not a public relations ploy, nor a media event. It is life in Christ and in terms of His law-word.

170

MORAL FORCE

Chalcedon Report No. 80, April 1, 1972

The sustaining force behind all authority and power is moral force. When the moral force decays, the social order decays. Men are governed by brute force only when they are ready to believe in the ideas governing that force.

More than a few men regard any reliance on moral force with cynicism. It was Stalin who said with contempt, "How many divisions has the pope?" Guns alone spelled power to him. Many leftists as well as conservatives nowadays believe that force and brute power will govern men, and they alike despise religious faith as an evasion of the issues. Political pressure and military power are their essential trust. The New Left today, and such groups as the Weathermen, have a similar belief. "Direct action" really means that legal process and the battle of ideas are treated with contempt and brute force is alone trusted to change things. In this they are true sons of the current establishment, in that the political order relies increasingly on pressure, coercion, and direct action instead of ideas, due process, and legislation. Executive orders, a moratorium on legal process, and the bypassing of law constitute forms of direct action, as do bombs and assassination.

Direct action techniques are admissions of moral bankruptcy. The old saying that the thing to do, when you run out of ideas, is to shout louder, has more than a little truth to it.

Stalin's direct action, as also Lenin's, was a result of moral bankruptcy. The Marxist dream called for the destruction of capitalism so that communism might flower. Instead, famine was the immediate result of collectivization. The greedy masses who had cooperated with revolution now found themselves the victims of it. Every kind of intellectual gymnastic was performed to rationalize the failure of the ideal order to

materialize. War was declared against "counterrevolution" and a bloodbath was stepped up, with the revolution devouring its own fathers and sons. By the time Stalin died, the belief in the Marxist hope was all but dead, and cynicism had replaced it. Anatoly Kuznetsov, in his forward to *Octobriana and the Russian Underground*, declares that, "Hidden behind the official fine words, cynicism — both political and moral — has become the dominant feature of the average Soviet man, who no longer believes either in God, or the devil, or Lenin, or Communism, or in anything at all: his heart holds nothing but smoldering ruins." The result, Kuznetsov points out, is a radical moral collapse among the people, in high places and low.

Attempts to offer political salvation always lead to a decay of moral force, because the state cannot provide men with a faith for living, nor with moral character. The state itself must rely on the people for these things; the state is a mirror of the faith and hopes of the people, and it cannot generate in and of itself what its members lack. As a result, the religious and moral collapse of a people creates a crisis for the state. The moral emptiness of a people becomes the moral emptiness of the state.

Most politics have become pragmatic and relativistic. Thus, in the United States, the solution to problems is increasingly based on such premises. As a result, its "best" answer is always to buy off the troublemaker. There is no belief in a harmony of interests. The reverse of this is a philosophy of a conflict of interests; this often appears in speeches, but, in practice, it is all too often neither the free-market harmony of interests, nor the Marxist conflict of interests, which prevails. Rather, it is the philosophy of the bribe and payoff. Pay off foreign powers and give them what they want to win their support. Grant subsidies, favorable legislation, and payoffs to minority groups, capital, labor, agriculture, college students, senior citizens, and every strong protesting group as a means of quietening protests. The answer is thus not a principle but a payoff. In this, the state mirrors its people who are themselves unprincipled. Parents "buy-off" their children instead of disciplining them; money is spent as a means of winning the child's love and allegiance. The methodology of Dr. Spock's babycare has become the politics of a nation.

This is not new, of course. It has happened again and again in civilization. When nations lose their moral force, they substitute for it something else as the rationale of their civilization, because man in no age has been able to live by bread alone. Very commonly, such a decaying civilization, having lost all faith in moral absolutes, turns to a nonreligious source for its justification. Aesthetics becomes a substitute for ethics, beauty the replacement for morality. The classic example of this, under the influence

of Buddhism, was ancient China; in the thirteenth century, Japan also turned to aesthetics for its faith.

In such a culture, moral character is replaced by a subtle and refined appreciation for every nuance of beauty and taste. Men may be butchers and sadists, but they can talk learnedly of the finest details of aesthetics, of gourmet experiences, and of delicate variations of aesthetic taste. The Renaissance gives us many examples of such people. John Tiptoft, Earl of Worcester and constable of England, earned the title of "Butcher of England" in the fifteenth century; at the same time, he was a world traveler, a scholar, and a cultivated gentleman; he could weep over a torn manuscript and yet view cruelty and murder coldly. Significantly, at the same time, the belief in sorcery and magic was strong. Men looked for power, and the occult thus attracted them. Since they sought unprincipled power, the occult was to their taste. Since aesthetics was concerned with good taste, not good morals, they could readily combine perversity and perversion with an emphasis on good taste.

Aesthetics, however, when separated from ethics and theology, ceases to become a delight in beauty and becomes a refinement in bad taste, then perverted taste. Any analysis of avant-garde art, of pop art, primitivism, and every major movement of recent years makes clear very quickly that art is now a pursuit in large part of ugliness, but, even more, of shock and impact, an attempt at power through continually heightened perversity. Originally, this turning to the primitive had been based on a philosophy derived from Rousseau, a trust in the primitive as the simple, virtuous, and healthy; as faith in the masses declined, this return to the primitive became perverse: it became a philosophy of negation, and art and politics became a negation of principle, law, morality, and, above all else, God. Alfred Jarry, in *Ubu Enchaîné*, has his actors appear on "The Field of Mars" and say: "We are free men and here is our corporal. Hurrah for liberty, liberty, liberty. We are free. Never forget that our duty is to be free. Walk a little slower or we'll arrive on time. Liberty is never arriving on time — never, never! Let us have our liberty drill. Let's disobey all together, one, two, three, you first, you second, you third. There's the difference. Every one of us marches in a different rhythm, even though it's more tiring. Let us disobey individually our freeman's corporal. The Corporal: Riot!" Mehring commented on this: "Collective disobedience under orders from the corporal of liberty in the 'riot camp' — that would be total freedom for humanity, the freedom of all with respect to each. The next step after that kind of freedom was to press the muzzle of a revolver to one's temple — and that was the step Alfred Jarry took" (Walter Mehring, *The Lost Library* [London, England: Secker & Warburg, 1951], pp. 94–95).

The aesthetics which develops in a world of relativism is an aesthetics of destruction. In 1856, Walt Whitman gave the philosophy of an aesthetics of destruction in his poem "Respondez!" declaring,

> Respondez! Respondez! . . .
> Must we still go on with our affectations and sneaking!
> Let me bring this to a close — I pronounce openly for a new distribution of roles;
> Let that which stood in front go behind! and let that which was behind advance to the front and speak;
> Let murders, thieves, bigots, fools, unclean persons offer new propositions!
> Let the old propositions be postponed!
> Let faces and theories be turn'd inside out! Let meanings be freely criminal, as well as results! . . .
> Let us all, without missing one, be exposed in public, naked, monthly, at the peril of our lives! let our bodies be freely handled and examined by whoever chooses!
> Let nothing but copies at second hand be permitted to exist upon the earth!
> Let the earth desert God, nor let there ever henceforth be mention'd the name of God!
> Let there be no God!
> Let the reformers descend from the stands where they are forever bawling! let an idiot or an insane person appear on each of the stands! . . .
> Let shadows be furnish'd with genitals! let substances be deprived of their genitals!

This description of total revolution is a description of our times. The aesthetics of violence believes in the cleansing power of violence and force. Thus, a culture which denies faith and moral force turns to aesthetics and finally a justification of violence as a new moral force.

Violence as the new moral force is then directed against other men. Leon Trotsky, in *Literature and Revolution*, declared that, "Our goal is the total recasting of man." This total recasting requires total coercion and total power, because man wants his world to change, not himself. Man wants the world to meet his needs, not he the standards or needs of the world. Man then becomes the subject of coercive action to recast him in terms of the state's plan for man. André Malraux, in *Man's Fate*, wrote that "It is very rare for man to be able to endure . . . his human condition . . . It is always necessary for men to intoxicate themselves." Marx said that men found refuge in the opium of religion; Malraux called it intoxication. As Mehring sarcastically observed, "It is obvious that so marvelously complicated a life factory as the modern state has become must naturally seize completely not only the means of production, but the means for intoxication as well." In terms of Malraux, man is deprived of

his means of intoxication; in Whitman's language, he is stripped naked in order to be recast.

In 1944, Werfel wrote, "Everyone of us needs a reconnection, a '*religio*' — in its etymological sense — with an established entity." He saw the coming bankruptcy of modern man: "Modern man is loth to accept the truth that certain creative forces in him are bankrupt, that this great loss has left him a shivering beggar in spite of his strenuously built-up physique. On the contrary, he believes himself to be the possessor of a promissory note on happiness which one day will be redeemed when his political Ersatz religion will have created the material prerequisites for it" (Franz Werfel, *Between Heaven and Earth* [New York, NY: New York Philosophical Library, 1944], pp. ix, 21–22). Men are now finding that they have no "promissory note on happiness" and no political paradise around the corner of history. Instead, they are beginning to realize that their contempt of religious and moral force is leading them into the most fearful of all bondage, slavery to the state. Man has become the property of the state, the sheep of the state's pasture, kept for shearing and given no right of appeal against the supremacy of the state. By believing in nothing, man is becoming nothing. By granting creation no creator and no direction and no transcendental meaning, man has deprived himself of meaning. By denying God and the moral force of God's word, man has left himself a world in which apparently only brute force and coercion rule. But man cannot live by bread alone, and he cannot live under coercion alone. Man having been created in God's image requires meaning and purpose to live, and this meaning can only truly come from God. Werfel observed, "As intellectual beings we can as little conceive meaninglessness as a square circle or a bent straight line. Without an over-meaning, i.e., without world-conception, world-creation, world-direction, the universe would be meaningless and therefore inconceivable" (p. 126).

The coercive power of statism is very much with us. It will become much worse before there is a change. The hollow men of humanism can protest, riot, and destroy, but they cannot supply that moral force which alone can restore meaning and direction to man and history. T. S. Eliot was right: the hollow men and their world can only end, and "not with a bang but a whimper."

This is not so with men of faith. W. Haller, in *The Rise of Puritanism*, observed that "men who have assurance that they are to inherit heaven, have a way of presently taking possession of earth" (p. 162). In one of his letters, Samuel Rutherford (1600–1661) declared, "Duties are ours, events are the Lord's." Men who have God for their sovereign can neither

believe that evil shall triumph, nor can they tolerate it. Their lives are governed by moral force, and they govern everything they can control with that same moral force.

The world is full of wailing men who see the enormity of evil but not the sovereignty of God over all things. It is impossible for man to triumph against God. The purpose of God is not the enthronement of evil, nor is it the counsel of the ungodly which shall prevail. The triumph of God and His cause is inescapable, and, whether we see that triumph or not, we must never doubt that it will prevail. Samuel Rutherford wrote, "The thing which we mistake is the want of victory. We hold that to be the mark of one that hath no grace. Nay, say I, the want of *fighting* were a mark of no grace." All too many who call themselves Christian lack this mark: there is no fight in them as they face evils and troubles, only a long whine. In 1641, Hansard Knollys, in the midst of troubles and war, summoned men to struggle unremittingly for God's New Jerusalem and to beseech God concerning it: "It is the work of the day to give God no rest till He sets up Jerusalem as the praise of the whole world." This is religious conviction and moral force. Man was called to rule, not to be ruled, to have dominion, not to be a subject (Gen. 1:26–28). Apart from God, this is impossible. Under God, man has a mandate to reconstruct all things, and the power of God to do it.

171

RELATIVISM

Chalcedon Report No. 101, January 1974

The denial of God has meant the denial of any meaning beyond man. The universe is held to be a product of meaninglessness and chance accidents, and the attempt of any to find purpose or mind behind the universe is ridiculed as wishful thinking.

The social consequences of such a belief are rarely admitted by atheists or agnostics. Among the few who have been a little consistent with their unbelief was John Rutledge, the Southern leader and one of the first associate justices of the United States. (A little later, the Senate refused to confirm him as chief justice.) Rutledge rejected every argument drawn from "religion and humanity" to apply to social and political issues. His principle was plainly stated: "Interest alone is the governing principle with nations." Under the façade of laissez-faire, Rutledge in fact affirmed moral relativism and a statist economic order.

It was with the twentieth century that the politics of relativism began to flower into totalitarianism and slavery. Moral and religious values having been denied, there were now no restraints on the power of the state.

The December 1973 *Harper's Magazine* carries an interesting example of this relativism, Frank Herbert's article, "Listening to the Left Hand," subtitled, "The dangerous business of wishing for absolutes in a relativistic universe." Herbert gives us an illustration to "prove" relativity. If three bowls of water are lined up, one with ice water, another with lukewarm water, and the third with hot water, if we soak our left hand in the ice water, and our right hand in the hot water, and then plunge both hands into the lukewarm water, our left hand will report the middle bowl to be warm, and the right hand will report it cold. Herbert calls this "a small experiment in relativity" and adds, "We live in a universe dominated by relativity and change, but our intellects keep demanding

fixed absolutes. We make our most strident demands for absolutes that contain comforting assurance. We will misread and/or misunderstand almost anything that challenges our favorite illusions." It is amazing that a man could come to such a conclusion, and a periodical print it! Where is the relativity *except* in naive experience? In reality, is there not a difference between hot and cold water, and is there not an observable temperature to the three bowls, one which can be registered, apart from Herbert's childish game?

Herbert, however, wants to destroy differences by means of relativism, which is his private god. He posits that the human world or species is a "single organism" and must be understood as such. Herbert continues to make a number of conclusions in terms of his faith. There are no absolutes, and to try to think in terms of them is to rule out "an answer with a sensible meaning." After all, Herbert asks (apparently ignorant of thermometers or that a man can put both hands into all three bowls in turn), "Which hand will you believe, the 'cold' hand or the 'warm' one? It serves no purpose to ask whether absolutes exist. Such questions are constructed so as to have no answer *in principle*." Herbert concludes, "Accordingly, both Pakistan and India could be equally *right* and equally *wrong*. This applies also to Democrats and Republicans, to Left and Right, to Israel and the United Arab Republic, to Irish Protestants and Irish Catholics."

Practically, this means that there is no right or wrong, and, short of total knowledge about all of reality, no conclusions can be drawn, for "we do not like unproven propositions." Herbert's proposition is not only unproven, however, but it represents a very great act of self-blinded faith.

If there is no right nor wrong, and humanity is one organism, then there is no warrant whatsoever for any resistance to enslavement, or for any independence from the mob, or from a slave state. The rapid spread of statist slavery in the twentieth century has coincided with the spread of relativism and unbelief. Politics is thus far more than a political affair: it is a moral and a religious concern. Like all of life, it has deep roots in man's faith, in the basic presuppositions of his life and outlook. As long as relativism spreads, so long will slavery increase and the polities of slavery will dominate us. Education for slavery is the daily routine of modern, statist education, both in the Marxist states and in the Western democracies and republics. The continued decline in the learning ability of youth is a natural one: if all things are relative and in essence meaningless, then why should education, discipline, and a job have any meaning? Why bother with marriage, if marriage has no meaning because all is meaningless?

We should not be surprised at the social anarchy of recent years: we have been schooling our youth for it. To school youth into a belief in relativism and the essential meaninglessness of life is at best to educate them for irrelevance, but, even more, for death and final oblivion. Any culture which negates its heritage by its education has no future: it will be supplanted by those with a faith for living. Over and over again, this era is underscoring the truth of Wisdom's declaration: "But he that sinneth against me wrongeth his own soul: all they that hate me love death" (Prov. 8:36). "Therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live" (Deut. 30:19). If our foundation is not the Rock, it will be the sands of relativism.

172

KWAN-YIN VERSUS CHRIST

Chalcedon Report No. 123, November 1975

The origins of socialism in the modern world are deeply rooted in oriental thought, in Hinduism and Buddhism in particular. With the Enlightenment, modern man began to show great interest in Far Eastern thought, because he believed that he found therein the "natural" religion he felt was basic to all men. Few people today appreciate the extent to which eighteenth-century man was interested in India and especially China. This interest led to the very extensive work in the nineteenth century, by Friedrich Max Muller and others, in translating and interpreting the philosophies of the Far Fast.

The idea of "natural" religion died, but what remained from these studies was the essential relativism of Far Eastern philosophy. Because of the despair of truth, these philosophies insisted on the meaninglessness of standards and values, discriminations and distinctions, and the ultimate oneness of all things. Whereas Christianity established distinctions and requires a division between God and sin, good and evil, the saved and the lost (Matt. 10:34–35), Buddhism, for example, works to overcome divisions. Kwan-yin, the Chinese goddess of mercy, was held to affirm that she could not enter paradise as long as any human beings were excluded. "Never will I receive individual salvation," she is supposed to affirm, and stands outside the gates of heaven waiting for the last man to come in. Kwan-yin was very popular with Western liberals, and Unitarian leaders like M. D. Conway, in the nineteenth century, made much of her equalitarian creed.

Their point was well taken. If Biblical faith is not true, then the total inclusiveness and equalitarianism of Kwan-yin is the logical faith. All things being relative and equally meaningless, they are also equally meaningful if we give them any relative meaning or value.

It is thus easy to see why, in their rebellion against Christianity, modern men, from the eighteenth century to the present, have been so intensely interested in Oriental religions and philosophies. Some of them have sounded like children of Kwan-yin, so faithfully have they reproduced her philosophy. Thus the Socialist leader of U.S. World War I days, Eugene Debs, thrilled the American gurus and faithful with his passionate equalitarianism. Called the "Billy Sunday of Socialism," Debs would affirm his faith with intense fervor: "While there is a lower class, I am of it. While there is a soul in prison I am not free." This is a denial of the validity of criminal law; it means all men and all acts are equal. Debs did not go that far, but men since then have done so, and the result is the progressive defense and "vindication" of the criminal, and the reduction and disarming of the law-abiding.

In July 1975, Doris L. Dolan, founder and president of Citizens for Law Enforcement Needs, a California based organization, declared, "Crime is caused by criminals, and we, as law-abiding citizens, have the absolute right to be free of the criminal element—I am brokenhearted about the things I have witnessed and learned over these past 10 years of citizen involvement in the workings of the judiciary system. Our organization has files bulging with statistics on criminal activities and reasons why crime has reached epidemic proportions as recorded today. We have determined that a majority of the United States Supreme Court members, as well as a California Supreme Court majority, and some legislators, do not understand the right of the citizen to be free of the criminal element. They understand nothing but the right of the criminal" (Van Nuys, CA: *News*, 1975, p. 25A).

This situation should not surprise us. Because Biblical faith and law have been undermined, modern man tends increasingly to view things with the eyes of Kwan-yin rather than Christ, equalizing good and evil rather than establishing justice and stamping out evil. Meanwhile, as socialism is imported into the Far East, it is readily accepted, because, however much Westernized, it is simply the logical development of Far Eastern philosophies. Socialism will prevail in the East and West alike until its underlying relativism is rejected in favor of Biblical faith.

The answers thus are not to be found in the ballot box. Ballots simply express the minds and faiths of men. The problem is in essence religious. We can summarize it as Kwan-yin, or Christ. Are all things relative, or is there an absolute God with an unchanging Word? How we answer this question will determine our lives and our politics. If we deny God's justice and law, we must eventually accept Kwan-yin's democracy of good and evil.

Kwan-yin supposedly cannot and will not enter paradise until every last man is included. How beautiful this sounds to our modern sentimental relativists. However, when every last man enters, it will not be paradise but hell! Meanwhile, the application of this Kwan-yin principle is turning earth into hell. It denies justice, demolishes law, and, by mercy to the vicious, is merciless to the law-abiding. The rot of relativism cannot be eliminated by ballots and laws: it requires a return to Biblical faith, regeneration in Christ, and a society established on God's law. There is no substitute for the truth.

173

EPISTEMOLOGICAL SELF-CONSCIOUSNESS

Chalcedon Report No. 20, May 1, 1967

A very basic fact hides behind a rather difficult philosophical term, *epistemological self-consciousness*. What does this mean?

Two simple illustrations will help us grasp its meaning. An artist with marked epistemological self-consciousness is Willem de Kooning. De Kooning paints in terms of Nietzsche's statement, "The will to a system is a lack of integrity." For de Kooning, no system of thought or of art is possible, because there is no meaning. As a result, his painting is simply meaningless daubs and blotches, a defiance of meaning and pure self-expression, expressive of the moment and its impulses. According to Hess, de Kooning paints in terms of "No-Environment," and this concept Hess defines for us:

> NO-ENVIRONMENT—the metaphysical and social alienation of man from society and the nightmare of urbanization have been a preoccupation of modern writers from Marx and Dostoyevski to Heidegger and Celine. For de Kooning, however, "no-environment" is a metaphysical concept with physical materiality—with flesh and cement. In the Renaissance, he has pointed out, the painter located a Christ and a Roman soldier in their appropriate "places." What is a "place" today? (Thomas B. Hess, *Willem de Kooning* [New York, NY: George Braziller, 1959], p. 18)

For de Kooning, man has no "place," and the very idea of "place" is meaningless. There is "no-environment," because there is no framework of meaning for anything. As a result, de Kooning paints nothingness, because there is really nothing else to paint. The world is a world of nothingness, and, for many artists, for art to be realistic, it must portray nothingness. Modern art is not photographic, but it is realistic. For modern art, reality is brute factuality, it is meaninglessness. The interest

of modern artists in Buddhism is because of this agreement with Buddha that not God but nothingness is ultimate. As a result, these men are at war with the world of God and law, the world of meaning; for them, the true faith is in nothingness. Their nihilism calls for the destruction of the "pretense" of meaning. Of such men, we can say that they have a high degree of epistemological self-consciousness. They know that on their atheistic premises a man can know nothing, and some of them, the "hippies" in particular, try to live in terms of their faith.

For a second illustration, take any modern, atheistic scientist. The scientist denies that there is a God who has created all things and whose predetermined plan governs all things. Like de Kooning, the scientist believes in a meaningless, "no-environment" world where nothing has a "place," because the very idea of a "place" for things means an absolute law and plan. But the scientist still works in his laboratory as though a plan existed; his scientific theories assume a plan and a place for all things, and he operates in his science on the assumption that there is a meaning and a direction in the universe. If he allowed his atheism to govern his science, the scientist would have to deny his science as surely as de Kooning has denied everything that art once meant.

De Kooning, of course, does not have full epistemological self-consciousness. This full self-knowledge would be suicidal for unbelieving man, and he fights against it. Without God there is neither meaning nor life. Every non-Christian presupposes at some points the existence of God, even as he consciously denies Him, because without Him all knowledge and meaning would be impossible. But God steadily moves all men and history to epistemological self-consciousness. He forces men to know that without Him they have no foundation, that their lives are built on sand.

Men want the world of law and order which God created, but they want it without God. They complain because all respect for authority is disappearing, and their children fail to give them the honor and obedience which is their due. But if God's absolute law and plan are withdrawn from education and denied, a child and an adult is given then the right to think that *his* plan is just as good as anyone else's plan. If there is no God, then there is no authority. A very brilliant college student, who headed a criminal gang, told me that there was no such thing as crime, because there was no absolute law. His very fine parents were deeply hurt and shaken by his criminality and his arrest and trial, but the young man was not. His education had told him that man was merely a product of chance evolution, and he believed, therefore, that all the old standards were false. By the age of twenty, he had already lived more luxuriously

than his well-to-do parents ever had, and enjoyed more of the "best" pleasures of life than they ever could; a year in prison was a cheap price, and a kind of vacation.

This young man had more epistemological self-consciousness than his parents. He knew at least the basic choices: God and moral law, versus no God, no law, no meaning. The trouble with most men today is that they want the "best" of two worlds, the moral order and meaning of God's world, and the freedom from God of atheism. The liberals, as a result, dream of a new world order in which all men will be well-behaved brothers, as good as the best Sunday school children, having full freedom from God's moral law without misbehaving or becoming socially destructive. The non-Christian conservative thinks that by winning some elections he can restore the old godly law order and authority, and have a free country again, when most men are drifting into de Kooning's world and have no use for the ideals he espouses. Man cannot reestablish true authority and law order without first acknowledging and obeying the true authority, the triune God.

As a result, as history moves ahead, because epistemological self-consciousness increases, sinful man's rebellion against authority increases, because he progressively denies all authority and all meaning. Once non-Christian man was held in line by some of the God-given institutions, established at creation. The family in particular long functioned as man's basic policing power and source of order. But as men developed the principles of their unbelief, of their rebellion against God, they progressively rebelled against every authority God set up, in family, state, school, society, and everywhere else. Their only authority has become steadily their own will. Atheism itself is destroying the family, whether under communism, socialism, or democracy. Atheism is destroying authority in every area. College students are taught disrespect even for their teachers by their teachers, because the corrosive face of atheism destroys all authority. Instead of community, there is only a mob. Students were once self-reliant, individualistic, capable gentlemen who were taught how to exercise authority and also submit to authority. Today, they are only members of a mob, meaningless blobs because for them there is no meaning apart from their momentary impulses.

It is therefore of the utmost importance for Christians to develop epistemological self-consciousness. This means Christian education. It means a Christian philosophy for every sphere of human endeavor. It means recognizing that *every* issue is basically a religious one. As Stacey Hebden-Taylor has written, in a very important study, "He who rejects one religion or god can only do so in the name of another" (E. L. Hebden

Taylor, *The Christian Philosophy of Law, Politics and the State* [Nutley, NJ: The Craig Press, 1967], p. 22). The humanists religiously deny every authority other than man, and their totalitarian state is a deliberately conceived man-god defying the order of God with man's own order. The intensely powerful religious force of humanism, with all its hatred of God and God's world of law and order, can never be defeated by people whose ground of operation is vaguely Christian and largely humanistic. The lack of Christian epistemological self-consciousness is one of the major reasons, if not perhaps the major, for the growing victory of the enemy. Christians are too often trying to defend their realm on humanistic grounds, with Saul's armor, and as a result, they are steadily in retreat. Often, they are actually fighting for the enemy without knowing it

But victory should be ours. The more the enemy becomes what he is, the more his epistemological self-consciousness matures, the more impotent he becomes. What competition is a "hippie" for a truly Christian man? What competition is a de Kooning or a Bob Dylan for a Johann Sebastian Bach? But if we rear up a generation on humanistic premises, they will follow humanistic leaders. Humanism is progressively decaying; the more it becomes itself, the more repulsive and impotent it becomes. Nothing is more deadly for tares than maturity: they are then openly identified as tares, as worthless and poisonous, as definitely not wheat.

Today, the impotence and confusion of humanism is marked. It is wallowing in failure all over the world, in failure, but not in defeat, because there is no consistent Christian force to challenge and overthrow it.

Nietzsche said, "The will to a system is a lack of integrity," that is, to believe in a system of truth is to submit oneself to a higher law, to God. The strength of the humanists is their denial of a system: it is their lawlessness. They have been successful destroyers, but they cannot build. The strength of the Christian can only be a "system," i.e., systematic theology, a knowing, intelligent, and systematic obedience to the triune God, and a faithful application of God's law order to every sphere of life. If the Christian operates without this system, he is a humanist without knowing it. And this is the reason for the very great impotence of conservative, evangelical Christianity: it is neither fish nor fowl.

God cannot bless a cause which does not honor Him. As Dr. Cornelius Van Til has said, "The Holy Spirit cannot be asked to honor a method that does not honor God as God" (Cornelius Van Til, *A Christian Theory of Knowledge* [Phillipsburg, NJ: The Craig Press, 1954], p. 9). Let us honor God, that He may honor us and our cause.

174

MORAL DISARMAMENT

Chalcedon Report No. 31, March 1, 1968

In our last newsletter, our subject was anarchistic love as a revolutionary concept and an erosive force. To continue our analysis, it must be pointed out next that the total impact and purpose of all such thinking is *moral disarmament*.

Moral disarmament always precedes the economic, political, and military disarmament and dismemberment of a people. Disarmament begins first in the mind and soul of man, and it proceeds then to affect his every activity.

The forces of moral disarmament have always been present in history, but, in recent years, they have become progressively more vocal. The nature of their attack, if anyone had missed it previously, became obvious in 1928 when Ernest Sutherland Bates published his book, *The Friend of Jesus*. In many respects, Judas came out as Jesus' best friend! In fact, one could say Judas came out better than Jesus at Bates's hands. But the book attracted only minor notice: moral disarmament had already reached the point where Bates's book was not startling.

Evil was now getting more sympathy than good; a betrayer had become a tragic and noble figure, and treason was thus somehow a higher loyalty. Instead of a clear-cut stand by people for truth and against error, for God against Satan, for right against wrong, and for law against crime, there was now a growing and serious moral confusion.

The next decade saw gangsters extensively glorified in motion pictures, and the films made money simply because they met a growing popular demand. Sympathy was now with the rebel, the criminal, and the pervert. Captain Bligh, who was actually a man of calibre, became a symbol of evil, and the degenerate lot of mutineers in the *Bounty* became popular heroes.

Moral disarmament makes us sympathetic with evil in order to make us hostile to good. If we are made to feel for Judas, to that extent we are separated from Christ. The end result is that we are asked to be friendly with hell itself, to approve of coexistence with everything evil, religious, moral, political, and economic.

The next step is to call the good, evil. Thus, an Episcopal scholar, Marshall W. Fishwick, in *Faust Revisited: Some Thoughts on Satan* (1963), sends Christian conservatives readily to hell. Thus, Fishwick writes on one man:

> Descended from a Good Family, this public-spirited fellow made a Good Thing out of cleanliness.
>
> He ran for public office on a ticket of clean government, clean elections, and clean towels in City Hall. Campaigning in immaculately white collars, he won easily, and self-righteously crowed proudly from the Church steeples.
>
> He was very busy up until the day he died. There were so many meetings of the Children's Welfare Bureau that he neglected his own children, one of whom ran off with the trombonist in a jazz combo. He was too clean to allow his city to go in debt, so it built no new schools. He also refused to take federal funds to provide free lunches, since he thought that was dirty politics. He erred in the name of High Principles. He went to hell. (pp. 39–40)

Fishwick also declares, "There is something satanic about suburbia" (p. 80), and he hopes that someone will "burst our ideas of good and evil all to hell" and free theology (p. 128).

Notice Fishwick's association of ideas: clean government, clean elections, clean towels, and clean collars are all somehow marks of self-righteousness and evil. They lead to a neglect of one's children. If you do not go into debt, you are against progress ("new schools") and are a Pharisee. Taking federal funds is good, refusing them is bad. "High Principles" will send you to hell.

After a couple of generations and more of such teaching and preaching, is it any wonder that the people are morally disarmed? In the name of the modernist "Christ," they are now for evil and against good. In the name of Americanism, they tolerate Communists and oppose anti-Communists. In the name of morality, they invite perverts into their fellowship, and exclude Christians because they refuse to tolerate evil. Pastor Richard Wurmbrand has written that many Western Christian Church leaders defended their associations with Communist leaders, saying, "As Christians, we have to be friendly with everybody, you know, even the Communists." Why, then, were they not friendly to those who had suffered? Why did they not ask one word about the priests and pastors who had died in prison or under torture? Or leave a little money

for the families that remained? These church leaders were either morally disarmed, or were busy disarming the churches morally. Their sympathy is with evil, not good, with Antichrist, not Christ.

Of course, these churchmen assure us that their hearts are full of love for everyone, and they are burning with a passion to "save" mankind. A very prominent and able English Congregational theologian, John S. Whale, in *Victor and Victim* (1960), assures us that "the goal of the universe is the end of all estrangement, the fullness of reconciliation in Christ," and this means "that Satan himself is finally saved" (p. 41). Now if Satan himself is going to be saved and spend eternity with us, why should we, and how can we, be too hostile to him now? If Stalin and Kosygin are going to be our brothers in heaven, can we deny them love and brotherhood now? If coexistence is our destiny in heaven, why not begin practicing it now?

Whale said, "The goal of the universe is the end of all estrangement." This means the end of all discrimination and division. But the Biblical doctrine of heaven and hell is a denial of coexistence in time and eternity. It means that the *goal* of the universe is actually the final estrangement of good and evil, of the saints and the sinners; it means that a separation in terms of the righteousness of God in Christ is basic to the historical process. Take away this doctrine, and you deny that there is an ultimate distinction between good and evil. Coexistence then becomes a religious and political necessity. Emory Storrs once said, "When hell drops out of religion, justice drops out of politics" (cited by Harry Buis, *The Doctrine of Eternal Punishment* [Philadelphia, PA: Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Co., 1957], p. 122).

The coexistence preachers tell us that hell is a horrible doctrine, but is there any hell to equal the horror of coexistence between God and Satan, good and evil, Christ and Antichrist? Religious and political coexistence has created more misery and horror than we can begin to imagine. Justice and hell bring law, order, and sanity to life.

But moral disarmament wants to destroy all the God-given distinctions. Its hope is that problems disappear if we say they are nonexistent. Its moral disarmament is the necessary step for a surrender to evil. Some of the disarmers talk about moral rearmament. But is it moral rearmament to blur the distinctions between religions, to work for the unity of things which are by nature contrary, and to assume that God will ratify man's open contempt for His call to separateness?

Any honest survey of the world scene indicates that we have been morally disarmed. The churches on the whole are in the enemy's camp, actively engaged in moral disarmament. The Bible is neither believed nor

taught, and an alien religion is preached from the pulpits. We are also politically disarmed. We treat our enemies as friends, and our friends as enemies. We are soft on Communism and hard on Christianity, orthodox Christianity. The unpopular man is he who demands a moral stand in any area, in religion, politics, economics, education, or anywhere else.

Moral disarmament is the prelude to collapse and ruin, to captivity and slavery. The reason we are not already enslaved is simply that our enemy is still weaker than we are, and we still have a saving remnant.

To counteract the prevailing moral disarmament, more than pietism is needed. Christian maturity, Christian growth, is necessary. Reconstruction requires, first of all, sound doctrine, Biblical faith, and second, the development of Christian thinking in every area, in economics, politics, education, science, and all things else.

The Reign of Terror in the French Revolution was directed, quite openly, against three groups: *First*, the political counterrevolutionaries were to be liquidated. *Second*, the economic aspect, all who "hoarded" food or money to protect themselves, were marked for execution. *Third*, organized, faithful Christians were marked for beheading on the guillotine also.

The last target, Christianity, was the central one, the nerve of hostility to revolution. By November 1793, the Marquis de Sade and other revolutionists were ready to propose a new religion of reason, humanism.

The goal was moral disarmament; the *purpose* was to create a humanistic paradise on earth. The *result* was hell on earth. As a loyal biographer of Sade admits:

> Reason had been exalted to the status of a god, and committees, assemblies and communes deliberated on concepts of law, order and justice; but it was Madame Guillotine who ruled, without Reason, without Justice. She served all men with equal candor as they knelt at her feet, and blessed them with the benediction of her weighted blade. (Norman Gear, *The Divine Demon: A Portrait of the Marquis de Sade*, p. 131)

The goal of the revolution, of moral disarmament, then, was liberty, fraternity, and equality: liberty from God, fraternity in sin, equality of all moral, economic, and religious distinctions. But the end was liberty from life, fraternity in death, and equality in hell. This is always the conclusion of moral disarmament.

Let us heed St. Paul's words: "Finally, my brethren, be strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might. Put on the whole armor of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil. For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers,

against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places. Wherefore take unto you the whole armor of God, that ye may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand" (Eph. 6:10–13).

175

ABORTION

Chalcedon Report No. 59, July 1, 1970

Among the earliest battle lines between the early Christians and the Roman Empire was the matter of *abortion*. Greek and Roman laws had at times forbidden abortion, even as they had also permitted it. The matter was regarded by these pagan cultures as a question of state policy: if the state wanted births, abortion was a crime against the state; if the state had no desire for the birth of certain children, abortion was either permissible or even required. Because the state represented ultimate order, morality was what the state decreed. To abort or not to abort was thus a question of politics, not of God's law. Plato, for example, held that the state could compel abortion where unapproved parents proceeded without the approval of the state.

Very early, the Christians accused the heathen of murder, holding that abortion is a violation of God's law, "Thou shalt not murder." It was also a violation of the law of Exodus 21:22–25, which held that even accidental abortion was a criminal offense. If a woman with child were accidentally aborted, but no harm followed to either mother or child, even then a fine was mandatory. If the fetus died, then the death penalty was mandatory.

Because the law of the Roman Empire did not regard abortion as a crime, the early church imposed a life sentence as a substitute: penance for life, to indicate that it was a capital offense. The Council of Ancyra, A.D. 314, while making note of this earlier practice, limited the penance to ten years. There were often reversions to the earlier severity, and for a time, in later years, the administration of any draught for purposes of causing an abortion was punishable by death. The Greek and Roman influence tended to weaken the Christian stand by sophisticating the question, by trying to establish when the child or fetus could be considered a

living soul. The Biblical law does not raise such questions: at any point, abortion requires the death penalty.

(Incidentally, the old question as to whether the fetus is "a living soul" has been given an answer by research, according to William P. O'Connell, who declares: "Many feel that the choice is the woman's. I would agree if it were clear that the fetus is part of the woman and thus hers to dispose of. The evidence, however, is to the contrary. Microbiology has established that the zygote is human and an autonomous, if dependent, organism from conception. Once fertilized, the cell is no longer latent life. It has its full and human allotment of chromosomes. It is uniquely human, like no other living thing or part of a thing, anywhere along the evolutionary chain" [*Los Altos Town Crier*, April 22, 1970, p. 1].)

The *Didache*, an early Christian document, called all abortion murder, and a love of death, whereas Christians are called to a love of God and of life. Wisdom declared of old, "all they that hate me love death" (Prov. 8:36). Here is an important key to the problem of abortion. We shall return to it later.

The debate and discussion of the subject of abortion is very extensive today, quite academic, and unrelated to reality. Thus, the *American Medical News,* June 8, 1970, p. 7, has in article by Dr. Charles A. Dafoe, M.D., entitled, "Thoughtful Action Needed to Find Middle Ground on Abortion." Dr. Dafoe is an obstetrician-gynecologist in Denver, and chairman of the Therapeutic Abortion Committee of the Presbyterian Medical Center there. Dr. Dafoe wants a "middle ground" between a total ban on abortion and total permissiveness. Is this possible? Is there a middle ground between murder and the protection of life, between adultery and chastity?

The reality of the situation has been reported to me by two doctors as well as by other persons. Supposedly, therapeutic abortions are permitted only after approval by a psychiatrist, or two psychiatrists, and review by a board of doctors. In reality, in those states where abortion can be authorized, psychiatrists often sign the requests without bothering to see or interview the applicants, and the review boards are not consulted. One doctor, on a review board, but never consulted, stated that he walked into his hospital one morning to learn that ten abortions had already been performed. His hospital performs very few abortions as compared to others. University and county hospitals are often chief offenders and are becoming "abortion mills"; some religious hospitals perform a large number of abortions also. The invention of suction machines, which are quite cheap, have made mass abortions a reality.

According to Governor Reagan of California, under the mental health

section of the new law in California, "Our Public Health Department has told us its projections that if the present rate of increase continues in California, a year from now there will be more abortions than there will be live births in this state. And a great proportion of them will be financed by Medi-Cal." He said that "under a technicality," a "young, unmarried girl" can become pregnant, go on welfare "and she is automatically eligible for abortion if she wants it, under Medi-Cal. And all she has to do is get a psychiatrist — and they're finding that easy to do — who will walk by the bed and say she has suicidal tendencies." Reagan said that in Sacramento "a 15-year-old girl has just had her third abortion, with the same psychiatrist each time saying she has suicidal tendencies. I don't think the state should be in that kind of business'" ("Reagan Sees Abortions Topping Births," Santa Ana, CA: *The Register*, April 24, 1970, p. D5).

According to the *American Medical News* for May 25, 1970, the board of trustees of the American Medical Association has urged a "new abortion policy to permit the decision to be made by the woman and her physician." This is a return to paganism, to the belief that no sovereign and transcendental God governs man and the universe; it is a pagan belief that the control of life is essentially and finally in the hands of man, or of man's agency, the state.

This total control of life by human agencies is a part of the plan of the predestination of man by man. Predestination is an inescapable concept. If we deny that God predestines, we will assert ultimately that man or the state predestines. Whenever belief in God's predestination declines, planning or predestination by the state rapidly takes its place. There is no lack of belief in predestination today, but it is belief in statist predestination, in planning and control by statist agencies.

We should not be surprised, therefore, at a report from Paris of a UNESCO meeting on the problems of aggressiveness:

> A U.S. scientist told an international scientific meeting here Tuesday that therapeutic abortions might prevent future Hitlers from being born. Dr. David A. Hamburg, of the psychiatry department of the Stanford University medical school, told the meeting that research had linked the presence in mothers of abnormally high amounts of testosterone, the male sex hormone, with aggressiveness in their children. While there was not enough knowledge at present to apply these findings practically, Hamburg foresaw that decades from now a doctor and his patient might choose a therapeutic abortion to prevent the birth of an extremely aggressive individual. The U.N. Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), where the meeting was held, mentioned a future Hitler or Chenghis Khan as people who might be

> eliminated in this way . . . ("Abortions Held Way to Avoid Tyrants," *Los Angeles Times*, May 20, 1970, pt. 1, p. 9).

It is clear that abortions are, *first* of all, an attempt by man to play god. The widespread approval of abortions by churches reveals that these churches are anti-Christian and are in fact humanistic churches. When man plays god, he seeks first of all to control life, to grant or to take life on his own terms rather than God's. God, as the creator of all things, has given mankind His law in Scripture whereby we are to govern all things under God. Not man's but God's will is the concern of God's law. It is precisely this power which humanism grasps at by law, to take or to spare life in terms of its own decree. Does God require capital punishment for certain offenses? Very well then, will the humanist, being against capital punishment, deny the "right" to abortion? No, the humanist will establish a "right" to abortion on his own terms and execute capital punishment on the fetus.

Not surprisingly, there is an increase in assassinations and in murder. Men resort to their own will and their own plan and set aside God's law, which is God's declared plan. They seek to control life apart from God.

Man has made himself the arbiter and god of life, and he decides quite readily, in terms of his own logic, who shall live. Thus, in Colorado, the question of euthanasia, so-called mercy killings, was put to a vote by the Colorado Nursing Association. "Voting in favor of euthanasia, only a third of the nurses favored the idea. After hearing arguments in favor, a majority voted for what only a third had accepted before" ("Eliminating the Old," *Twin Circle*, June 14, 1970, p. 6). More significant than the vote was the attitude of these nurses that euthanasia is an open question, one for man to decide or to vote upon. Today they vote in favor of killing the aged and the infirm; will they vote to kill doctors tomorrow? Or will the doctors vote to kill all nurses?

If men can decide who shall live, whom will they kill? Unwanted children can be aborted, the aged put to sleep, all priests and ministers killed, all Communists, Nazis, or conservatives executed, the Jews sentenced to death, or the Germans eliminated, all blacks wiped out, or all whites: all of these are open questions if man can decide who shall live. All of these *have* become open questions as humanism has developed in the twentieth century. Either God's law prevails, or man's law. If man's law is accepted, everything is an open question. When man plays god, man himself is the victim.

Under God, the doctor is a minister of life, of healing. His profession has had a long and necessary connection with a priestly calling. Under humanism and with abortion, the doctor ceases to be a healer and a

protector of life and becomes a murderer. (Statute law may permit abortion, but it is still murder, not only under God's law, but under common law, as doctors may sometime find out.) Under the influence of humanism, a radical change is taking place in the medical profession. Instead of being a man who regards life as sacrosanct, as wholly governed by God and beyond his province to destroy, the doctor is playing god in most cases. But, because the doctor is not god, he becomes a murderer. The majority of people may favor abortion, but they will still not respect an abortionist. Man, created in God's image, will, even when fallen, reflect to some degree the judgment and law of God. With the increase of abortion, the medical profession will rapidly decline in prestige. As a hated and despised group of murderers, even the women who use them will welcome the total control of doctors by the state. Few will wish them well.

Second, as we have noted, abortion represents a hatred of life. This hatred of life manifests itself in a number of ways, from outright suicide to suicidal activities. It is estimated that 250,000 will commit suicide in the 1970s, and another two million will try and fail ("250,000 U.S. Suicides Predicted During 70s," *Los Angeles Times*, June 7, 1970, sec. A, p. 21). The use of drugs represents a form of suicide and a hatred of life. Hardin Jones, of the University of California, has stated that in the United States, "over 100,000 young people (2.5 times U.S. war deaths in Vietnam) have been killed by drugs and far more hare been converted into mental cripples" ("Drug Toll," *Twin Circle*, May 17, 1970, p. 12). A wide variety of suicidal activities are common today. The hatred of God is also the hatred of life.

In his novel, the *Death of Ivan Ilyich*, Tolstoy tells the story of the death of Ivan Ilyich, a conscientious official but a man without faith. As his fatal illness progresses, he begins to hate all people in good health. He hates his wife and children for being so strong, clean, and healthy, "with all the loathing of a diseased body or all cool, white, sweet-smelling flesh" (Henri Troyat, *Tolstoy*, p. 559). Tolstoy's Ivan Ilyich can serve as a symbol of humanistic mankind and his culture. As it faces death, humanism turns on life with hatred; it pursues a suicidal course of action in every realm and strikes at life with savage and murderous intent: it professes to reverence and affirm life even as it murders it. The drive for legalized abortion is a worldwide manifestation of this hatred of life. Pompously, the legal and medical authorities write in various restrictions on abortion even as they approve it. All is supposedly wisely governed and therapeutic. But in actual practice, the decision is a thumbs-down on life; abort, abort; no restrictions in actual practice. Their love of death and hatred of life manifests itself in an increasing abortion rate. With some girls and

women, it has become a kind of status symbol of "liberation" to have secured an abortion; they have proven their freedom from God and their dedication to ecology, to preventing a supposed overpopulation.

On every level it is a mark of a dying culture, a hatred of life, and a desire to play god. Indeed, all they that hate God love death. And death shall be their destiny. But we are called to life.

176

MORAL PARALYSIS

Chalcedon Report No. 96, August 1973

Almost every week, by letter, person, or telephone, a number of reports come to me which indicate a common malady, moral paralysis. A state senator reported that most of his colleagues were less and less sure of their liberal and radical doctrines; they saw events confounding their faith, and their old, easy assurances were giving way to a fearful and bitter uncertainty and uneasiness, and an inability to act with their old vigor.

A meeting of prominent "conservatives" turned up a wide variety of ideas. More than a few were pro-abortion, and a variety of other radical ideas were present in virtually all, so that a visitor remarked that a conservative is an unawares liberal. The meeting got nowhere, in that nothing could be agreed upon, except to be antiradical, whatever that might mean.

Still another example: A doctor of considerable ability and influence is unable to act to check the rapid moral deterioration of his own children, or of his medical society. He dislikes the "new" morality, and he does not believe in abortion, but he is unable to oppose either. "After all," he says, "who am I to force my ideas on anyone else? I have no way of knowing what is right and wrong, and my ideas may simply reflect the mores and customs of my youth. All I can say is that I have my principles, and they are mine, but I can't say they are good for everybody."

To a limited degree, the doctor is right. If a man's principles are merely his own, then he has no right to impose them on anyone else, nor can he logically do so. The result is a moral paralysis: even what he holds to be good for himself is then meaningless, because it has no roots in reality for him. As long as the Marxists believed in dialectical materialism and the "inevitability" of the triumph of the proletariat, they had vitality

and drive: they believed that history made their victory inescapable. The growing disillusionment of Marxists, and the growth of awareness of the basic relativism of their premises, has led to a decline of power and a creeping moral paralysis.

Moreover, the followers of the left have become increasingly aware that pragmatism, not principles, governs their leaders. However pragmatic people may be in their personal lives, they want their leaders to be guided by principles. This is a moral contradiction, but all the same true. In the 1930s, dedicated young liberals read *The Nation* as the voice of idealism. Now, aging and pragmatic liberals read the *The Nation* and agree with writers like Hans Koningsberger when he denies that Juan Domingo Peron was ever a "Fascist dictator." Koningsberger solemnly declares that the Fascist and Nazi labels were tied to Peron by the U.S. State Department and a section of the press. Peron is now the champion of the Argentine Left, and we are reminded that he was never in favor of free enterprise and free trade. Koningsberger gives us a lyrical portrait of Peron and "Saint" Eva, including an account of a mass for Eva on the twentieth anniversary of her death. The old magic is gone, however, and the report reads better as humor and caricature rather than political fervor (Hans Koningsberger, "Argentina Joins the Third World," *The Nation,* July 2, 1973, pp. 17–20). It is, however, typical. Pragmatism and partisanship have displaced principles to a very great degree.

The 1960s saw worldwide student action, followed by student inertia. For many, the student movements of that decade were the beginning of a new world order, but their only consequence has been a deeper descent into cynicism and moral paralysis. The flaw of these movements was a very obvious one. Moral strength and advantage was associated, not with character and principles, but rather with holding that things are wrong. Youth held itself to be morally superior because it was declaring the world and its parents to be in the wrong. This was true enough at many times, but it meant nothing, because these young critics were no better and sometimes worse than the things they criticized. Recognizing theft when one sees it does not make one an honest man. After all, thieves are best at recognizing theft! Moral reform does not mean the ability to recognize evil but the power to do good and to rebuild in terms of righteousness and justice. A major fallacy of our time is that righteousness is equated with denunciations of evil, which means that those with the best nose for dirt gain the best reputation for character. Not surprisingly, moral reform in the twentieth century generally begins and ends with investigating committees and groups, and a report on evil is equated with moral strength.

The result is a growing moral paralysis, and, increasingly, a world scene in which every pot is calling every kettle black, and they are all right! Let us repeat it: there is no moral advantage in detecting evil, only in doing good. At this point, our world is seriously derelict and ineffectual. Its moral paralysis runs deep, and its roots are in the inability of men to declare what is right for all men at all times. Let us turn again to the doctor who does not want to impose his ideas on his family and his profession. If we are moral, and if we refuse to practice abortion, only because we do not like the alternatives, then we can neither claim righteousness for our position nor impose it on anyone else. We have no reason for holding our position to be true other than our own prejudices. Logically, we can then only say, "Let every man do that which is right in his own eyes."

But if we hold that a sovereign God governs things and holds all to be accountable to Him and His absolute law, we have no right to condone in ourselves or in anyone else a denial of that moral order. We then do not stand on our own options but on ultimate and unchanging law. Instead of moral paralysis, we then have moral vitality.

The modern state has shifted its legal foundations from Christianity to humanism, from a belief in ultimate law to an affirmation of ultimate relativism. The modern state has taken over education in order to organize mankind in terms of statist humanism, and the result has been the rise of totalitarianism and moral paralysis. The fundamental principle of legal positivism or relativism is that the state declares that the good is what the state does, and just law is whatever the state decrees. There is then no god but the state, and the party in power is its prophet.

But man is still God's creature, created in His image, and, no matter how much the state seeks to remake man, man's thoughts inescapably witness to his true Maker. Man may hold to moral relativism, but his being is governed by moral absolutes. A few years ago, a professor who insisted that there is no good and evil, and that all things are relative, insisted also that the Vietnam War was absolutely wrong morally. When I asked him how he could say *anything* is morally wrong in terms of his premises, or say more than, *for me* it is wrong, he became angry. Some things have to be wrong, he insisted. This was illogical, but it reflected his basic schizophrenia. He was denying the God who created him, and he was still affirming that somehow moral judgment could transcend man. If there is nothing beyond man other than more people, then every man's judgment has equal validity, and the "law" of society becomes the hippie slogan of the 1960s: do your own thing. The result is anarchy and moral paralysis.

Men wish the world to be just and moral while denying moral law. Selwyn Raab, writing in the same issue of the *The Nation* as Hans Koningsberger, speaks with intensity of justice and cites a case of serious injustice. Clearly, justice in society is desired. Yet in the next article Alan Wolfe criticizes Irving Kristol's analysis of our contemporary situation by saying, "like all historical conservatives, Kristol attributes the problem to a moral crisis." If there is no moral crisis, then why are there serious problems of injustice? And if there is no absolute right and wrong, why be concerned about purely relative matters? The fact is that people in growing numbers are unconcerned. Truth and justice mean less and less to them.

In a relativistic perspective, the only legitimate personal "moral" goal can be self-realization. Nothing counts save the absolute individual, who can realize himself only at the expense of others. If we try to replace this with a social realization for humanity, then we say that the state has the right to realize itself at the expense of the individual. In either case, we have no valid ground for moral action.

A man cannot climb up a ladder unless that ladder can be given a base on hard and solid ground. A ladder cannot be planted on air or on clouds. To climb, a man must first have a valid base to start from. Similarly, men and society require a valid base for moral action and progress. That foundation is the God of Scripture. As the psalmist observed long ago, "Except the LORD build the house, they labour in vain that build it: except the LORD keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain" (Ps. 127:1).

Moral paralysis affects different men in different ways. Some years ago, Gosse commented on the deep melancholy of the poet Thomas Gray and others, who showed clearly the decay of the will to live which was an aspect of the Enlightenment. Of Gray he wrote, "He never . . . habitually rose above this deadly dulness of the spirits . . . Nothing was more frequent than for men, in apparently robust health, to break down suddenly, at all points, in early middle life. People were not in the least surprised when men like Garth and Fenton died of mere indolence, because they became prematurely corpulent and could not be persuaded to get out of bed" (Edmund W. Gosse, *Gray*, pp. 13–14).

Not all men show their moral collapse by means of physical or mental inertia. With some, it manifests itself in a savage hostility to moral order, in attempts to smash and obliterate everything which reminds them of a world they refuse to recognize. In either case, there is a moral paralysis insofar as any effective command of the future is concerned, and there is a loss of the ability to rebuild or even to perpetuate an order.

For this reason, although moral paralysis is always a dangerous phenomenon, it is also a suicidal one: it has no future. Today, we have a

phenomenal interest in the future, a vast curiosity about it, and futurology has become a "science." A curiosity about the future is, however, definitely not the same as the ability to command it. There is a difference between idle curiosity and dominion.

The calling of man under God is to dominion, and, wherever there is true faith, there is an extension of God's power and of dominion in, through, and under Him. Moral action means dominion, in the family and in all society. It means dominion over ourselves and over all the world, in every area of science, art, industry, agriculture, society, and life.

Western civilization was not lost by the church to its enemies: it was surrendered by default, by the inner decay of Christian theology and philosophy, and humanistic statism readily occupied the territory which the churches defaulted by their apostasy and waywardness. Today, the same process of default is in operation, this time by the humanists and statists. One report after another cites the growing cynicism and contempt of people for their political leaders and their growing disillusionment with the political hope, as well as the moral decay and paralysis which runs deeply in all classes. This being so, this is a time of great opportunity.

The future belongs to men who can exercise dominion and who are under the dominion of Almighty God. The mind of the dying turns over the good and bad in his doctors and nurses. The living are at work, because the present and the future are theirs to redeem. For the living, the time of opportunity is a time of promise. There is no clearer way to view our time.

VAN TIL & LOGIC

177

THE VAN TIL I KNEW: AN INTERVIEW WITH R.J. RUSHDOONY

by Andrew Sandlin

Chalcedon Report No. 358, May 1995

ANDREW Sandlin: Rush, this year in May we're celebrating the one-hundredth anniversary of the birth of Van Til. Most theological historians, and theologians, recognize you as Van Til's protégé. Would you spend a few minutes and give some recollections of your relationship with Van Til and his thought and his impact on the church and modern society?

I was prepared for Van Til's philosophy by a professor in the philosophy department at Berkeley, a pragmatic naturalist, Edwin A. Strong. Dr. Strong was, in a sense, a presuppositionalist because he recognized, to use his terminology, that the *given* determines everything in any philosophy. Your starting point, your given, your axiom, is whatever you assume at the beginning, because you can pursue no kind of thinking without a starting point, without a presupposition. I recall vividly that he (whether it was in the class on medieval philosophy or modern philosophy, I don't recall) ticked off one student who described contemptuously creationists and his argument with them, and Dr. Strong told him, "If you ever meet an informed creationist, he's going to tear you apart, because if you once raise the problem of origins, you cannot vindicate any non-creationist scheme of thought." And he added, "The only tenable position for a person who is not a Christian is to say, you believe in God as your given, your starting point . . . I begin with the universe as eternally existing as my starting point. You have to do that, or you are destroyed by any intelligent opponent."

There was a great deal more that Dr. Strong had to say that made me

rejoice when I first opened Van Til. I was on a speaking tour. I stopped off to speak at this small town in Colorado . . . (I've forgotten the name of it), and the pastor there, Schaub was his name, had received a review copy of *The New Modernism*. I picked it up and started to browse in it and to make a note of the publisher, to order it, because I was excited by the contents. Mr. Schaub said, "Take the book; I don't find any value in it and I'm not going to review it." I took it and I began to read it. I left the next day on the train, reached Denver in not too many hours, and there all the trains were sidetracked to make way for troop trains (it was wartime). It was between five and six hours before we could go forward again, and I sat there, at the railway station, and did not even take time to eat, I was so absorbed in the book. I read most of it. On my return home I had quite a few duties, so I think that it was about a month later that I was able to go back and finish the last few pages.

About that time (I believe it was November), a Canadian religious periodical, a theological journal, had a review of Van Til's book, and I believe the reviewer's name was Stuart Cole. He gave no evidence of having read the book; he understood what the contents were, and he raged against them in a long review. So I wrote a long, long letter to the journal and in effect reviewed the book myself. Well, they published it with a kind of answer by Cole, who wrote to me and admitted he had not done the book justice, although he disagreed with it. Subsequently, I heard from Van Til, and that began a correspondence. After about five years or more, I returned to California from Nevada. Van Til, in those days, was spending his summers with Dr. Gilbert den Dulk in Ripon, California. I went over from time to time, and the three of us spent some time together. And on one occasion, Dooyeweerd was with us also. I had marvelous discussions with Van Til. He was a born teacher. He enjoyed intellectual discussions; he loved California and the California dry summer heat. He didn't want air conditioning; he wanted to bake in the dry heat of California. He only stopped coming when his wife insisted that they spend more time with relatives in Indiana. I visited him once and spent a little time in his home. We corresponded a great deal and, I'm sorry to say, most of the letters, in the course of my moves, have become lost. But I think, in reorganizing my library, I have come across, perhaps, ten or twelve.

Van Til was a man with a profundity of knowledge and a remarkable simplicity of faith. His position, I believe, could be summed up in the familiar saying, "God said it, I believe it." He was a superb preacher. Most eloquent. He was familiar with so much of the Bible, by heart, in English and in Dutch. There was a great zest for the simple things of life. He

enjoyed humor . . . When John Saunders, the actor, became acquainted with Van Til's writings through me, he made a point of going back there and visiting with Van Til. I think they had two visits together. And they took to each other immediately. They would sit, in the evenings, on the porch steps of Van Til's home, drink a little beer and tell stories and laugh endlessly. When we brought out Van Til for the Arts and Media Conference, he thought the idea of getting people together for a Van Til Arts and Media Conference was preposterous. He didn't believe we could find ten people to come. He was startled when he came and found hundreds there. He had people coming around him to talk, to ask him to autograph copies of his books, and we had a great many books there for sale. He was enjoying it immensely. He was not used to people being receptive and appreciative. Coming, as he did, out of a critical, hostile realm, he was so overjoyed that the first day of the conference he hated to go to bed when the meetings were over. He was enjoying talking so much to everyone that John told him, "I'm going to escort you up to bed, you need your rest, and I don't think it's proper for you to stand here flirting with all these girls." Van Til roared with laughter over that. He was totally tickled with it. At the closing banquet, he got up to acknowledge the applause, and the expression of honor accorded him, and wanted to say a few words, which he did, very eloquently.

Well, the night before, there were two attractive young women, professional dancers, and they asked John, "Who is this Van Til that everyone is so excited about?" He said, "I'm not going to tell you; go over there and buy a couple of his books." So they each went over and bought a couple. The next morning I was standing there with John when these girls came up, two very attractive young women, and they said, "You cost us a night's sleep. We were up almost until dawn reading Van Til. We have never encountered anything like it. We didn't know thinking like this existed . . . and it just blew our minds." Well, after Van Til finished speaking and I pronounced the benediction, everybody got up to leave and Van Til was standing up and one or two were chatting with him, and these two dancers came up and said, "Dr. Van Til, we spent a good deal of the night reading your book . . . and . . . would you do us the honor of autographing our books?" They each put two books in front of him . . . and they said, as he sat down, "We know you need your rest, and we're sorry to detain you at all." And he said, "Oh no . . . I wish this night could go on forever." He was so delighted with being appreciated. He spoke to the girls. (I don't recall what he said.) He was very appreciative of their interest. And as he finished autographing all four of the books, one of the girls leaned over and kissed him on the cheek . . . and he was

the happiest, most radiant man! He was so glad he'd come; it had been a joy from start to finish for him.

He was a very wonderful man. He was quite conservative politically; as a Calvinist, he believed that the state was not to be trusted. A state was man's sin enlarged. And even a Christian state had to be viewed with caution. We had no right to trust man, nor church, nor state. So he took a consistently conservative approach in politics.

Andrew Sandlin: Rush, would you go back to the beginnings of Van Til, what you know of his upbringing, and the influence on him and that type of thing?

Well, Van Til was born in the Netherlands; the family migrated here. As a boy, he did wear wooden shoes. He had a great deal of love for this country because he was very appreciative of its traditions. He was also dismayed by the drift away from the Reformed faith in the Netherlands. And it hurt him to see the same thing occurring here, and in the Dutch community, to such a great extent.

One of the things we must realize about Van Til is that he was basically a very simple and uncomplicated person. It was amazing to see that remarkable profundity, his mastery of the history of philosophy, his ability to penetrate to the heart of the thinkers as the new ones would come along. Men like Wittgenstein and others he understood clearly, and yet with it all he was a simple, trusting believer. His was a very uncomplicated faith. He was also not fully aware of his importance. He was doing what he felt God had called him to do. When I would tell him how important he was in the history of Christianity and philosophy, he would be shocked and he'd tell me, "I don't know whether you're good for me, you're going to make me a proud man if I keep listening to you." So, he was ill-prepared to meet the hostility that developed very, very early, in the '40s, and to encounter it at Calvin College, supposed citadel of the Reformed faith, to encounter it in the OPC (Orthodox Presbyterian Church), and at Westminster Seminary; it all but killed him. He would have died about 1950; he was seriously ill, with a bad heart condition, and Gilbert den Dulk found him in that condition in the late '40s, perhaps not quite the late '40s, and he immediately volunteered his services, as a doctor; he flew back there more than once, prescribed for him, brought him out here in the summers, and restored his health. So Van Til lived to be well over ninety. The abuse never ended. In a sense, it only increased. But that's another story.

Van Til was born into a world that was dying. In Europe, where he was born, secularization took over in one country after another. What

had been still somewhat a Christian era, until about 1850, became rapidly secular thereafter. The things that contributed to it were Romanticism, revolution, and Darwinism. And as a result, the old order was crumbling. Very briefly, Abraham Kuyper restored it in the Netherlands. However, Kuyper was so eager to retain the surface Christian character of the country, or to restore it, that he was ready to drop the Old Testament, to an extent, as a compromise. So he dropped the historic theocratic stance of orthodoxy in the Netherlands, and this was a sad mistake. He himself had come out of modernism, and at the time he began his work, he didn't fully appreciate all that orthodoxy meant. He came out of a world that was cracking up. He lived in a country that was still outwardly Christian. But once we entered into World War I, that order collapsed. We began to show our secular spirit. In some respects the Europeanization of America began with Theodore Roosevelt. He was the first to talk about human rights as opposed to property rights. That was unheard of in America; it was European Marxist thinking.

Andrew Sandlin: So what happened after that; where did Van Til go to school?

He studied in Europe, I've forgotten the name of the schools. He was familiar with Debrecen in Hungary. He was prepared by his dual background, Dutch and American, to cope with the collapse of Christian thinking and to create a new order of thinking. He was, I believe, the Thomas Aquinas of Protestantism. This is why I feel so strongly that we should get all his out-of-print and unpublished works back into print. He felt that I was his heir. He made that clear also to the then president of Dordt College. He laid down the foundation of Christian Reconstruction in his book on theistic ethics. He held, "Man's highest good is the Kingdom of God." Now, the church has been made into an end rather than a means. The church sees itself as the Kingdom of God. This was what destroyed the medieval church. It began to see the church as the Kingdom. But Protestants began with the Kingdom as the goal, and the church as the army to create the Kingdom, but now the church sees itself as the end, as the goal. Therefore it works to build up the church, not the Kingdom of God. And that's why Christian Reconstruction is so offensive to them. It takes the focus away from the church and puts it on the Kingdom. And of course, this is why Gary North finds my position so offensive. He is church-oriented. Well, when the church is church-centered, it sees itself and bringing people into the church as the goal. It develops its version of the scholastic doctrine of the Middle Ages that man as he is, is essentially whole, he only needs something added to nature to give him the good

life, and that's the *donum superadditum*, the extra gifts that God gives which caps your natural powers and abilities and makes you a Christian, a citizen of the Kingdom of God. Then you have no calling except to wait for heaven, to be a part of the church, which is the Kingdom, and this has become the doctrine of Protestantism.

Now, if you look at Campus Crusade, its whole message to people is, God loves you. There's a little something He can give to you, which will make the plus you need to have a wonderful life, nothing about the fact that you are a reprobate. Now, what was once called the three Ss, virtually unknown now, constituted, it was rightly held by Protestants, the essence of God's plan for man. You start with sin, you need salvation, and because of salvation you go into service . . . sin, salvation, service. But now it's sin, salvation, and wait to be raptured, or wait to die and go to heaven.

The Reformed community itself has been polluted by such thinking and sees the church as its end. One German Reformed theologian of the last century held that your sanctification was a completed act this side of heaven, completed or rather arrested at the time of your justification, so that there is not growth in sanctification and vision. Well, that kind of thinking, in one form or another, has infected the various churches. So they are no-growth churches, no-growth in terms of growth in *grace and service*. Those who have become Christians are told, "Now that the Lord has saved you, to be a good Christian you don't sin by smoking, drinking or dancing, and you come to church morning and evening, and you go to prayer meeting Wednesday night." Well, that kind of limited vision has captured the church. This is why we Reconstructionists are regarded as very radical and wild. It's as someone said, that, if I were right, it would mean that the whole work of the Christian and of the church would be revolutionized. And he didn't like that. It meant more responsibilities for churches and members who like to feel they've got it made, bought their fire and life insurance policy, when they said yes to Jesus.

Andrew Sandlin: Rush, in the late '40s and early '50s, as you know, there was a push on the part of a number of evangelicals, intellectuals, for what they called a "new evangelicalism" that would be an intellectually respectable defense of the faith against liberals. Since Van Til's writings at that time were available, why did they so eschew Van Til and not employ his writings as a basis for opposition to liberalism?

The leaders of that movement were Carl Henry, who is still with us, and Edward J. Carnell. Those two men wanted intellectual respectability, and the liberals gave it to them. They were very happy to see these

turncoats out to do in Van Til, to bewail this harshness toward modernism, Barthianism, and so on. So because they were in essence, compromisers, they were made establishment figures; and the establishment Christians today are Carl Henry and Billy Graham.

Andrew Sandlin: What was Van Til saying that so threatened them?

Van Til threatened them because he pointed to the clear-cut dividing line between belief and unbelief. Between the people of God and the people of Adam, Adam's generations. What Van Til did had its precursors, Calvin of course, who founded everything upon the Word of God, but after Calvin, a great deal of rationalism entered into the Reformed faith, and Kuyper began a break with it, but his was a rather mixed position because he was just beginning to realize the difference between the world of Greek philosophy and Christianity. And, Dooyeweerd and Vollenhoven, in the Netherlands, were pursuing the same path, but with less a consistency than Van Til did. The world reacted to Van Til with a savagery that really is hard to believe. When Barth was at Princeton, not too long before his death, someone told him that Van Til was in the audience, and he became very agitated, and he actually made this statement, according to someone back stage, before he came out: "That man hates me," and he went on to indicate that though he did not believe in hell, "there should be a hell for that man." Well, he created a like reaction among those who were ostensively Reformed but who were rationalistic.

I felt the brunt of that quite often. I was responsible for the publication of Gordon Clark's book *Religion, Reason, and Revelation*. It had made the round to more than a dozen publishers, and they all rejected it, and with good reason. It was a lot of scribblings, typings, pages half X'd out, other things stapled on to it. If any student had ever turned a paper into Clark that way, he would have flunked him. Well, I didn't agree with Clark, being Van Tillian, Clark being mainly a rationalist, but at certain points semi-presuppositionalist, but I felt the book deserved publishing, and I told Hays Craig that it should be published. I corresponded with Clark about the manuscript, and it was a painful thing because the man was extremely angry that a protégé of Van Til would be responsible for getting his book published. He went out of his way to be snide. Of course, his hatred for Van Til was intense. To attack Van Til, some of his opponents urged Clark to seek ordination in the Orthodox Presbyterian Church. All he was doing was to supply pulpits occasionally, and his main work was as a professor of philosophy; but they urged him to apply, hoping to destroy Van Til in the process. Well, it left bitter scars with Gordon Clark, and to the very end he was totally irrational and hostile

where Van Til was concerned. Van Til had been Christian Reformed, a church that did not respect him, then became Orthodox Presbyterian, a church that was equivocal about him. Westminster Seminary drew students from all over the world because of him, but Clowney, the president, and others did not like his position, or agree with him, or treat him with respect. So his was a hard life. The hostility was there until the end.

Andrew Sandlin: What relevance is Van Til's thought to today?

More relevant than ever before because it tells us unequivocally that God cannot be an afterthought: that God has to be the starting place. You don't add God as the "*donum superadditum*," and Protestantism has adopted that scholastic view. Now, if you believe in Jesus, then you can relax and go with your life; there's no mandate to do anything other than to clean up your act a little. And the cleanup is not all that great in most instances. Antinomianism is destroying the church.

When I was around Van Til, it was an unadulterated pleasure. You knew you were in the presence of greatness. Now, he was limited; he was primarily a theologian and a philosopher. He confessed himself, very humbly, to be ignorant of a great many other things. And at times his opinion would be a conventional one. But even when you disagreed, you knew that here was a mighty intellect, and a man of remarkable humility. In fact, he was humble to a fault. Ever since he began writing, he had been so clobbered that he had no great confidence in himself. He knew that his position was the right one, but he never appreciated the importance of what he'd done, because to him it was the logical, the inevitable position. He had found appreciation in one man at the beginning. He had taught for a year at Princeton, after returning from Germany and his doctorate, and then Princeton Seminary went modernist. He simply resigned, took a church in Michigan, a country church. J. G. Machen went to him, asked him to come to the newly founded seminary, and Van Til refused. But Machen persisted, and a year later Van Til agreed to go along with Machen and to join the Westminster staff. The interesting thing is in his apologetics, Machen was essentially of the old rationalistic school and he made no bones about it; he recognized his thinking was not going to change probably; he was used to thinking in those channels. But he recognized that Van Til was the future, and so he insisted on Van Til's joining the faculty . . . and that's how Van Til came to the status of a professor of philosophy of religion and theology.

It was interesting that I was instrumental in leading one of the faculty members, E. J. Young, to a Van Tillian position. Young was a San Franciscan, and he had, as a student, helped Adam Schriver, a pastor and

Sunday-school missionary for the state of Nevada. So before I ever met Young, I knew him through Adam Schriver's stories of him, so we became acquainted and would see each other when he'd spend his summers in California. He told me it was my writing that helped him understand Van Til's position. I haven't found my correspondence with Young in my reorganization of the library; I'm afraid I've lost it.

Andrew Sandlin: Young was a great Old Testament scholar in his own right . . .

Yes, a very wonderful man.

One thing more I'd like to say about Van Til. I spoke of his gift of simplicity. He could summarize things with a remarkable clarity and state in a few words the gist of the matter. And at one point, he wrote, "The choice is between autonomy and theonomy," self-law and God's law. Of course, that's our position. If you don't accept God's law, in terms of the theme of the book of Judges in the Bible, every man is his own law because he recognizes no god as his king, and he does that which is right in his own eyes. And this is our problem today, because as we abandoned, as a nation, as schools, the priority of God and His law, then we adopted self-law. It is now taught in the "values clarification" curriculum of our public schools, that you make up your own rules, your own "lifestyle." So we are disintegrating as a society, and, wherever this Antinomianism has been adopted anywhere in the world, you have disintegration. This is why Van Til is so critically important and why you cannot accept Van Til's premises without accepting theonomy. So what I have done has been a development, an extension, of Van Til's thinking.

Andrew Sandlin: How did Van Til's apologetic method break with the past? You mentioned earlier he was, to a certain degree, an extension of Calvin, bringing Calvin's view of apologetics and epistemology to its purest form. How did he really represent a break with the earlier apologetics?

The historic method of apologetics was adopted from Greek or Roman culture. It therefore began with man and man's mind, man's reasoning proving God. Now, from the point of view of John Calvin, you begin with God and His infallible Word, and then you prove all things. If there were no God, there could be no proof. There would be nothing. And of course the essence of the non-Christian approach in any sphere is really nonsense. If you refuse to accept the Genesis account, for example, then you are going to say that chance somehow produced all things. The ultimate choices are God or chance. All other positions are variations of the

two. You can have a belief in fate or necessity, but how can you account for fate or necessity? Some pragmatists, some naturalists, have accepted necessity, and this is why they do not have a belief in predestination, only moment-by-moment fatalism.

Well, if you believe in chance, the alternative to the God of Scripture, then the whole of the universe is a vast series of the most amazing miracles because out of a universal nothingness, a primeval atom suddenly developed. Then that atom had a spark of life. That atom developed into all the vast universe we see now. This is a staggering concept. It boggles the mind; it boggles any sense of rationality. But, if you abandon God you are ultimately adopting unreason, total irrationality. This is why Van Til says repeatedly, that the rationalists end up in irrationality. This has been the problem. But men want to do what Carnell believed in, playing God. He said, "Bring on your revelations; if they do not meet the test of Aristotle's logic, the law of contradiction, then they are worthless."

Andrew Sandlin: Rush, what about the development after Calvin, before Van Til?

Those years did see the development of a thoroughgoing theonomy. It was taken for granted by many that the Word of God was always valid. Saurin, James or Jacob Saurin, stated that Antinomianism was really a ridiculous belief. He could not understand how any sensible man could adopt it. Well, in his day, a couple of hundred years ago, Saurin was regarded as the most Reformed and important preacher in all of Europe.

Today he is forgotten. When Saurin went to the Orange Street Church in London to preach (and I have preached there, I'm very happy to say also), Sir Isaac Newton, who lived next door, went to hear him. He said it was like hearing an angel from heaven speak, he was so powerfully impressed. But today the Reformed community doesn't know who Saurin was. This tells us how we have left behind a great portion of our heritage.

Andrew Sandlin: What are the implications of Van Til's apologetic method for evangelism?

The implications of Van Til's apologetic method for evangelism are very great. Because the sovereignty of God is denied in evangelism and the sovereignty of man is confirmed, the plea is, accept Jesus as your Lord and Savior, in other words, you are the sovereign person. And this has corrupted the churches so that churches, instead of being places where men come to worship God and to stretch their minds to understand His Word, now suppose the congregation is sovereign and the preacher and his preaching have to please the people. I could, and you could also, cite many

cases of people who have preached something, in an Arminian church, that was Scriptural to the core. No one could say that they departed an iota from Scripture, but, if he preached sovereign grace, a congregational meeting would be called and he would be fired from the pulpit, immediately. In fact, one man who preached on Leviticus 18 on sexual offenses, a very fine man, in Louisville, Kentucky, was dismissed from the church for preaching that sermon. No one could say that he had not been faithful to that chapter. One of the men that got up to speak against him, against the chapter that speaks about various sexual perversions, was himself, precisely, guilty of one serious offense. But he got up to say, very emotionally, that it was a terrible thing when you couldn't come to church without hearing a sermon on a distressing subject no one should discuss in public. And of course, the preacher was blackballed by all other churches (he was a very fine pastor; in fact, about twenty or thirty of the books I have right here, the new books that I just received, came from him).

Andrew Sandlin: Rush, one of Van Til's students, in the '40s I believe, was Edward F. Hills, who made an application of Van Til's epistemology to the idea of the textual issue, of the text underlying our English translation. Do you think his understanding of Van Til, in his application of Van Til's views, was valid and do you care to comment on that issue?

Yes it was, and Hills — he and I corresponded over the years and talked on the telephone — was very bitter that Van Til had not stood with him when he came into conflict on this issue with some of the faculty there. And I think Stonehouse, in particular, was a leader against him. Van Til sided with the faculty against Hills. But he told me himself, many years later, that he had come to realize that Hills was right and asked me to pass that on to Hills. What Hills did simply was to take a presuppositionalist method and apply it to the text of Scripture. Now, it is ironic that the Received Text was maintained in its integrity by Eastern Orthodoxy, whereas Rome insisted on making the Vulgate official and departed from the Received Text. Burgon, who was very Anglican, favored the Received Text. Well, the whole concept of the Received Text is more in line with the presuppositional, and the concept of the Received Text, which doesn't lack evidence, nonetheless says you begin with God and His enscriptured Word.

Andrew Sandlin: Van Til himself certainly was not involved politically but the whole idea of reconstruction derives from the antithesis between the Biblical method and the humanistic method. How were you

able, in your mind, work, and writing, to make the connection between Van Til's thoughts and the application of the faith to the political order?

Calvinism takes elements of Augustinianism and develops them. Augustinianism had a number of strands. St. Augustine was really the founder of the amillennial position, and the amillennial position, whether in the hands of Rome or Protestantism, leads to a stress on the church more than anything else. Because if there is no hope, and the world is going to go downhill progressively, then you do not stress reconstruction, you do not stress the law of God. You simply wait for the end. So it really is a kind of premillennialism without any hope. The world is going to get worse, and worse; but instead of a rapture, there's going to be the end. The Augustinian position, although it did not triumph in the theology of Rome, triumphed in its ecclesiology. The church is built on the premise it is the all-sufficient ark of salvation. And while the Bible does compare the church to the ark, it doesn't say the Kingdom of God is only in, not outside, the church. The Kingdom is more comprehensive than the church.

If you follow the Reformed perspective, which is implicitly in Calvin postmillennial, you see that his commentary on Daniel and many things in Isaiah point to an eschatology of victory. He never got into the subject of eschatology because he had too many other battles to wage. In that first generation, the main reformers did not get into eschatology. But hard-core Calvinism has always been postmillennial. It has implicitly manifested itself in the Westminster Standards and the Savoy Declaration: it is openly present there, as you know very well. This meant that the early Calvinists, although they did not have a single major ruler on their side, were marching to the conquest of Europe, with the Reformed faith. It was King James I of England, supposedly a Calvinist, covertly an Arminian, who worked against the grand strategy of the Calvinists; and the Thirty Years War, of course, did irreparable damage. Between the two it enabled the Arminians, whom you could call neo-Catholics, to conquer. In the Netherlands it was the Calvinists who were really responsible for the victory against the Spanish Empire. They were the ones that provided the backbone, the uncompromising faith. I recall, fifty to sixty years ago, reading something (I've not been able to locate or remember the source, it could have been oral from some Dutch friend . . .) on how in one particular community, the Spanish forces, occupying the community, took the Calvinist leaders and burned them at the stake. They made the people stay and watch it. And when they were dead, or no more than ashes, it started to rain. The people stood there in the rain; they did not leave. It was all over, and they could have left, but they waited until the rain had made the ashes cold; they went up, took the ashes, and wrapped

them in a handkerchief to put on the fireplace mantles in their homes, so they could tell their children and their grandchildren, "This is the way a Christian lives and dies."

Calvinism was seen as a great threat by rulers. It produced men who would not waver, men who stood their ground, and they were regarded as the outlaws of Europe. There was a remarkable clarity, too, in these men. When you read Calvin and you read Luther the difference is as between night and day. Luther can very often be interesting as he digresses all over the landscape. He wrote a book on the annunciation to the Virgin Mary. As I recall, it is 90–120 pages, and he wanders all over the landscape, whatever pops into his mind he comments on, and you do learn a lot of interesting things . . .

Andrew Sandlin: Very unsystematic though . . .

Very unsystematic. But Calvin marches. The other writers were very prone to be wordy and to get very personal, insulting one another. The grand master of the most vicious kind of insulting was Sir Thomas More, who was scatological in his insulting. Now, Calvin never indulged in that . . . on one occasion he was tempted to, and it was after Pighius, I believe, had become very viciously personal and attacked Calvin and his doctrine of predestination. So Calvin was getting ready to go after Pighius as a stupid nonthinker and an arrogant character, but just as he was about to start writing his answer, one of his two great treatises on predestination, he received word that Pighius had died. So he started off his treatise by saying he had, he confessed, intended to answer Pighius personally, but he had now, having received word of his death, decided against it, lest, he said, "I be accused of kicking a dead dog." You didn't tangle with Calvin with impunity because if he wanted, he could cut you down to size.

Now, the English Puritans were not as strictly Calvinistic as one would wish, but those who were, like John Owen, have that same clarity of writing. And the same is true of Bishop Ussher. Wherever you find a good, hard-core, consistent Calvinism among the seventeenth-century English writers, you find that there is a systematic, clear-cut style; but the Puritans, who were Calvinistic up to point, would meander and they would get into psychological analysis.

Andrew Sandlin: You mentioned earlier Augustinian ecclesiology. Does it disturb you that a number of professed Reconstructionists have developed a very high-church ecclesiology, much like one that you mentioned earlier in this discussion?

Yes, without going into any of them by name, you find that there are

serious defects, as you've pointed out, not only in their ecclesiology but in the soteriology, and, as a result, they have incorporated an element of mysticism into their thinking. If you don't begin and end with a Reformed perspective, you're going to go astray.

Andrew Sandlin: One of them developed a hermeneutical method that is more closely tied to patristic symbolism. Do you find that dangerous, given the Reformed emphasis on grammatical-historical interpretation?

Yes it is. Some of these so-called Reconstructionists relied heavily on some Eastern Orthodox thinking. Alexander Schmemann had an undue influence on some of these men. As a consequence, they have aspects in their thinking that really depart from Reformed premises. You cannot take a smorgasbord approach in theology. There are too many that want to do this . . .

Andrew Sandlin: Yes.

No more than you can incorporate a series of beautiful women, other than your wife, into your home — can you borrow seemingly lovely but erroneous premises into your theology.

Andrew Sandlin: Yes. Being postmillennial, we can't limit the work of Van Til to the past. What can we appeal to, in Van Til, to help us for the work of reconstruction in the future?

First of all, Van Til was nominally amill. In reality, the implications of his thinking were postmill, and in *Jerusalem and Athens*, I believe it was, I think Greg Singer, who is amill, said that Van Til's thinking was implicitly postmill. Van Til never contradicted him, because, *first*, he did not want to get into areas that were not a part of his expertise and, *second*, he was not denying that the implications were such. Now, let me see . . . I went astray in my thinking . . .

Andrew Sandlin: Oh, yes, I was asking about how we can employ Van Til's thought for the future in the task of reconstruction.

Well, of course, I've cited as a basic premise Van Til's statement that the choice is between autonomy and theonomy. Now, the essential premise of reconstruction is that in every sphere, we apply the whole Word of God. And this is precisely what Van Til did. Whether it was in the area of the psychology of religion or Christian-theistic ethics or apologetics, in every sphere, *systematic theology*. You began and you ended with the Word of God. Well, this is what we've got to convince the church that

they must do. They may not do anything else without endangering the Christian faith. Their failure to do so has led them astray and has led to the radical impotence of the church today. It does not have the impact on the country that it should.

There is no group in the United States more powerful numerically than the Christian community. And I'm speaking of only those who profess to be Bible-believing. A good many years ago, someone who had been an active member of the Communist Party, told me that their actual working membership was about 1/10 of 1 percent of the population. But their power in the universities and in Washington was very great, *because they were consistent and systematic*. They applied their faith rigorously. I recall one of the FBI men, whom I knew in southern California, giving me one volume from, I believe, a longshoreman's personal library, a book by Karl Marx. The man had turned informant. What I found out, from this agent, was that to join the party took more than a desire to be a Communist. You had to study the writings of Karl Marx and pass a very strict examination. You were drilled by the teachers. You had to learn exactly what you believed. Well, there's nothing comparable to that in the modern church. It used to be that, across the board, the churches had a confirmation class. It has virtually disappeared. Lutherans still have it to a degree and so do Catholics, but it's become pablum, whereas at one time, whether you were a Presbyterian or whatever you were, you, as a teenager (and it was comparable to the Jewish Bar Mitzvah) had to be a mature person in Christ; you had to pass a strict course of study.

That's gone now. Once you had more mature Christians. You had people who could understand serious preaching. Well, if we go back to Van Til's position, we are again going to stress that. Now, one of the things the older churches in the Reformed tradition did, the Dutch in particular, was to devote Sunday evenings to preaching on the confession or the catechism. It's still done, but in most cases very much watered down. A marvelous collection of Sunday evening sermons by one such Reformed preacher was published two or three years ago. The title is *The Joy of Life*. It's one of the most beautiful volumes to read. But that's a minority thing now. With that kind of training there could be mature preaching. Now it's pablum.

Andrew Sandlin: What are the specific areas of thought or disciplines that you would recommend that younger Reconstructionists get involved in and apply Van Til's views?

Now, Van Til was a systematic thinker to the core of his being. We have to be systematic also. One of the things I learned very early as I studied

the church fathers (back in the 30s I read them extensively . . . Nicene and Ante-Nicene fathers) was that these men (I don't say that they were consistent always in their thinking) preached the Bible systematically. If you check those volumes, you'll find that there will be a series of sermons on Matthew, or on Job, or on Isaiah, or on Corinthians, and so on. They would simply march through the Bible systematically. Well, I felt that had to be the way one should preach. As a result, after I left the Indian reservation, where my preaching was more on specific subjects in order to bring them up to a level (and I'm not sure now I shouldn't have done it systematically there, too), when I came back to California, I began with the Sunday evening services, to go right straight through a book. And I subsequently did that when I started in the OPC and, in particular, in the Tuesday morning Bible studies. But I also did it at the church. Dorothy was remarking yesterday on how marvelous those sermons were, and she thought for sure it was going to be dull when I hit the chronologies of 1 Chronicles. But, she said, it was some of the most inspired preaching I've ever done. Well, I don't remember what I said; but I know that I studied all, and I was amazed at the richness that there was just in those genealogies. But this is what I do now, in my preaching. I finished going from Exodus through Deuteronomy; before that it was Romans and Galatians; right now it's the Gospel of John. And of course, in the Thursday evening Bible study, I'm going through Genesis.

Andrew Sandlin: Rush, one aspect of the genius of [Christian] Reconstruction is its ability to wed sound thinking and theology to godly action. John Upton, who is here with us, is involved in a number of endeavors like that. Do you care to comment on that aspect of the task of reconstruction?

Yes, one of the things that distressed me very early was that we have a paper Christianity. Churches, whether they're modernist of Arminian or Reformed, will issue paper pronouncements. They assume that paper statements are enough. We need a return to an active Christianity. Salvation must lead to action, to service.

178

DR. CORNELIUS VAN TIL

Chalcedon Report No. 358, May 1995

WHETHER men like it or not, the whole world will never by the same because of Cornelius Van Til. The thrust of his writings present man with an ultimatum: if you do not begin and end with the triune God of Scripture, then it will be man, man's reason, or some other facet of creation. Like Joshua of old, Dr. Van Til's summons to men was this: "choose you this day whom ye will serve" (Josh. 24:15). For men with a divided allegiance, or with a lust for philosophical or theological respectability, this was most offensive.

I once had Dr. Van Til speak to ministers and laity here in California in the 1950s. It took some effort to get a goodly number of the clergy there. The meeting was held in a Methodist church in order to make it more "neutral," and I consented to the arrangement. Van Til preached a very eloquent sermon on 1 Corinthians 1:18–31. He spoke powerfully of the hostility to the pure gospel as foolishness and a stumbling block to men but as truly the power and wisdom of God. When it was over, men and women told me at the door that they had never heard the gospel preached more powerfully and clearly. The ministers, gathered at the front, told me that the meeting was a disaster, that Van Til was "too philosophical" to understand. Their problem was that they understood him too well. Van Til might be difficult to follow as a theologian-philosopher because of some technical language, but, as a preacher, he was a master of clarity and power.

Cornelius Van Til was a giant of the faith, one of the greatest men in the history of Christianity. Many in the United States are doing their best to forget him, but his influence keeps expanding. His books are mainly no longer kept in print, although he, over the years, refused to take royalties on his books to facilitate their continued printing. All the same, people are Xeroxing them and treasuring them.

Van Til's *Christian Theistic Ethics* can be called a key work in prompting Christian Reconstruction. His *Defense of the Faith* has been to countless numbers their introduction into the freedom and the power of Van Til's thinking. One book after another has been seminal in opening new areas of Biblical insight and application.

What is needed now is massive funding to bring out the collected works. There are important and as yet unpublished works that should be made available, and out-of-print works that need reprinting. Ross House Books has available two works on Van Til, a symposium, *The Foundations of Christian Scholarship*, edited by Gary North, and my work on his thinking, *By What Standard?* But more is needed.

Van Til's future influence is assured. The question which remains unanswered is whether American Christianity will be judged for its neglect of him, or whether Van Til's influence will become a part of its renewal.

179

A LETTER ON LOGIC AND IDOLATRY

Published under "Letters on Van Til, Clark, Logic, and Idolatry" in Chalcedon Report No. 361, August 1995

DEAR ———

Greek philosophy, the fountainhead of rationalistic apologetics, began with the ultimacy of chance; its god was simply a limiting concept whose purpose was to evade the idea of an infinite regress. As I pointed out in my *Systematic Theology*, abstract ideas were the ultimates for the Greeks, not God nor gods. Rationalistic theologians hold that God must operate *under* the law of noncontradiction, i.e., abstract logic being ultimate, not God.

But such theologies and philosophies are irrational because apart from the Creator God we have *billions* (if not more) of chance-accidents creating the universe, bigger miracles than the Bible reports! — and totally irrational. Even Darwin confessed that he could not account for the eye by chance variation.

But God the Creator ordains all things, including any valid laws of logic. *There can be no other source.*

Aristotle's (and Carnell's) law of noncontradiction is an ultimate abstraction governing God, man, and creation. But no law in any sphere can have its source in or over any sphere but from God only.

In other words, do you believe that *before God and over God* Aristotle's laws of logic existed from all eternity to govern God? I submit that such a belief is both irrational and blasphemous.

In Christ,

R. J. Rushdoony

180

VAN TIL'S CHRISTIAN THEISTIC ETHICS

Chalcedon Report No. 363, October 1995

Dr. Cornelius Van Til came from an amillennialist church, but, at Princeton, he was close to the old American postmillennialism, which also marked Machen. When a friendly critic spoke of Van Til's implicit postmillennialism, I asked him about it. He avoided comment, because, he said, it was out of his field of study, and he had enough battles on his hands already.

It can be said, however, that Van Til's *Christian Theistic Ethics* (1947) gives as solid a theological foundation for an eschatology of victory as possible. Of course, Van Til's basic premise that we have but two alternatives, "theonomy or autonomy," God's law, or self-law, is basic to Christian Reconstruction. For Van Til, "man's chief end is to glorify God and to enjoy Him forever." Thus, "Calvinism is Christianity come to its own." (All citations are from *Christian Theistic Ethics*.)

Van Til does not begin his study with some texts on "the ethics of Jesus." Rather, his starting point is the atonement at Calvary; God's law having been broken, God become flesh makes atonement for us. Apart from this blood atonement and the broken law, we cannot have a truly Christian ethics. The ethics of Jesus cannot be separated from the person of Jesus, and what He came to do. "For non-Christians there is really no redemptive principle anywhere in the world." For us there is Jesus Christ. For non-Christians, we are all surrounded by an impersonal environment, whereas for us as Christians, God is our total environment—we live, move, and have our being in Him. The non-Christian lives in an impersonal, neutral world, whereas we live in God's world and under God's law.

Man's *summum bonum*, his highest good, is the Kingdom of God, "the realized program of God for man." Man must "realize himself as God's vicegerent in history." He is the head of creation under God.

Non-Christians take existence, as it now is, as being normal, whereas the Christian knows it to be *fallen* and in need of redemption. Fallen man dreams of utopias in which men are changed by controls and laws, whereas the Christian knows that only atonement and regeneration can create a new man and a new society. For the non-Christian, "Sin is thought of as something that can easily be removed by changing man's environment." On top of this, for non-Christians, "The idea is still that one can really live in no other way than at the expense of others." (Politics as a result becomes expropriation.) Modernism affirms the Kingdom of God, but as man's work, and separated from the grace of God, whereas for Christians it is the gift of God's free grace as we serve Him faithfully. Sin must be destroyed and God's righteousness or justice upheld. If God is what Scripture affirms, "sin must be absolutely destroyed": "The individual believer has a comprehensive task. His is the task of exterminating evil from the whole universe. He must begin this program in himself. As a king reinstated it is his first battle to fight sin within his own heart. And this will remain his first battle till his dying day." We know that "our victory is certain."

God called Israel "to be an absolutely *God-directed people*." This call applies now to Christians, and all peoples are summoned to be so ruled, to be theonomic.

Our faith must begin, *first*, with creationism. Christ has a cosmic significance. He is our Creator-Redeemer. *Second*, we must recognize that man is fallen and in need of redemption. Man is a sinner. *Third*, atonement means the vicarious sacrifice of Jesus Christ, the Lamb of God. Christianity is "restorative," i.e., clarifying and reestablishing the faith of the Old Testament, and "supplementary," bringing it to its fullness in the person and work of Jesus Christ. The goal of the Kingdom is, *first*, the destruction of evil. *Second*, this gospel of the Kingdom is to be preached to all nations because it is for all the world. It is thus, *third*, a Kingdom of hope. As Van Til stresses, "There is no alternative but that of theonomy and *autonomy*." Is it any wonder that Arminians and antinomians found Van Til objectionable, or that his *Christian Theistic Ethics* is too seldom mentioned?

It should be apparent now that Van Til's work was foundational to Chalcedon.

(Those interested in reading more on Van Til can read R. J. Rushdoony, *By What Standard?* and *Foundations of Christian Scholarship*, edited by Gary North.)

There is a great need to republish Van Til and to bring into print his as yet unpublished works. This would be a very expensive project, but one with an impact for generations to come. Are you interested?

FAITH & ACTION

Volume 2



FAITH & ACTION

VOLUME 2 • GOVERNMENT, EDUCATION & SOCIETY

the Collected Articles of

R.J. RUSHDOONY

from the CHALCEDON REPORT, *1965–2004*

ROSS HOUSE BOOKS

CHALCEDON / ROSS HOUSE BOOKS
VALLECITO, CALIFORNIA

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 2

Cultural Conflict

181 We Are at War 583
182 The Necessary Future 588
183 Christ Versus Satan 590
184 The Cultural War 593
185 The War Against Christ's Kingdom 595
186 Humanism and Christ's Kingdom 601
187 The New War on Religion 606
188 Selling Out Christ 610
189 Detente 612

Law

190 Autonomous Man 617
191 Abelard 620
192 Covenants and Law 623
193 Covert Theonomists 626
194 Law and Sin 628
195 Freedom Under God's Law 631
196 The Power of Heresy 633
197 Natural Law 635
198 Necessity Versus Law 638
199 Justice and the State 641
200 The Modern State, an Ancient Regime 644
201 Social Justice 647
202 Injustice in the Name of Justice 650
203 Restitution 653

204 Two-Cow, No-Cow Justice 656
205 The Fifth Amendment 658
206 Social Unrest 662
207 What Is Law? 666
208 Jesus and the Tax Revolt 670
209 Reacting Instead of Acting 673

Economics

210 The Economics of Death 677
211 Towards a Biblical Economics 682
212 Are We Using Language to Confuse Ourselves? 685
213 Capitalization and Decapitalization 687
214 Capitalization Is the Product of Work and Thrift 691
215 Laissez-Faire 693
216 Rewards and Punishments 696
217 A Chicken in Every Pot 698
218 Economic Confiscation 700
219 Inflation 705
220 Debt 709
221 Devaluation 712
222 Socialism and Inflation Both Decapitalize an Economy 715
223 God, the Devil, and Legal Tender 717
224 God and Mammon 720
225 Covenant Wealth 723
226 Is Wealth Moral? 725
227 The Budgetary Process 727
228 Taxation as Revolution 730

Society & Classes

229 The Mystery of the Social Order 737
230 Religion and Culture 740
231 No Part-Time Christianity 742
232 The City 744
233 The City and Order 749
234 The Dark Ages Defined 752
235 Plague 754
236 Grim Fairy Tales 758
237 The Humanistic Myth 764
238 Get a Horse? 770

239 Imitation 775
240 The Worship of Feeling 782
241 Revealing Ourselves 785
242 The Artist as the Prophet of Rebellion 787
243 The Grand Opera Life 791
244 Incarnation, Life, and Art 793
245 Art and Culture 795
246 Art: Christian and Non-Christian 798
247 Dating 802
248 Sports and Culture 805
249 Estate and Calling 807
250 Women and Children First? 810
251 Responsibility and Change 812
252 Counter-Counter Culture? 817
253 Justice and Purpose 823
254 Necessary Roles 826
255 Outlaw Social Goals 829
256 Snake-Oil Peddlers 832
257 The New Barbarians 834
258 World Weariness 836
259 On Spontaneity 838
260 The Lust for Instant Gratification 840
261 The Bond of Guilt Versus the Bond of Faith 842
262 The Silent Majority and Decapitalization 844
263 The Religion of the City 849
264 Agriculture 853
265 Sex and Culture 858
266 Present Orientation 863
267 Drifting Classes 868
268 Class 873
269 More on Class 877
270 Future Orientation 881
271 Permissiveness and Class 886
272 The Governing Class 891

The Family

273 The Family as Government 897
274 The War Against the Family 899
275 Family Law 901
276 Molech Worship and Baptism 904

277 The Family 907
278 The Family 909
279 Culture Versus Faith 911
280 Faith and the Family 913
281 Family and Government 916
282 Family and Civilization 919

Education

283 The Church and the School 925
284 Dr. Franklin Murphy's "Cultural Awakening" 926
285 Grammar and Faith 928
286 The Meaning of Accreditation 930
287 Classical Education? 932
288 Classical Learning and Christian Education 934
289 Education and Law 936
290 The Necessity for Christian Schools 938

American History

291 Biblical Faith and American History, Part 1: The Past 943
292 Biblical Faith and American History, Part 2: The Present 949
293 Biblical Faith and American History, Part 3: The Future 953

Politics & Government

294 Unconditional Love, Etc. 959
295 The Collapsing Right Wing 963
296 The Fallacy of Politics 965
297 Politics and Faith 967
298 Self-Government Under God 968
299 A Christian Manifesto 970

The State & Statism

300 The Ten Fundamentals of Modern Statism 973
301 Despotism 974
302 Why We Aid Russia 976
303 Predestination 978
304 Totalitarianism 983
305 Executive Privilege; or, the Right to Steal 988

306 Millers and Monopoly 990
307 Who Is the Lord? 993
308 Power Over the People 995
309 Are We Robbing Widows? 997
310 Do We Need a License to Die? 999
311 The "Right" to Abortion 1001
312 Privilege, Power, and Envy 1003
313 The Death of Justice 1006
314 Justice and the Law 1009
315 Law as Reformation 1013
316 Law as Regulation 1016
317 Law as Redistribution 1019
318 False Solutions 1022
319 War 1025
320 The Warfare State 1027
321 The War Threat 1032
322 The Laws of War 1034
323 The Case of the Mired Horse 1036
324 Reflections at the Close of the Twentieth Century 1039
325 The Freedom to Sin 1042
326 The Grand Inquisitor 1044
327 The New Inquisition 1047
328 Freedom Versus Security 1049
329 What Is Freedom? 1052
330 Equality and Freedom 1054
331 Slavery and Human Nature 1057
332 Freedom or Slavery? 1060
333 The Fear of Freedom 1062
334 The Meaning of Freedom 1064
335 Controls 1067
336 Failure of Statism 1070
337 The Search for a Humanistic Eden 1075
338 The State 1077
339 Dying Age of the State 1082
340 The State 1087
341 The Failing State 1093
342 The State and Simplicity 1098

Christian Reconstruction

343 The Reconstructionist Worldview 1107

344 Foundations 1109
345 Dominion 1113
346 Spare-Tire Religion 1115
347 Christians 1117
348 Faith and Society. 1120
349 Decay of Humanism 1123
350 "We Have Met the Enemy..." 1126
351 The Failure of the Conservative Movement. 1128
352 Is America a Christian Nation?. 1131
353 Should We Clean Up Television? 1134
354 Political Apostasy 1136
355 The New Power in the "Christian Right" 1138
356 Revolution or Regeneration: A Further Word 1140
357 First Line of Defense 1142
358 Education for Chaos 1145
359 "Seek Ye First" 1147
360 "For the Healing of the Nations" 1149
361 Valerian's Persecution 1151
362 This Is the Victory 1153

CULTURAL CONFLICT

181

WE ARE AT WAR

Chalcedon Report No. 159, November 1978

Although done without publicity and fanfare, a war against Biblical faith is under way all over the world, in varying degrees. The civil governments are in the main in the hands of humanists, whose passionate hatred of Christianity is intense.

This, however, is a disguised war. The Soviet Union, as a leader in the humanistic vanguard, began its history with a brutal and open assault on Christianity. Later, for strategic reasons, this gave way to another approach, attack by indirection, a method adopted from Nazi and Swedish practices. The Soviet constitution guaranteed freedom of religion to allay fears and criticisms, but it made this "freedom" totally subject to licensure, permits, regulations, controls, etc. In other words, the state supposedly granted a right while at the same time ensuring that it would be nonexistent. In practice, thus, there is no freedom of religion in the Soviet Union.

In the United States, there is a concerted effort to accomplish the same goal by the same means. The First Amendment guarantees freedom of religion. While the United States has no church establishment, Christianity has been from the earliest days the religious establishment, i.e., the determiner of law and morality in the United States. But, as John W. Whitehead points out in *The Separation Illusion: A Lawyer Examines the First Amendment* (Milford, MI: Mott Media), the U.S. Supreme Court decided by 1952 that "God was dead, and His church was dead." The remaining task was to dismantle the church and Christianity and to make way for the new established religion, humanism. Now that war against Biblical faith, designed to control, dismantle, and eliminate it, is under way.

It is a well-planned war. When virtually all fifty states embark on a common program, in unison, and appear with federal directives in hand,

it is no accident. Of course, they declare themselves innocent of any attempt to control a Christian school, church, missions agency, or organization, but this is the practical results of their requirements. These efforts are directed at present mainly against small or independent groups, those least able to defend themselves. Meanwhile, major church groups are not disturbed or upset. Legal precedents established against these smaller groups can later be applied against all others.

These demands take a multitude of forms: attempts to control church nurseries, the various religious uses of church buildings, zoning regulations, etc. Christian schools are told that they must pay unemployment compensation, seek accreditation by the state, use state textbooks, teach humanism, and so on. Catholic orders and Protestant missionary agencies are told that they must pay unemployment compensation also. The National Labor Relations Board seeks to unionize parochial and Christian school teachers, and so on and on. Now, too, there is a demand that Christian schools be integrated at a percentage set by the Internal Revenue Service, this despite the fact that such schools have not been involved in segregation. In another case, a church is being taken to court for firing a homosexual organist. In one way or another, all are being told that they must wear the mark of the beast (Rev. 13:16–18).

Fighting this battle is not easy nor cheap. The great pioneer and leader, whose victories in the *Yoder* and *Whisner* cases represent legal landmarks, has been and is Attorney William B. Ball, of Ball and Skelly. Mr. Ball is active in a number of cases currently, and during the summer of 1978, for example, was involved in cases in Kentucky and North Carolina. Attorney David Gibbs has formed the Christian Law Association (Cleveland, OH) and is also actively involved in cases in many states. The *C.L.A. Defender* is a magazine which reports on some of these cases and is available to supporters of the C.L.A. But all these men cannot continue without support. They are working long hours, and often sacrificially. Numerous new cases are arising weekly. Attorney John Whitehead of the C.L.A estimates that in a very few years, perhaps two or three, $500,000 monthly will be required to fight these cases!

The price of resistance is high, not only in money, effort, and abuse, but in many other ways. One pastor, facing the possibility of jail, spoke of the very real threat of gang rape by homosexual prisoners who looked forward to assaulting a preacher. It also means the animosity of the compromising churchmen whose conscience disturbs them and who therefore lash out against the courageous men who make a stand. I know that, when I support any who resist, I am usually given "friendly" warnings by these compromisers that it would be inadvisable for a man of my

stature to associate with such men, and I have no doubt that these resisting Christians are warned against associating with the likes of R. J. Rushdoony!

But "the battle is the LORD's" (1 Sam. 17:47), and those who are the Lord's will fight in His camp: they will not seek terms with His enemies.

One reason for the intensity of the battle is this: the growth of the Christian school movement is far greater than most people realize. If it continues at its present rate, the humanists fear that, by the end of this century (not too far away), the United States will have a radically different population, one made up of faithful and zealous Christians. Humanism will then perish. Moreover, the birthrate for humanists has been low for some years now, and the birthrate for various minority groups, even with the "benefits" of welfarism, is beginning to drop markedly from its earlier high ratio. But the people involved in the Christian school movement have a high birthrate. The Christian schools are producing the better scholars, who are going to be the leaders twenty and forty years from now. This is for them a threat, and a crisis situation.

But this is not all. Humanism is failing all over the world. The politics of humanism is the politics of disaster. Because humanism is failing, it is all the more ready to attack and suppress every threat to its power. The issue is clear enough: humanism and Christianity cannot coexist. Theirs is a life and death struggle. Unfortunately, too few churchmen will even admit the fact of the battle.

The battle is more than political or legal: it is theological. The issue is lordship: who is the Lord, Christ or the state, Christ or Caesar? It is thus a repetition of an age-old battle which began, in the Christian era, between the church and Rome. *Lord* means sovereign, God, absolute property owner. For us, "Jesus Christ is Lord" (Phil. 2:11): this was the original confession of faith and the baptismal confession of the Christian church. Now, too often, the confession, whatever its wording, seems to be a pledge of allegiance to a church or denomination, not to the sovereign Lord, Jesus Christ. Thus, our great need is to confess Jesus Christ as Lord, our Lord and Savior, Lord over the church, state, school, family, the arts and sciences, and all things else. If we deny Him as Lord, He will deny us. "Whosoever therefore shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven. But whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven" (Matt. 10:32–33). To confess means to acknowledge and to be in covenant with, to stand for in a position of testing or trial. The question thus is, will the church of the twentieth century confess Jesus Christ? Will it be His church, or the state's church? And whom will you and I confess?

The issue is lordship. Because we are not our own, but have been bought with a price of Christ's blood, we must serve, obey, and glorify God in all our being and our actions (1 Cor. 6:20). We cannot live for ourselves: we are God's property, and we must be used by Him and for His Kingdom. All too many churchmen are like the likeable and earnest young man, very active in a sound church, who insisted that he was "entitled" to enjoy life. A powerboat and waterskiing were his goals, and, in view of his support of, and faithfulness to the church, he felt "entitled" to enjoy these in due time without having his conscience troubled by the Christian school battles, and tales of persecutions at home and abroad. In brief, he wanted Christ as Savior but not as Lord. He wanted Christ to provide fire and life insurance, so that he could live his life in peace. But if Jesus is not our Lord, He is not our Savior. If we are not His property and possession, He is not our shield and defender (Ps. 5:12; 59:9, 16; etc.).

The philosopher Hegel, the spiritual father of Marx, John Dewey, and almost all modern humanists, saw the state as god walking on earth. The humanist is a very dedicated and religious man: he cannot be countered by lukewarmness. (Our Lord's indictment of the lukewarm is especially severe in Revelation 3:14–16.) The humanist's church, his lord and savior, is the state. The salvation of man requires that all things be brought under the lordship of the state. Hence, the current move against churches, Christian schools, and Christian organizations is a religious move, designed to further the humanistic salvation of man and society.

Because these attacks on Christianity are religiously motivated and are religiously grounded, they cannot be met by merely defensive action, or simply by legal action, although defensive legal action is urgently necessary. Our Lord is greater than Caesar: He is King of kings, Lord of lords (Rev. 19:16), and the Creator and Governor of all things visible and invisible (Col. 1:16). We must take the offensive as His ambassadors, His army, and His bringers of great and glorious tidings of salvation, to bring every area of life and thought into captivity to Christ the Lord. Of Christ's victory, and of the defeat of His enemies, there can be no question. What is at issue is which camp we will be in.

We are at war, and there are no neutrals in this struggle. The roots of humanism are in the tempter's program of Genesis 3:1–5, man as his own god, knowing or determining good and evil for himself. Those who claim, in the name of a false and Neoplatonic spirituality, that they want to rise "above" the battle are also trying to rise above Christ and the meaning of His incarnation. To stand for the Lord is somehow unspiritual and unloving in their eyes. They are like the fourteenth-century monks of Athos, who "rose above" the problems of their day and found spiritual

ecstasy and visions of God in contemplating their navels. When Barlaam condemned this practice, these loving, spiritual, navel-watchers arose in a fury (of love, no doubt), called a synod, and cited and condemned Barlaam and his party as heretics! So much for being loving and spiritual! We still have, in other forms, our navel-contemplators all around us, very much around us, but not with us. All well and good: let us donate them to the enemy. "If God be for us, who can be against us?" (Rom. 8:31).

182

THE NECESSARY FUTURE

Chalcedon Report No. 427, February 2001

This is a subject I discussed often before Chalcedon was founded, and in the early years thereafter. I then stopped because I assumed everyone knew of my view, but I find that this is not now true. Hence this brief statement.

In the pre-Christian world, apart from Israel, the state was the central *and saving* institution. Man's hope was a statist hope. The good and saving life was a statist life, and man was hardly a person outside the state. The statist man was hardly a man. In Rome in early years, foreigners dwelled outside its walls, which legally made them nonpersons.

Christianity challenged all this. It saw itself as a Kingdom with a King, Jesus Christ, and a lawbook, the Bible. Rome, normally tolerant of religions, could not tolerate Christianity because it was another and a rival state or empire.

The Roman Empire gave way to the Christian Empire, which was at first alien to cities as essentially pagan in concept. Feudal estates replaced cities.

In time, however, the Roman dream returned, now Christianized in the Roman Catholic Church. Europe now was a form of Roman Christianity, and imperialism. The Renaissance was an attempt to reform the Greco-Roman dream and to advance humanism also. This dream was for a brief time misunderstood by the Reformation and the Counter-Reformation, but, with the Enlightenment, the old pagan, statist dream was restored. We are now in the last days of the modern age of the state, and the twenty-first century will see it crumble.

What the Bible requires is the Kingdom of God, ruled by Biblical law, and Christ as the Savior-King. Attempts to make statism Christian are wrong. (Neither the Republicans nor Democrats deserve a Christian label.)

Both law and education must be Christian. Neither church nor state can save man, but both have their place *under* Christ and His Word, the Bible.

Our purpose must not be to capture church or state, but to place ourselves and all of society under our King.

Today, both church and state are full of people with a minimal belief. They acknowledge God because they want to go to heaven. As for obeying God, it means mainly no major thefts, and usually an avoidance of adultery. They are not under God and His law but in their minimal faith to gain heaven.

In politics, both parties pay lip service to God while excluding Him and His law from the life of the nation. To see either party as a Christian's cause is a *sin*.

This twenty-first century will see the collapse of the statist faith. It will be a disaster for Christians to pin their faith in non-Christian politics. They will then die with the statist culture.

183

CHRIST VERSUS SATAN

Chalcedon Report No. 452, May 2003

The battle of time has been between Christ and Satan. However determined the battle, the victory is assured, a predestined one recounted in the Bible. But neither Satan nor his followers believe in predestination by the sovereign and triune God, and therefore plan on and work towards victory.

Battle Strategy

Both sides have their strategy and their characteristic forms. Satan's realm takes the form of the City or Kingdom of Man, the concentration of all power and authority is in the hands of the creature, who is the determiner of all things. The tower of Babel is a key example of this. In Genesis 11:4, we are told that the builders said, "Go to, let us build a city and a tower, whose top may reach unto heaven." The purpose of the tower of Babel was to rival heaven, to exalt the glory of man, and to defy God to dare to rival their tower, a world center of government. The symbols of the Tower of Babel continue to this day. A poster of the European Community echoes it, and it is said that someone has written across it, "This time we will make it work."

As against this city-or-kingdom-of-man dream, from the tower of Babel to the present, the other goal has been the Kingdom of God. This is an eternal Kingdom without end, inclusive of all things in heaven and earth. Its government is under the headship of Jesus Christ; its law is the law of God, and of this Kingdom there shall be no end. Jesus Christ is King over all, King of all kings, and Lord over all lords (1 Tim. 6:15–16).

Satan's plan as set forth in Genesis 11:1–9 is "a tower whose top may reach unto heaven," i.e., challenging God's supremacy in the name of the

creature. Both in inventions and into space exploration, the Kingdom of Man challenges the supremacy of God in the name of the creature.

Names in the Bible are definitions, and Satan, as the pretended angel of light, challenges God as the true light-giver. The sovereign God, who is beyond definition, creates light in Genesis 1:3, and in John 1:5, we are told, "And the light shineth in the darkness, and the darkness comprehended it not," i.e., could neither understand nor contain it.

Perhaps the characteristic institution of the Kingdom of Man is the state. Now the goal of the non-Christian state is the control of man. Politics is the art of controlling other people, whereas Christianity seeks to *convert* them. When Christians fall into the error of seeking to control others, they have abandoned Christ for Satan. It can readily be seen that the kingdom of man is radically dedicated to controlling people. Its answer is to deprive of freedom, freedom to smoke or drink, freedom to govern their own lives, and so on and on.

Tyrants

The two kingdoms have salvation as their goals, but from differing perspectives, one from compulsion, the other from conversion or regeneration. We lose freedom as the kingdom of man prevails; its laws and regulations have no end, whereas the extent of God's law is only a few hundred, many of which are only enforceable by God. It is man who is the author of tyranny. Tyrants are rulers without God.

This is why antinomianism has always been so deadly. It frees man from the restraints of God's law to release him into the boundless numbers of man-made laws which can bind and limit man's freedom in any and every sphere. Man's law is a guideline into tyranny, whereas God's law is our charter of liberty.

God's law is the prescription for justice — man's law, for tyranny. All human lawmakers have an axe to grind, an agenda in mind, and man is the victim.

Moreover, the essence of God's law is its moral character. It provides an order and stability to society. Statist law leaves behind, in time, the moral nature of law to promote regulations for the benefit of some men and parts of society at the expense of others.

The laws of the two societies have differing goals. The kingdom of man seeks equality, fraternity, and brotherhood, among other things, goals which sound impressive in themselves but which in reality are not particularly moral. In the Kingdom of God, the laws are more precise and specific. For example, the law governing just weights and just measures

is precise and specific; it covers weights, measures, moneys, and more. It establishes a premise for honesty in several fields of measurement, and it ensures to those who follow it a viable standard. The influence of this law (Deut. 25:14–16, etc.) has been felt in the United States into the early twentieth century, in that gold was coined in terms of very strict measurements, the $20 double eagle being one ounce, 90 percent gold, and all smaller coins a fraction of an ounce with a similar ratio of gold.

All laws are the will of the sovereign power for the government of his people. Thus God's laws govern man, a human king's laws govern his people, and a republic's laws govern its citizenry. The question we need always to raise is this: whose people are we? If we are no more than the creatures of a state, then we must obey the laws of the state. If we are God's creation, we will obey His laws.

This presents us with a problem. We are both as Christians, members of God's Kingdom and of Satan's. We must extricate ourselves from the latter, not by revolution, revolt, or disobedience, but by faithful adherence to the laws of God and the laws of man. Thus, we pay our tithes and gifts to the Lord, but also our due assessments to our country's Internal Revenue Service. As we build up God's tithe agencies, we gradually undermine and erode the nation's alien towers of Babel.

We must be constructive. Much of what constitutes missionary actions today is actually the creation and propagation of Christian governmental organizations. We are currently engaged in rebuilding many areas of the world, as witness the work of many fine men and organizations. Every Christian and his home is a part of this extension of Christ's Kingdom.

This is our task. There is a great battle underway.

184

THE CULTURAL WAR

Chalcedon Report No. 404, March 1999

YEARS ago, I read the study by a medieval scholar of the great religious war of the ages, between the Kingdom of God and the kingdom of man. The writer scornfully concluded that the two alien realms were merging instead of warring. The church was becoming more like the world than vice versa.

In our time, the problem is more serious. Unbelief is robbing the churches of their status as part of the Kingdom of God. Too often, the seemingly orthodox take a loose view of infallibility, six-day creation, the atonement, and more. They are often more hostile to the truths of orthodoxy than to the modernists.

The attempt to merge the two cultures is a futile one, however, because good and evil cannot be reconciled. Men may dream of merging good and evil, but they create by their efforts only a more radical and explosive division.

God is eternally God: He does not change. Moreover, God is not man's creature. He is the same yesterday, today, and forever. We cannot lessen nor alter the truth of God. Thus, we have more than a few men who may agree with God's law "up to a point" but want to make it useful by adapting it to our times. But God's Word is not ours to amend with our "superior" wisdom.

We commonly hear ourselves better than we hear God, and we are much more in love with what we have to say than what God has said. After all, the essence of modernism is the belief that our experiences and our thinking far excel God's and, therefore, we must correct Him and His Word. Men make themselves God's editor in their arrogance! But ordination does not give man editorial supervision over God!

Years ago, as a student, I recall hearing a young ministerial student

discuss his version of the future of the church. As he saw it, as the church better expressed the noblest of human thought, it would in time become the world's church. It would purify and best express man's best side and create a true heaven on earth.

Of course, he did not believe in original sin, but rather in natural goodness. This is the dividing line. The culture of fallen humanity affirms man's goodness, whereas the Bible tells us of man's depravity. The cultural war between the two permits no reconciliation of their premises.

185

THE WAR AGAINST CHRIST'S KINGDOM

A Special Chalcedon Alert no. 1
Chalcedon Report No. 186, February 1981

The destruction and death of the Christian faith is planned and in progress by our humanistic statist establishment. This is to be a destruction by indirection, i.e., by regulation, licensure, and controls. Step by step, the controls are to be introduced and extended.

Recently, the Ohio Department of Public Welfare published a new set of "Proposed Rules Governing Licensure of Day-Care Centers." These rules propose to license and control all church nurseries, Sunday schools, vacation Bible schools, "church-operated" day cares, and "church-operated" preschools. These rules would make the welfare department the governing board over all these church activities.

Lest it be assumed that this problem is unique to Ohio, it should be added that like plans are under way in other states. In one major state, a welfare department official has stated that all Sunday schools will have to be licensed and controlled as child-care facilities if even one child attends at any time without his or her parents. (The same rule would apply to a church service.)

But this is not all. In all fifty states, child-control plans are being readied, to be introduced piecemeal in some cases, which undercut the family, the church, and the Christian school. The goal of these plans is religious, i.e. humanistic in faith: the purpose is to create a new generation. This new generation is not to be created through rebirth in Christ but by separation from the old corrupt generation and family, with its pollution of Biblical faith. In one state, "health" homes are proposed for all children, the implication being that the family is an unhealthy home.

This ties in with the recent insistence on giving recognition to the "voluntary" family, i.e., any group of lesbians, homosexuals, runaway youths,

or a sexual commune.

The child control plan includes a two-year national service requirement of all youth, male and female, between the ages of seventeen and nineteen.

The obviously *fascist* direction of all this is clear. Fascism is that form of socialism which retains the forms of freedom, of private property, and the church, while totally controlling every area of life and activity to accomplish the same statist goals of socialism. We should not be fooled by the professed horror of the establishment for Hitler and Mussolini. The fact is that the real patron saint of virtually all modern states is Mussolini.

Roland Huntford, in *The New Totalitarians*, describes clearly and accurately, in terms of Sweden, what this new totalitarianism (and fascism) is. The older model of the totalitarian state is the Soviet Union, a model in sorry internal disarray and decay. Its instrument of power was *terror,* total terror. However, with respect to its more able citizenry, even the Soviet Union is using the newer model, psychiatric brainwashing and punitive medicine (see Chalcedon Medical Report no. 8, and my article in the January 1981 *Chalcedon Report* on the medical model versus the moral model in law). This new totalitarianism relies on a state school system to control and brainwash the people, on the medical model of law, on the regulation and control of every area of life while maintaining the form of freedom, and so on. It is the new totalitarianism, a development of the old fascism. All over the world, it is on the march, and one of its main targets is Biblical faith.

The church is being reclassified steadily in the United States, as a part of this control, as a charitable, not a religious, trust. The position of the Internal Revenue Service, and, for example, of the California Franchise Tax Board, is that the Sixteenth Amendment (Income Tax) ended the First Amendment immunity of the church to taxation and control. There is thus, it is held, no longer a constitutional immunity from taxation, only a statutory one, revocable at will. Since the Sixteenth Amendment made no exemption for churches, an income tax can be assessed against them if the state so wills (November 5, 1979, statement of the California Franchise Tax Board to Calvary Baptist Church of Fairfield, California).

As a charitable trust, the church would be required to drop all discrimination with respect to race, color, sex, sexual preference, or creed. The church, it was held, in the case against the Worldwide Church of God, belongs to all people, and its assets, funds, and properties must be used for all the people, not just the members or believers. This will mean integration: an equal number of men and women in the pulpit and church

boards; it will mean the integration of lesbians and homosexuals into the church staff and pulpit. It will also mean equal time for all creeds: the church will have to give equal time to humanism, Buddhism, Mohammedanism, occultism, and more.

This *charitable trust doctrine* goes hand in hand with another doctrine, the *public policy doctrine*. This is held by the IRS and various local, state, and federal agencies. Whatever is contrary to public policy is thereby not entitled to tax exemption, nor to a free exercise of faith, i.e., to any legal existence. Thus, if abortion and homosexuality are held to be public policy, no group has a "right" to tax exemption, or to maintain its legal freedom to pursue and uphold its "discrimination," but must assent to these policies. *No better blueprint for totalitarianism has been ever devised than this public policy doctrine*. It is with us now. There is a lawsuit to remove the tax-exempt status of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States for its stand against abortion.

In other words, this is total war, and we had better believe it, and make our stand.

Together with all this, there is a campaign under way to give a new meaning to the First Amendment and the separation of church and state. Almost every day, the press carries attacks on the recent role of the church on the political scene. It is plainly stated that tax exemption requires silence on the part of the church, and that separation of church and state requires no comment on anything political by the church.

The fact is that the purpose of the First Amendment was to keep the church free to exercise its prophetic role with respect to the state and other areas of life. The clergy demanded the First Amendment because they knew that an established church is a controlled church; a controlled church is a silent church, and usually a corrupt one as well. The election sermon was then a routine fact before civil elections. The church was the prophetic voice of God, spoke to every area of life, including the state, bringing God's Word to bear on all things (see Chalcedon Position Paper no. 16, "The Freedom of the Church"). For the church to be silent is a sin, and it is a denial of its calling, and a forsaking of the very purpose of the First Amendment. The freedom of the church to apply God's Word, God's law and moral requirements, to the state is necessary for the health and welfare of the state and society. Today, as in ancient Israel and Judah, where evil rulers sought to silence the voice of the prophets, so now evil and anti-Christian rulers again seek to silence the prophetic word of God, and the church, the ministry of that Word.

To be silent in such a time is to deny the Lord, abandon the faith, and concede to the enemy.

Another thrust of statist action against the church is to limit the scope of the First Amendment immunity of the church. It is implied or stated that only the "purely religious" activities are under First Amendment "protection." This is very narrowly defined to mean little more than the liturgy of worship. The Christian school is called "educational." So too is the Sunday school. But it does not stop there. It has been implied that the sermon, too, is "educational"! This would remove all of these from any immunity from control.

This is, of course, the goal: *control*. Let us remember that more people are in church on any given Sunday in the United States than have ever voted in a national election. These people are a tremendous and potential source of power. That power began to manifest itself in the 1980 U.S. election. It promises to do more in 1982. This can spell the death of humanistic statism.

But this is not all. We may not agree with all the preaching on radio and television, but we do know this: there is a great deal of it! The preaching congregation is thus far, far greater than the very considerable number who are in church. It includes millions more, and many of these listen daily. This is a frightening fact to the enemy.

It should not surprise us that the 1980 election was preceded and followed by a very extensive newspaper and magazine attack on the church. Ironically, the church was portrayed as the new fascism by these champions of fascism! Such publications as *Playboy* and *Penthouse* joined in the attack, as did former Senator McGovern.

The saddest part of the story is the role of the pietists in the church. The more serious the battle becomes, the more they avoid it. Their idea of moral courage is to attack all those who are fighting for the freedom of the faith. These men seem to believe that spiritual exercises are a substitute for the obedience of faith. They try to vindicate their position, and their flight from battle, by stressing their superholy exercises and their refinement (not application) of doctrine. In some cases, these men will involve themselves in the battle — by appearing as witnesses against Christian brothers on trial. They do not hesitate to slander the men under fire, nor to cross over to the other side of the road (Luke 10:31–32); they want no "contamination" from the world.

The state is a religious fact. The state is, in fact, the oldest religious institution in world history. *Baal* means *lord,* or master, and Baal worship was state worship. *Molech* worship was a form of Baalism; Molech (or Moloch, Melek, Milcom, or Malcolm) means *king*; Molech worship, declared by God to be a very great abomination, is a form of state worship.

The state from antiquity has claimed to be *lord,* or *sovereign*. This is a

religious claim. It is an assertion of divinity and ultimacy. For this reason, the early Christians refused to be licensed by Rome, which involved declaring that "Caesar is lord" or sovereign. Instead, they declared, Christ is lord over Caesar, not Caesar over Christ.

The conflict of church and state ever since has been over this issue. Wherever the state claims sovereignty, it claims, after Hegel, to be god walking on earth. The modern state is the heir of Rome and Baal states in its claims to sovereignty.

The U.S. Constitution broke with European civil theologies by avoiding totally the use of the word *sovereign*. For the Founding Fathers, as John Quincy Adams later stated, that doctrine belongs only to the Lord God of Hosts, not to man, nor to civil government. The American civil system thus began with a religious rejection of sovereignty.

Nothing more clearly reveals the extent of apostasy and theological decline than the fact that almost no churches challenge the civil doctrine of state sovereignty as anti-Christian and blasphemous. Certainly, it is an example of the claim to be God; clearly, the attempt to control and govern the church (and to compel it to become an instrument of humanism) is something which should remind us of 2 Thessalonians 2:4: "he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God." Christ is Lord; He alone is head of the church; His Word alone can govern and command the church. For the state to claim that right is to declare itself to be man's true savior and lord. It means arrogating to the state the prerogatives and powers of none other than Jesus Christ. For any churchmen to be silent in the face of this is a denial of Christ.

For the state to attempt to license, regulate, control, or tax the church in any of its activities is for the state to usurp the powers and office of Jesus Christ. We cannot render unto Caesar that which belongs to God alone.

We have slipped by easy stages into the compromise which has made this evil possible. The church, we have been told, must serve man; it must be "responsive to the needs of the people." The goal has been to make the church more "democratic," more people, and experience-oriented and less theologically and Biblically governed. More than a few churches have boasted of "serving the needs of the community." Having been long governed by man, and by man's needs, the church has trouble seeing any problem in being governed by the state.

Perhaps the most powerful (and evil) movement in the church today is "liberation theology," a form of Marxism. In the name of human need and hunger, "liberation" theologians seek to liberate the church from God and to enslave it to man and the state. Given this softening of the

faith and theological mind of the church, the readiness to surrender in many quarters is understandable. Men who do not know the Lord will have no problem bowing down before, or surrendering the church to, the only lord they know, the sovereign or Baal state. Before Gideon could free Israel, he had to reject Baalism (Judg. 6:25).

In the Ohio situation, the proposed rules to control Sunday schools, etc., exceed the statutory authority given to the Ohio Welfare Department. The same situation prevails in numerous other states. As a witness for Christian schools, churches, and other Christian agencies, I have seen state officials acting with little regard for, and often little knowledge of, their own department's code, as established by the state (or federal) government. Their very obvious position is this: they see their office as a blank check to exercise total power. They thereby plainly assume the sovereignty of the state. Any resistance to them is seen by them as evidence of evil intent. These officials immediately assume dark and evil motives on the part of the resisting Christians: illegal goals, financial mismanagement, abuse of trust, and so on and on. A servile press, which depends on statist news handouts for its materials, echoes these charges with impunity.

There is no way out of this solution except with the Lord. He alone can triumph. The time has come to attack the very gates of hell: they cannot prevail, or hold out, against our King (Matt. 16:18).

186

HUMANISM AND CHRIST'S KINGDOM

A Special Chalcedon Alert no. 2
Chalcedon Report No. 201, May 1982

In January 1982, President Reagan introduced a bill into Congress to control ostensible racism in Christian schools, and to control the churches of which these schools are a part. No more evidence of "racism" was shown than two cases out of 538 investigations by the Internal Revenue Service. All the same, many thousands of institutions were to be radically controlled by the bill.

By March 1982, the president's bill was apparently virtually dead, but not the impetus behind it. Some states saw the introduction of similar measures, as well as other bills to place all Christian schools under state departments of public instruction. In one major state, a bill was introduced to give the state sole and exclusive control over all instruction and all instructional programs. This state's Department of Public Instruction, in its analysis of the bill, stated the following: "Instruction includes teaching, educational counseling, the rendering of advice on educational matters, or any other process by which knowledge is attempted to be imparted to any person by another. 'Instruction elsewhere than school' means the instruction of any person of compulsory attendance age which regularly occurs outside of a public school and other than as authorized or provided under the auspices of a school district pursuant to statute."

Consider the implications of this measure. Any non-state approved regular teaching of children ages five to eighteen would be illegal unless licensed, regulated, and controlled by the state department of education! This would include Sunday school; church services attended by those aged five to eighteen; nightly family Bible readings, teaching, and prayer; Christian schools, and more. At least one other state is trying to gain most of these powers by fiat regulation; at least one or more are planning

to do the same, and courts in many states are asserting the same powers.

The argument of many congressmen and senators who have defended the president's bill is (1) that tax exemption is not a privilege but a subsidy, and (2) activities contrary to public policy are not entitled to tax exemption. Both arguments are totalitarian and fascistic. The next logical step from these premises is to deny freedom to anyone who holds to opinions, or is active in matters, contrary to public policy, whether or not the activists are tax-exempt.

Religious freedom is not a grant from the state but the affirmation of the sovereignty of God, not the state. We are not "one nation under God" if the state can control religion. From the days of the early church, Christians have fought for freedom from state controls because Jesus Christ is Lord or Sovereign, and Christ is Lord over Caesar, not Caesar over Christ. That victory is now in jeopardy.

It is in jeopardy from two sources, *first*, from the assaults of humanistic statism, and, *second*, from churchmen whose voices always trumpet retreat and surrender.

One prominent man is justifying surrender to state licensure on the grounds of Acts 21:40; Paul, after the mob scene in the Temple, was taken into custody by the Roman captain. Paul asked for permission to speak to the crowd, identifying himself as "a Jew of Tarsus, a city in Cilicia, a citizen of no mean city" (Acts 21:39). To be a citizen of Tarsus meant that one belonged to an old aristocracy, with full burgess rights, which were respected in Rome (see W. K. Ramsay, *The Cities of St. Paul* [1907], p. 174ff.). This fact would have made the captain ready to be agreeable. Paul, however, may have meant that he was a citizen of Rome, which he was, a point the captain missed, to his later dismay (see R. C. H. Lenski, *The Interpretation of the Acts of the Apostles* [1944], pp. 896 ff.). Then, we are told, the captain gave "license" to speak, according to the King James Version; the word translated as *license* is the Greek *epitrepo*, to allow, let, or permit; it has no reference to formal licensure, and a military captain had no such power to license. That a man of learning would offer such a "justification" for licensure and surrender indicates in him and those who follow him an amazing intellectual prostitution and cowardice. These men refuse to comment on the many texts which tell us, as Acts 5:29 does, "We ought to obey God rather than men."

Meanwhile, one of the clearest indications of God's grace to the United States is that He is raising up an increasing number of men, all over the country, who will not surrender to Caesar. More than a few have paid or are paying a price for this. On February 18, 1982, in Nebraska, District Judge Raymond Case sentenced Pastor Everett Siliven of the Faith Baptist

Church, Louisville, Nebraska, to a four-month prison sentence on a contempt of court hearing. Pastor Siliven had refused to allow the church's school ministry to be licensed and controlled by the state.

What we are seeing all over the world is the rise of *fascism*. Fascism is a form of socialism which retains the forms of a republic and/or a democracy while rendering those forms meaningless. Open socialism proceeds to the outright ownership, "free" elections, and like things. Benito Mussolini, the first fascist leader, was a Marxist who learned his lesson well from Lenin and his associates. The Soviet Union, more openly socialistic, all the same adopted the forms it sought to destroy. It calls itself a Union of Soviet Socialist *Republics*, although none are republics. It uses the appearance of elections to ratify totalitarianism. It has a legislative body with no independent voice, unions which cannot strike, hold free meetings and elections, or do anything normal to a union, and so on and on. The Soviet Union has instituted history's perhaps greatest slave state (Red China is its rival here) in the name of freedom, and it presents itself to the world as the champion of freedom! Because all socialist states find it necessary to disguise their tyranny, they all become fascist in due time. A few Marxist journalists are belatedly waking up to this fact.

Like most modern states the world over, the United States is moving into fascism. Its excuse is the civil rights of people, the desire to further brotherhood, prevent injustice, and so on — the classic justifications for tyranny in every age. Limit freedom to gain worthy goals, say these apologists. One congressman has written, defending the president's bill, that the federal government must protect the "civil rights of all Americans, regardless of race, color, or creed," and hence controls are necessary. Presidential aide Edwin Meese feels that the federal government has the power to require, if it chooses, the ordination of women as pastors and priests (no discrimination), and of homosexuals as well; he does not believe this administration will take that step. To assert the priority of the Civil Rights Act over the First Amendment means that discrimination in terms of creed can also be abolished; churches and synagogues will then be required to give equal time to all faiths, to humanism-atheism, Buddhism, Mohammedanism, and so on. In at least one court decision, this is implicit.

The New Fascism, more than the old, seeks to justify itself in terms of every humanitarian idea, in terms of social justice, brotherhood, equality, and the like. In the process, it begins by destroying freedom, and then all the goals it claims to seek.

The major beneficiary, and the one continuing beneficiary, of the New Fascism is the state, the modern power state. The champions of the New

Fascism in civil government, the press and media, the university, and the pulpit are a self-styled elite who believe that their program of controls is the solution for all man's problems. They love controls, as David Lebedoff points out in *The New Elite: The Death of Democracy* (1981), because growth is free and uncontrolled. Risk, the entrepreneurial climate and necessity, is a horror to the new elite: they want a controlled world possible only in the graveyard.

Because the new elite distrusts representative government, it looks increasingly to rule by court fiats, and, as a result, the courts are more and more ruling the country. On top of this, "sweetheart suits" are increasingly used to sidestep any defense by the people. In a "sweetheart suit," one branch of the federal government, e.g., the Justice Department, sues another branch, e.g., the Internal Revenue Service, as the ostensible champion of some aspect of the non-statist sector, e.g., Christian schools. The real defendant is kept in ignorance of the trial until a decision is rendered. All this in the name of human rights! This is the New Fascism, together with bureaucratic regulations.

Huey Long, when asked if America would ever go fascist, said, "Yes, only we'll call it anti-fascism." We call reaction, reform; we call slavery, freedom; and so on. As Lebedoff says, "An elite is coming to power under the name of anti-elitism. Thus, every change in the rules was made in the name of reform. 'Openness' was the battle cry of those who closed things up. What the New Elite extols is precisely what it seeks to destroy" (p. 82).

Moreover, for the New Fascism, here as in Sweden (Roland Huntford, *The New Totalitarians*, 1971), justice is now equated with legality. The presupposition of such a view is that the state is god walking on earth, and therefore there is no truth nor justice beyond the state, or the "Great Society." What the state does is just, because there is said to be no God whose doctrines can be used to judge the state and its laws. At the foundation of the New Fascism is the denial of the God of Scripture and the assertion of the ultimacy of man (elite man, or the philosopher-kings), and man's humanistic state.

Such a view abolishes by fiat any higher law, and it denies any court higher than man's court. The denial of any law, of God, and of any court above man and the state is the foundation of tyranny. Statist fiats are then both law and justice. The vital nerve of resistance to evil, the faith in a higher good, the God of Scripture, is then cut, and darkness settles over the land.

Crime then ceases to be sin but becomes social deviation, a refusal to bow down to the modern Baal, the state. Then, too, the state, without God, ceases to be what St. Paul tells us God ordains it to be, a terror to

evildoers (Rom. 13:3–4), and becomes instead a terror to the godly. The state asserts and equates its control with justice, when Scripture tells us that it is God's law-word which is alone justice. St Augustine saw clearly, in *The City of God*, that a state without God, and submission to Him, is simply a larger criminal gang or syndicate.

The modern state is less and less a terror to evildoers, and more and more a threat to the godly. In Sweden, according to Huntford (p. 336), a state legal expert has said openly, "our aim is remove all traces of Church morality from legislation." The same goal is in evidence in one country after another, and certainly in the United States. Emancipation and freedom have come to mean to humanistic statism liberation from God and His Word into the world of the tempter, every man his own god, doing what he considers right in his own eyes (Gen. 3:5). This new liberation is ancient sin and tyranny.

This decade will see this battle develop with force and intensity. There is no neutrality in this war, and Christ recognizes none. There was a time when the most common painting, reference, and designation of Jesus Christ was as Christ the King. The Puritan battle cry was, "The Crown Rights of King Jesus." He is the Lord, the Sovereign, and we cannot surrender that which belongs to Him without incurring His judgment. If you are indifferent to what is happening to Christ's faithful ones, what can you expect from Christ the Judge? We dare not surrender to anyone that which is the crown property of the King of kings, and Lord of lords.

187

THE NEW WAR ON RELIGION

Chalcedon Report No. 149, January 1978

Alan N. Grover, *Ohio's Trojan Horse*. Greenville, SC: Bob Jones University Press, 1977; xv, 154 pp. Also obtainable from Christian Schools of Ohio, 6929 W. 130th Street, Suite 600, Cleveland, OH 44130.

The publication of this book is an important fact. It is the account of the attempt in Ohio by the statist educators to control Christian schools, and of the resistance to that attempt. It is, however, much more. What the Christian schools of Ohio came to realize, in their resistance, was that they were engaged in a major battle of an emerging war of religion, humanism versus Christianity. In that battle, the major agencies of church, school, and state are in the hands of the enemy, so that the battle lines, while clear-cut, give a confused picture insofar as the forces of Christianity are concerned.

The state or "public" schools are religious schools, earnestly dedicated to the teaching of the religion of humanism. In their minimum standards, their curriculum, their accreditation, standards, and policies for teachers and schools, and their stated purposes, they represent a faith alien to Scripture. Even more, they represent that faith which Scripture declares was first set forth by the tempter and which constitutes original sin: every man as his own god, knowing or determining for himself what constitutes good and evil (Gen. 3:5). It is indicative of the extent to which the churches have gone over to the enemy that CSO (Christian Schools of Ohio) had criticism in its stand from pastors and "Christian" schoolmen.

One of the opening guns of the assault on Christian schools was the case of the Reverend Levi W. Whisner (to whom this book was dedicated), who was ably defended by Attorney William Ball, already an established and great champion of Christian conscience. In the *Canal*

Winchester case, Attorney David C. Gibbs, Jr., began his active and extensive involvement.

At issue has been the claim of the state to virtually universal jurisdiction. In opposition to this has been the declaration of the embattled Christians that Christ's kingdom (*ecclesia*, or church) cannot be under anyone or anything, that the state, like the church and school, must obey Jesus Christ. What the state demanded in Ohio, and is now demanding in other states, is a single culture, a humanistic one. It became apparent in Ohio that even small and struggling Christian schools educated their pupils more ably than the state schools. Where the basic skills are involved, the Christian schools are clearly superior. The demand for controls and for accreditation is a first step towards creating a single and humanistic culture. In Ohio, the state's minimum standards require the promotion and teaching of humanism in every aspect of the curriculum.

As against this, the Reverend Levi Whisner held that a Christian school cannot compromise and must be independent. The regenerate man cannot place his school or children under the control of an unregenerate school system which promotes an alien faith.

What came clearly into focus in the Ohio battles was the recognition by the men of CSO that all education is inescapably religious, and a religious neutrality is impossible in education. Every school will implicitly or explicitly witness to and indoctrinate its pupils in one religion or another. The rise of humanism and anti-Christianity in the United States of America and throughout the world has been a result of state control of education, and the use of that control to promote humanism.

Moreover, although many churchmen have refused to face up to this fact, the courts have recognized and stated that secular humanism is indeed a religion, and Alan Grover develops the implications of this fact. What we have thus in public education is a state religion, the religious establishment of humanism. (To restore Bible reading and prayer to such schools would be simply to whitewash sepulchers. We do have, however, a considerable number of churchmen representing a major denomination of our time, the Church of the Whited Sepulchres.)

Grover analyzes the religion of humanism in all its forms, its two Humanist Manifestos, in the state schools, and in general thought. Its presuppositions are those of the tempter; its faith is anti-Christian, and its plan of salvation involves, among other things, the deliverance of man from Biblical faith. It is a religion of the "now," of enjoying life in terms of self-realization rather than in terms of faith in and obedience to the triune God. Humanism is hostile to all godly authority. As Alan Grover summarizes it, it is man-centered; it is "now-oriented"; and it teaches

faith in a world government as basic to man's hope. The Christian must not be "conformed to this world" (Rom. 12:2), and all state controls on Christian schools, minimum standards, accreditation requirements, and other controls have at root an implicit requirement and goal of conformity to humanism. (One of the most pernicious of illusions is the faith that bumbling, corrupt, and inefficient civil bureaucracies can set and maintain better standards for schools, medicine, businesses, or anything else than can anyone else. This view does not represent experience but rather a blind faith in the state as the omnicompetent agency.)

The issue, as Grover states it clearly, is *not quality but control*. State intervention or control does not produce quality; quite the contrary. Educators themselves view education as a means of social control. Grover quotes John Dewey to this effect again and again. The goal of the school, Dewey held, is "the formation of the proper social life . . . the securing of the right social growth . . . " and "the teacher is always the prophet of the true God and the usherer in of the true kingdom of God." Dewey's "God" is really humanity.

Education in origin was a church function; in essence, it has always been inescapably a religious function. The Christian school is a Christian ministry, and it cannot be made subject to statist controls without a denial of the faith. As Grover points out, "Professional educators have endorsed control of society through education, and they have sought to control all of education to implement their goal. They have been sought to control religion in their grasp for power" (p. 115).

In this battle between Christians and humanists, the courts have closely examined the faith of the Christian defendants. At stake has been the issue of motivation and faith. Are the defendants motivated by a preference, or by a conviction? If the decision is a matter of preference, the court refuses to honor the defendant's position. A man may prefer one course above another, but the alternative is then not an impossible one for him but simply lower in acceptance. Conviction is another matter: it is faith, and the conscience of faith. Conviction is grounded in the mandate and law of God, which gives us no alternative but to obey. Is the independence of the Christian ministry in church and school grounded on a total dependence on and an obedience to Christ as Lord? If so, it is conviction, when a man's faith and a life in conformity to that faith are in evidence. (It was clear to the Ohio Supreme Court that the Reverend Levi Whisner is a man of conviction, and hence his vindication.)

It is the expectation of major federal judges that one of the most common kind of cases appearing on appeal during the next decade will involve Christian schools. A battle is under way which will not disappear

simply because men choose to ignore it. The importance of this book is that it sets forth the basic geography of that battle, and, as a result, it is necessary reading.

It will be a major, if not the central, battleground because it will govern the future. If Christian schools continue to grow at their present rate, they will, in twenty years or less, have created a different kind of United States, one in which trained and informed Christians predominate, and one in which leadership will pass into the hands of Christians. The humanists recognize this clearly. This is the reason for their full-scale offensive in state after state to control and thereby suppress and destroy this strong and resurgent Biblical faith. What is at stake is, *first*, the life or death of Christianity or humanism. Whichever triumphs educationally will prevail. The humanistic state schools are a growing disaster. The only way that disaster can be prevented from bringing on the death of humanism and its culture is to kill off the opposition, the Christian school movement, through controls. This is a fight for life for both parties. If the state schools prevail, then the destruction of our children will be effected. *Second*, the future of the United States is at stake. Humanism spells the degeneration and collapse of any country it commands. The Christian-school movement is America's best hope for a Christian future.

In this developing war of religion, there is no neutrality. The delusions of neutrality are ably exposed by the Reverend Alan N. Grover.

188

SELLING OUT CHRIST

Chalcedon Report No. 319, February 1992

The conflict of the early church with Rome was over the issue of controls. Rome was ready to accept and license almost any religion on examination, because it believed that religion provided the necessary social cement to the social order, but it would tolerate no unlicensed religions. The early church rejected all certification, licensure, regulation, or controls on the grounds that Jesus Christ is the universal emperor, "the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords (1 Tim. 6:15). In due time, all men would confess Him, and all men bow before Him (Phil. 2:9–11). Caesar was therefore under Christ, not Christ under Caesar. Rome fought the church bitterly as an empire within the empire; the church and Christian groups increasingly provided better government than Rome in areas of health, education, welfare, law courts, and more.

Religious freedom and tax exemptions are the results of this struggle. The Christian ministries should be immune to statist controls as branches of a supernatural Kingdom.

All this some churchmen are ready to surrender. What some medieval popes, Protestant reformers, and some Puritan leaders fought for is now being forgotten by many.

There are increasing numbers of churchmen favoring some kind of vouchers plan for Christian schools. But the courts have uniformly maintained that, whatever any legislative act may decree, where tax funds go, state controls must follow. This will put the Christian school movement in the hands of the states.

Many state officials favor this move, and why not? They see the children slipping out of their hands; 40 percent now are in Christian and home schools, and it could be over 50 percent by the end of the decade. What better way to regain control over them than by means of some kind

of vouchers plan? What better way to nullify a great Christian movement than a payoff?

The churchmen who advocate vouchers are not honest enough to admit that this is a form of socialism. They virtually salivate as they describe what all they can do with the thousands upon thousands of extra dollars. They are going to do the enemy's work for him, and all in the name of Christ!

Judas sold out Jesus Christ for thirty pieces of silver, good, old-fashioned hard money. Our modern Judases are ready to sell out our Lord for paper, for debt money! Worse, they will not believe that they are selling out Jesus Christ.

If Christians will not support their churches and schools, they do not deserve to exist. Getting something for nothing is the premise of socialism, and the "something" that people get is the death of freedom and of faith.

The early church, an underground movement meeting in homes, created churches, schools, homes for orphans and the aged, courts of arbitration, and more. They were not a wealthy people. They simply believed that their faith was worth living, dying, and paying for. Our latter-day churchmen want the state to do the paying.

There will be a pay-off later, from Jesus Christ.

189

DETENTE

Chalcedon Report No. 196, December 1981

One of the central aspects of the modern age is the politics of detente. Detente represents a development with deep roots in modern philosophy and a close relationship to the popular culture of our time. In the 1960s, one expression of this faith was summarized in the maxim, "Better Red than dead."

It is important for us to recognize that this is a very logical, not an illogical, faith. It is grounded, not in cowardice, treason, or an evil design, but a humanistic religious presupposition. One of our key problems today is our unwillingness to face up to the basic premises of our position, and the positions held by others.

A humanistic faith sees the world as having evolved out of nothing, a product of chance development, and as having only those values imputed to it by man. There is no inherent or created value in life and the universe. Man creates values and imputes them at will to whatever he chooses. Man can thus give central value to progress and technology in one era and despise it in another, favoring instead of progress and technology, zero economic growth and the environment. The closest the humanist comes to an unchanging value is himself, and even here we have seen humanistic social orders sacrifice present man to future and ideal man.

In brief, humanism has no fixed and unchanging principles. It has no Jesus Christ, nor a Ten Commandments. Its standards are situation ethics; they are variable in terms of circumstances and human needs. Law too becomes variable: it is a product of man's experience and is thus a changing product of change. Over ten years ago, a frustrated lawyer remarked to me: the law books only tell me what the law was yesterday; the judge decides what it is today.

When we turn to Biblical faith, we are in a very different world. We

are here in the world of God's fiats and His unchanging Word. Biblical faith requires confrontation. In a meaningless world, nothing is worth dying for, and detente makes very obvious sense. If there is no God to declare that things are clearly good or evil, and that blessings and curses, heaven and hell, follow our moral decisions, then nothing is really worth living for or dying for.

In a meaningless world where nothing is worth living or dying for, men will be ready to do anything if the price is right. The presupposition then is this: the other side believes as little as we do in an absolute meaning, and thus they too will believe in compromise as a way of life. Both sides then enter into detente, each seeking to gain the utmost advantage from the situation. Both operate in terms of advantage, not principle. Without principles, detente is inevitable and necessary. It is a religious requirement of humanism. Wars do result, not because of principled opposition, but because of lost or imperiled advantages.

Biblical faith, on the other hand, requires confrontation. This confrontation can take two forms. The first, basic, and necessary one is evangelism, with conversion as the goal. To men without hope, it offers hope. Its power is the obvious witness to a life with meaning, or freedom, to a world of order under the triune God. This witness is both a personal missionary endeavor and a political witness as well. The dream of America once dominated the world and is still not entirely lost, despite our humanistic politics. The American Christian missionary presence is still a potent world force for Christ and His Kingdom. The evangelical impact on American politics in 1980 and 1981 stirs up daily wrath in the press and from politicians, because it reintroduces into politics a dimension which politicians largely have sought to avoid, moral confrontation. The hatred for all such evangelical groups is not because of their real or fancied blunders, but because they have reintroduced Biblical morality into politics. Since 1960, politicians have congratulated themselves on eliminating the moral dimension. John F. Kennedy saw future problems as simply technical ones. Richard M. Nixon, with his China policy, made central to American foreign policy the ancient and evil balance of power politics of Europe. The Monroe Doctrine, and, even more, the important but now forgotten Polk Doctrine, were aimed against the introduction of power politics into the Americas. All this was now forgotten. The United States abandoned moral considerations from politics. The age of detente had supposedly begun.

At the same time, however, Christian Reconstructionism was infiltrating one area after another. The Biblical mandate for every area of life and thought has been increasingly apparent to people, not only in the church, but in politics, education, the sciences, and more.

As we have noted, the *first* and primary mandate of Biblical faith is evangelism, with conversion as the goal. The *second* requirement is battle against evil. Battle takes various forms. A significant aspect of this battle on the current scene is in the church and state conflict, especially with respect to the resistance of Christian schools. The growing anger of the humanists against Christians has as its basis their inability to understand why these people will not compromise. For the humanists, the course of reason requires compromise. In a meaningless world, reason has no grounds for intransigence. How can there be irreconcilable differences in Darwin's universe?

True, there are humanists, usually conservatives, who take a hard line on things, but they do so on borrowed premises. There is no valid ground for a principled and unwavering stand on non-Biblical grounds; only traditionalism and nostalgia inform such behavior.

Ironically, this century of relativism and compromise is the bloodiest century in all of history. Humanism in essence has one "virtue," compromise, a coming together to bury ostensibly superficial differences. It also has one "sin," coercion, but it does love to sin! The spirit of compromise and detente is the desire to gain an advantage over the other party; it denies absolutes. Self-interest governs the coming together, and when the self-interest is violated or outraged beyond a point, self-interest demands coercion. The politics of compromise becomes the politics of coercion, because if nothing is worth living or dying for, then submission is the "reasonable" course for the opposition. The century of relativism and compromise has become the century of coercion.

The implications for law are great. If law ceases to be the instrument of principled morality, of good against evil, it becomes an instrument, then, of power, and the end it serves is power. Accordingly, law is less and less today a protection of our persons and freedom from evil, and more and more an instrument of statist power. The modern state abandoned God's covenant law to establish itself on the myth of the social contract, a detente between men to create a state ostensibly, but more a detente between men and the state. In that detente, man has been the loser. Only the return of Christian covenant man to the political scene will make the state the loser. Christ calls us to be dominion men.

LAW

190

AUTONOMOUS MAN

Chalcedon Report No. 150, February 1978

Autonomous man wants an autonomous universe: the goal is the independence of all things from God, and from one another. Of the Renaissance mind of Francis Bacon, Judah Stampfer writes, "When his negotiations are finished, the universe — the world of things — is in business for itself. We will shape, experience, and know it at out pleasure — let God be circumspect in His complaints." Later, Hobbes and Isaac Newton reduced reality to matter, to "eternally bouncing mini-marbles" (Judah Stampfer, *Face and Shadow* [1971], pp. 61–62).

In this materialistic realm, God had no real place. Man and the universe were in business for themselves. Instead of God's law, man's law (first of all royal law, later democratic law) is operative. Instead of all life and society under covenant with God, all things were seen instead as a contract between men. The covenant of God with man was set aside and denied in favor of a social contract, the contract of free agents with one another. As a result, civil government and law were grounded on a social basis; they were determined by men, not by God. The social contract led to social justice. Because the foundations of the state and of law are of human ordination, it was logically held that justice also must be of human or social origin; hence, true justice is seen in this tradition as social justice, socially determined.

When, in the first half of the 1970s, then Senator John Tunney of California was confronted by pro-life advocates, he defended abortion as moral *because* it was legal and the will of the people. He was then asked if theft would be moral if the majority of the people voted its legalization; the senator felt that then theft would be moral.

This is the logic of the doctrine of social justice. Justice is what man says it is. Man may be variously defined: as elite man, as the dictatorship

of the proletariat, as the democratic consensus, or as the majority, or as individual, anarchistic man. In any case, justice is what man says it is. As a result, we have Marxist justice, National Socialist justice, democratic justice, white justice, red justice, black justice, and so on, all forms of the humanistic definition of righteousness.

But this is not all. If justice is social, then injustice and evil are all things which are antisocial. Again, we have a term which can mean anything. Everything from communist propaganda to Christian missions can be called antisocial, depending on who does the defining. I recently heard opposition to abortion and homosexuality described as injustice and as antisocial activity.

How far gone this erosion of the doctrine of God's law and justice is appears clearly in the fact that so many churchmen speak of social justice and call any appeal to God's law legalism. Their doctrines of good and evil, and justice and injustice, are derived, not from God's law, but from man's law and man's doctrines of social justice and antisocial activities. Men may name God and Christ when they talk of social justice, but in reality they worship at alien altars, and they worship another god whose name is man.

But here is the irony and the built-in disaster of the social contract and its children. When man rejects God in favor of autonomy, he cannot arrest the principle of autonomy. Independence from God is followed by the independence of man from man. Humanism may seek a *social* order, but it creates an *anarchistic* state instead. The demand for autonomy from God is followed by a demand for autonomy from all law and morality, and from all men. Everyone has "rights" to autonomy and to a judgment-free world: men, women, children, criminals, perverts, all are to be autonomous, free from all controls and judgment. Some have even proposed the autonomous nature and "rights" of trees and wildlife.

But autonomy is an illusory dream for the creature. He is absolutely the creature of God, and his life is one of dependence and interdependence. The fulfillment of man's dream of autonomy is death and hell. The dead in a cemetery are the only people who are in any sense autonomous, and independent from the world around them. Social justice finally means anarchism and death. The only alternative to social justice is God's justice, or, in brief, God's law. In Scripture, righteousness and justice are the same word and meaning. God's law is true justice or righteousness. If men will not build on faith and on the obedience of faith to the law of God, they build only for disaster.

Social justice holds that man the sinner can define right and wrong and can set forth the meaning of justice. This is like asking a mule to be

fertile, or appointing a prostitute to be the guardian of virtue. Every doctrine of justice set forth by man the sinner will be an attempt to present sin as a virtue, and lawlessness as law.

Social justice does not exist. It is a myth. Every effort to achieve social justice instead increases injustice, because it enacts an illusion and an evil.

God's law, however, works to effect restitution and restoration, and it stresses responsibility. It does not express man; rather, it governs, guides, and protects man in terms of God's calling and purpose.

Men who move in terms of God's law are not guided by the social consensus nor by the majority. For them, God, not man, is the Author of possibilities and they move in terms of God's calling. Stampfer tells a delightful story of a relative, an immigrant fresh from Poland, who was at once employed in his first sweatshop job in the garment industry. After half an hour, he asked the next stitcher in Yiddish, "Please, exactly how much money will buy this entire establishment?" We need Christians with the same sense of confidence in God's possibilities. What God commands and requires is much more easily attained than that immigrant's dream. All things shall be brought into captivity to Jesus Christ, men and nations, the arts and the sciences. The only question we face is this: will we be a part of that victorious army, or one of the defeated?

191

ABELARD

Chalcedon Report No. 167, July 1979

In the world of Biblical faith, because all things are created by the triune God, all things work in terms of His will and decree. There is thus a total harmony of interests. Love and justice, grace and law, faith and works, and all things else have a common purpose and goal. In all non-Biblical faiths, a conflict of interests prevails, and the result is a radical conflict, for example, between love, law, justice, and grace, or a false peace between them.

Because this conflict of interests was basic to pagan antiquity, every revival of pagan thought was a revival of conflict. This conflict could be in any and every area, i.e., between mind and body, or between love and justice, because where God's eternal decree is denied, the unity is gone.

With Abelard, a major revival of Hellenic philosophy took place in medieval thought. The results were radically destructive, in the long run, to Christendom, because the doctrine of law was eroded. In Abelard, we see hints of the modern dialectic of nature and freedom, with nature being the realm of the law and of necessity, and the heart the domain of love, freedom, and morality. As John Gillingham, in *Richard the Lionheart* (1978), observed: "Peter Abelard could argue that those who crucified Christ had not sinned because they genuinely believed that they were acting rightly" (p. 43).

The implications of this position are far-reaching. *First*, the unity of man is denied. A man's acts and a man's heart are divided. If the heart be right, the consequences do not count for Abelard. *Second*, sin is no longer a matter of a violation of the law of God but rather of the subjective will and intent of man. If a person can plead, "I meant no harm," any man is justified in such thinking. God's law is not the standard by which man is then to be judged, but the condition of a man's heart is the final

test. Sovereignty has been transferred from God and His law-word to the subjective heart of man. *Third*, the implication is clear that man's heart is good, and that man's problem is not a fallen and depraved nature but inadequate or faulty knowledge. Abelard's presupposition is that the men who crucified Christ were naturally good men with defective information. Such a position assumes that men will act justly and wisely if they are provided with correct information; this view is in contradiction to all of Scripture.

Abelard's perspective is an honest statement of a position widely prevalent in the modern world, among unbelievers and churchmen alike. His view is basic to antinomianism and to anti-Christian faiths. It destroys the wholeness and unity of life and leads to defective and one-sided judgments in every realm. To illustrate, increasingly King John of England is regarded as an able and competent king, because his reign coincides with the beginning of bureaucratic recordkeeping on a larger scale. If we consider record-keeping in abstraction from life, we can call King John a great king, and American presidents all great men, and we will thereby prepare ourselves for our own destruction by a totalitarian bureaucracy.

Very plainly, the doctrine of law has been undermined in the modern world, because law is seen as something lesser than the heart of man rather than as an expression of God's righteousness. For the law to regain its due place in society, it must be seen as a theological concern. Law is not a statist product in Biblical thought: it is the revelation of God's holiness and righteousness. It is the canon or rule of life. Every word of God is a law-word, a command word from the Almighty.

Law is either revealed or made; it is either God's word or man's word. In any system of thought or faith, the source of law is the sovereign, lord, or god of that system. If the source be man or the state, then we have either anarchic, autonomous man, or the totalitarian state. If it be God the Lord, then God is the Sovereign, the Lawgiver. The basic step in humanism is the usurpation of lawmaking. This usurpation begins with the tempter, who, in Genesis 3:5, summoned man to be his own god, lawmaker, or legislator, knowing or deciding for himself what constitutes good and evil. The tempter was thus the first antinomian.

A professor of law, J. H. Merryman, in *The Civil Law Tradition* (1969), stated that "the age of absolute sovereignty began" when the state claimed that "the ultimate lawmaking power lay in the state" (pp. 20–21). There was then no law to control the state, because the state was now the author of all law. "The legislative act was subject to no authority, temporal or spiritual, superior to the state, nor was it subject to any limitation from within the state (such as local or customary law)" (p. 22). The state became, after Hegel, a god walking on earth.

Where the heart of man takes priority over God's law, then finally statist law rules absolutely over man to the obliteration of man, his heart, property, and family. The result is a conflict society, and the antinomian becomes the victim of the tyrant state.

192

COVENANTS AND LAW

Chalcedon Report No. 170, October 1979

One of the central failures of the church in our age is its retreat from the historic Christian faith in and reliance on God's law in favor of humanistic law. All forms of humanistic law, such as civil law and class (or Marxist) law, presuppose man's autonomy from God. Autonomy means literally self-law, i.e., man as his own god, determining for himself what constitutes good and evil (Gen. 3:5), as against theonomy, God's law. Humanistic law is leading to the suicide of civilization.

Basic to the church's error is its failure to understand the relationship of law and grace, and behind that failure is its neglect of the doctrine of the covenant. Covenants are treaties, literally, and they are of two kinds. *First*, treaties can be made between equals, or between two powers of varying strength, who agree on a mutual faith and law. Every covenant requires a common faith and law, and hence Scripture forbids covenants or treaties with unbelieving nations and peoples, or a covenant of marriage with an unbeliever (Exod. 34:12–16). To make a covenant with an unbeliever is to concede the validity of his faith and law, and to practice polytheism, to say that religions are equally good.

Second, covenants or treaties can be acts of sovereign grace by a supremely greater power to an insignificant one, and the covenant law is an act of grace from the sovereign to one whom he receives into fellowship by grace. The law then sets forth the life of grace. Such is God's covenant with man. God the Lord, as the total and absolute Creator and Sovereign, needs no alliance or treaty with His creatures. Such a covenant is an act of pure sovereign grace on God's part. Now, without law there is no covenant. The law sets forth the sovereign's requirements for the recipients of His grace, so that, instead of being in opposition to grace, law is concomitant to grace. When the Lord in His grace made a covenant, He also gave His law.

All too many churchmen in the past century have seen it as virtue to reject God's law in favor of man's law. Even so important a man as Abraham Kuyper, while waging a major battle against the forces of revolution, undermined the permanence of his own work by undermining the historic Netherlands' belief in Biblical law. He refused to ground civil government in God's revealed law. Instead, he held that civil government is an agent of "common grace" empowered with the coercion of the sword against lawbreakers. Thus, Kuyper sought the authority of the state in God's law-word, but he then turned loose an authorized state to make law by the democratic process. The authority of God's Word was thereby attached to the humanistic lawmaking of the modern state. Not surprisingly, covenantalism, with its law and grace, was soon in disarray and retreat, and the Netherlands became precisely the kind of revolutionary society Kuyper had opposed. The covenant was undermined by "common grace."

Throughout the Western world, in varying degrees and ways, the modern state was freed by churchmen and theologians from any accountability to God's law while at the same time increasingly stronger doctrines of submission to civil authorities were preached. At the same time, higher criticism began to challenge the authority and infallibility of God's enscriptured Word. Positivism in civil law began also to deny that any law exists beyond the law of the state, so that the "right" of the state became the final and only "right."

In 1943, John H. Hallowell's very telling work appeared, *The Decline of Liberalism as an Ideology, With Particular Reference to German Politico-Legal Thought*. Liberalism had replaced God with the state as the source of law. Then, by affirming materialism, liberalism placed the world, man, and law beyond good and evil, and all ultimate and absolute values were rejected. Truth and value, then, became relative to man, and thus to collective man in the state. A form of this materialism is pragmatism, which is basic to John Dewey's world, to modern education everywhere, and to politics. In Hallowell's words, "Pragmatism, like materialism, rejects absolute values, but it goes beyond materialism by saying that individuals are justified in acting as if certain things are true and good" (p. 89). Liberal or modern Phariseeism thus claims over all men a "right" which it denies in essence. The result was a "liberalism" which in practice became a despotism in Nazi Germany and is in the process of becoming the same thing throughout the world. National Socialist Germany was not an aberration: it was the advance guard of the Western liberal humanism. World War II was largely a family quarrel between competing versions of the humanist faith.

In all of this, the critical battle of the centuries, the church has in the main been studiously irrelevant. Instead of opposing autonomy with theonomy, it has hailed autonomy as the true light. (A telephone call yesterday from a very faithful adult teacher in a church reported a split and departure. A leader of the dissident group, attacking his teachings on election, declared, "You can take everything else away from my faith, but you can never take away my free will." In other words, Christ is expendable, but not my free will, my autonomy!)

Statist slavery thus advances in the name of man's autonomy. It will not be reversed by humanism nor by pietism. Only by a return to covenantalism, to God's covenant in Christ, and to the grace and law of covenantalism, will man be free. "If the Son [not 'free' will, nor the state] shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed" (John 8:36).

193

COVERT THEONOMISTS

Chalcedon Report No. 223, February 1984

One of the amusing facts I frequently encounter is the fact that many who are very much opposed to theonomy are in fact ready to insist on the validity of God's law — when it suits them!

Thus, a law I find strictly enforced in many churches where the pastor rails against theonomy is Deuteronomy 22:5, "The woman shall not wear that which pertaineth unto a man, neither shall a man put on a woman's garment: for all that do so are abomination unto the Lord thy God." The law is not repeated in the New Testament, and thus it does not meet the "test" of the antinomians that only laws repeated in the New Testament are binding on Christians.

The law against bestiality (Exod. 22:19; Lev. 18:23) is not repeated in the New Testament. Why, then, is it observed? It is clearly a "civil" as well as "moral" law. For that matter, if any civil law is immoral, it surely cannot be law in God's sight. The distinction between civil and moral law is not Biblical.

Homosexuality is clearly condemned in both Old and New Testaments. Homosexuals declare that such texts are now invalid because grace supposedly invalidates the law.

The point by now is clear. The opponents of theonomy affirm law after law in the Old Testament. They are at a hundred and one points covert theonomists. Their position is an awkward and untenable one, because, having rejected the law in principle, they sneak it back in piecemeal.

There is, however, another and more serious consideration. Dr. Cornelius Van Til has stated it very simply in declaring that the choice is between theonomy and autonomy. *Theonomy* (*theos*, God; *nomos*, law, the belief in and submission to God's law) cannot be reconciled with *autonomy* (*auto*, self; *nomos*, law, self-law). Autonomy is the logical

development of Genesis 3:5, every man as his own god, choosing, determining or making his own law and deciding what is good and evil for himself. Theonomy and autonomy cannot be reconciled: they represent Christianity versus humanism.

The covert theonomists are actual humanists, because they sit in judgment on God's law and decide which laws are right in their own eyes. Such a position is a surrender of the sovereignty of the triune God.

194

LAW AND SIN

Chalcedon Report No. 158, October 1978

A question often raised by many people is this: why did not God so create man and the world that sin and evil would be unnecessary or impossible? This question exposes the heart of humanistic statism, because it reveals its doctrine of ideal order. The essence of original sin is man's desire to be his own god, determining for himself what constitutes good and evil (Gen. 3:5). Man's idea of good means, in part, to prevent the possibility of evil. Man seeks to spare himself and his children the necessity of moral testing. One of the great evils perpetrated by parents in the name of doing good is the attempt to spare their children from the hardships, testings, and decisions they themselves faced. As a result, they help destroy their children.

Biblical law deals with actual sins. The adulterous, covetous, or envious *thought* is sin, but God's law calls for the punishment by men of the actual act. It is punishment after the fact, not before. God requires the courts of men which He ordains to deal with actual transgression, not potential sins. God Himself can alone deal with the heart and mind of man, with intentions. Thus, the courts of law are strictly limited: their jurisdiction, and the state's coercive power, extends to lawless actions, and not over godly men.

When the state begins to play god, it seeks to make men good by legislation which seeks to prevent, not punish, sin. The state as god on earth seeks to make sin impossible to commit. It therefore punishes any intention, situation, or organization which may transgress its doctrine of brotherhood, health, order, or society. It begins when, for example, the state's surgeon general or some agency determines that smoking, drinking, breathing, or living may be hazardous to a man's health, and then continues by denying man the right to do what the state feels it is wrong for man to do.

The result is that the state moves from government by God's law to rule by agencies, committees, and departments of state. It moves from rule by law to rule by bureaucracy. Instead of punishment and control over the fact of crime, we have punishment and control before the fact. Instead of a small criminal element being the controlled segment of society, all of society is then controlled. To be uncontrolled, or to seek to be uncontrolled, is to be therefore criminal.

One of the most revealing aspects of the current investigations and trials of Christian schools and churches has been the attitude of state officials, both in court, in the hallway, and in more private conversations. Like parents who seek to prevent their children from the testings of moral decision, these bureaucrats believe that the good state is the controlling state. For any segment of society to be uncontrolled is plainly evil in their eyes. In terms of their doctrine of righteousness, a thing is good or potentially good only if it is in the safekeeping of the state, and a thing is holy if it is separated from freedom under God to "freedom" under state rules and policies.

This means, of course, that the state is usurping God's place and prerogatives. It is functioning as the visible god on earth, and it does not lack for worshippers (Rev. 13:4). It seeks by total controls to make sin and evil impossible (Rev. 13:16–17). It sees itself as superior to the godly state and to Biblical law, because it does not merely punish sin but instead by controls works to prevent all forms of transgressions. It fails miserably in this task, but it succeeds in making itself the great transgressor, and the enemy of God (Rev. 13:6).

Neither man nor the state has any legal rights or powers apart from God. God alone is the source of all law. A significant Biblical fact witnesses eloquently to this. To put off one's shoe was to surrender a legal right and duty in relationship to another person (Deut. 25:9–10). In relation to God, putting off one's shoe meant to be totally without rights. As a result, when men were in God's presence, they had no rights or claims against Him: they could only be commanded. God commanded Moses out of the burning bush, saying, "put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground" (Exod. 3:5; cf. Josh. 5:15). Shoeless before God, man's status was like that of a slave to be absolutely commanded by God. (Shoeless before men, a man had surrendered his duty and place.) Man before God had God's Word alone; man before men again must be governed by God's Word alone. To depart from God's Word is to be shoeless, i.e., a slave.

The choice before men today is a question of rulers. Will men be ruled by God or by the state? Will they stand in terms of God's sovereign

law-word, or in terms of man's word, the state's law? Shall the law punish the ungodly, the criminals, or shall it enslave all men? To whom do you answer, "Speak; for thy servant heareth" (1 Sam. 3:10), to God or to the state?

195

FREEDOM UNDER GOD'S LAW

Chalcedon Report No. 374, September 1996

We have forgotten in recent years that freedom is a religious fact. It is Jesus Christ who makes us free from the bondage of sin to be free men (John 8:31–36). The greatest form of bondage and slavery is to sin. To be in Christ is freedom, and the law of God is "the perfect law of liberty" (James 1:25; 2:12).

There are many kinds of law, Buddhist, Shinto, Islamic, humanistic, and so on, but all these are prescriptions for tyranny. We see political leaders offer us solutions to our problems in the form of a legal scenario, but these answers lead only to an ever-increasing enslavement to a power state.

All laws are a description of good and evil, definitions of right and wrong in terms of a particular faith or philosophy. Can we trust National Socialism or Marxism to define good and evil for us, or can we depend on homosexuals, abortionists, and like persons for a good description of moral ultimates? More bluntly, can we allow anyone except the triune God through His Word to define law and morality for us?

We have in recent generations preferred to forget that the definer of law and morality is always the god of that society, the final arbiter of law, morality, and truth. How can any Christian look to any other source than God and His enscriptured Word for such an arbiter and definer?

We live in a society in which the legal powers specifically and systematically deny the validity of God's law and reject God as Savior and Lawgiver. Worse yet, most churches are antinomian, and they assent to this rejection.

Now, we can readily grant that the United States has often been indifferent to Christ and the Bible. It has seen much hypocrisy in high places. All the same, despite much lip service by politicians, our legal system still

reflected its Biblical origin. It was only in the latter part of the nineteenth century that law schools began to undermine the Biblical foundations of law, and it was only after World War II that the U.S. Supreme Court began to dismantle the Biblical nature of U.S. law. That dismantling job is now nearly finished.

The doctrine of Christ's atonement is basic to the legal systems of what was once Christendom. This doctrine stresses the essential requirement of restitution. Christ makes restitution to God for us, and we make restitution to one another.

Now we see a variety of alien models for law. The Marxist model sees guilt as a class matter, the attribute of the rich and the middle classes, who supposedly oppress the poor. The racist model sees guilt as pertaining to race, black or white, who are thus the source of evil. The therapeutic model sees mental sickness, created by various agencies, as responsible for crime, and crime is seen, not as requiring restitution or punishment, but as therapy. The list of alternatives to the Biblical perspective can be extended, but it is enough to say that crime increases under these false solutions.

If God does not define good and evil for us, we are under His judgment. There is no good outside God, nor any definition of it apart from His Word. In fact, if we reject God's definition of law, of good and evil, we have rejected God. Have we not then made something or someone else our "angel of light" and our source or "minister of righteousness" or justice (2 Cor. 11:14–15)?

We are deeply in trouble, and it is a disaster of our own making.

196

THE POWER OF HERESY

Chalcedon Report No. 397, August 1998

The power of heresy and false belief seems at times to outweigh that of the greatest men of God. Compare the power in the twentieth century of Karl Barth as against Cornelius Van Til. Fallen men, and too many are in the church, find it easier to affirm the church than Jesus Christ, God the Son.

An example of the power of heresy is clearly seen in Marcion, who founded the Marcionite movement near the middle of the second century, A.D. His father was a bishop, but Marcion was very early expelled from the church and refused readmission by his father. There are uncertainties as to some of Marcion's beliefs, but one thing is clear: he held that there were three first principles, in effect, three gods. The world of matter, ruled by law, was the work of one god, and this material realm was the world of evil.

The good god was the author of grace and of charity and is the father of Jesus Christ. This view led at once to dispensationalism. It separated Jesus from the old god to make Him a product of the new god and age. In time, third-age thinking developed.

The Jews were the chosen people of the old god, the Christians *a la* Marcion, of the new. The law being nullified, so, too, were the creation ordinances and categories, and women were given status in the church which the orthodox held to be non-Biblical.

The Bible, in the early years of the church, included Old and New Testaments as one undivided book. Marcion's division led to a separation into Old and New Testaments, while retaining the format of a single volume, a compromise.

Marcion's thinking was at times close to that of Mani and Manichaeism, i.e., a belief in two gods, one evil, one good, both of equal power and ultimacy.

Much of twentieth-century evangelicalism, with its reduction of God to love, its hostility to God's law, and its tendency, like Marcion, to limit the valid points of the Old Testament to prophecy, reveals that too many "Bible-believing" churches resemble Marcionite chapels more than anything else.

Another great evil of Marcionite thinking has been its depreciation of creationism. Salvation is stressed to the point of making God as Creator almost irrelevant. In the world of Marcion, the creation of the physical universe did not compare with its redemption, whereas, for orthodoxy, the two doctrines are inseparable, and only the Creator can regenerate.

Again, for Marcion, the law and the gospel were irreconcilable, whereas, for the orthodox, salvation means, *first*, the satisfaction of the law by obedience, and, *second*, sanctification by faithfulness to God's law-word. Where orthodoxy sees a total unity between Old and New Testaments, and between the law and the gospel, Marcionite thinking sees an irrevocable division.

The question then arises, why be good if the law is bad? Not surprisingly, very early, charges of immorality were raised against the Marcionites, which scholars since have held to be invalid. We have no way of knowing whether the charges were valid or not, but we do know that, logically, immoralism had been vindicated. We also know that, in some church circles where Marcionite thinking prevails, so, too, in time, does immorality.

Because Marcionite thinking now rules in too many circles, modernist, "orthodox," and "fundamentalist," this heresy must be a major concern to all of us. It eliminates as invalid a vast portion of the Bible, the law; it separates law from grace, and love from justice. Can we be loving if we deny justice to men, or do we show grace if we allow evil to prevail? Do we not then reduce the faith to sentimentalism and a whitewash of sin rather than man's removal by atonement? Is it any wonder that atonement is becoming a fuzzy doctrine to many when law and restitution are denied? Are we Christians or Marcionites?

197

NATURAL LAW

Chalcedon Report No. 143, July 1977

One of the most confused ideas in the history of Western thought is the concept of natural law. Because of their Christian faith or background, most men assume that it means that, because God created the world, His laws are basic to the constitution of all created being. Whether we deal with matters of physics or biology, psychology or chemistry, we deal with God's creation and therefore God's law. Both Catholics and Protestants have commonly understood natural law in this sense.

The concept of natural law, however, is essentially Greek in origin, and its Hellenic and naturalistic meaning has again and again dominated the doctrine to give it a radically anti-Christian meaning and use. The French Revolution was based on this doctrine, as was the Russian Revolution, which gave it a different name.

In terms of the Greek mind-body dualism, natural law could mean two things. First, it could be a universal, an idea, and the imposition of that idea onto history. The idea was known through reason, and right reason became an equation for natural law. Plato's *Republic*, a blueprint for a communist society, was intended as a statement of what constitutes pure reason (or natural law) and therefore the necessary order for man and the state. The philosopher-kings are therefore the voice of natural law and the elite minority is the voice of true law.

Aristotle associated natural law with matter, because mind's only universal expression was in nature. This expression of the material world is the state, and man is a political animal. The life of the state is law, and law expresses nature (and justice) when it gives every man his due. This meant treating equals equally and unequals unequally. Men have tried to derive a workable system of justice out of Aristotle but have only succeeded when they have imported Biblical law into it. The reason is that,

for Aristotle, as he stated at the beginning of his *Politics*, "the state or political community, which is the highest good of all, and which embraces all the rest, aims at good in a greater degree than any other, and at the highest good." The state is thus the voice of justice and of natural law. For Aristotle, therefore, ethics is a branch of politics, not of theology. It is thus impossible to fit either Aristotle or Plato into a Christian view of things. Biblical law declares that God is the author of all things and the only valid source of law. The repeated preface to law in Scripture is the declaration, "I am the Lord."

After the Enlightenment began to rethink natural law, there was a steady separation from the concept of the Christian additions to it, and the result was that natural law became the source of the theory of natural rights, i.e., rights that are inherent to man and in man. Just as law is now identified with nature as separated from God, so right was identified with man apart from God.

The logic of this view came into focus with the French Revolution. The revolution and its regime became the triumph of natural law and the rights of man. In the "Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen" by the National Constituent Assembly of France, it was held that, "The nation is essentially the source of all sovereignty; nor can any individual, or any body of men, be entitled to any authority which is not expressly derived from it." Right reason was now the revolutionary regime, and natural law was whatever the state declared it to be. In Marxism, new terminology replaced the old, but the ideas remained the same: the dictatorship of the proletariat is the rule of right reason and natural law.

It should be obvious why the church's use of the term natural law has been so troublesome. It has incorporated into it too many anti-Christian premises. What a consistent Christian means by it is creation law, laws governing the universe because God is its Maker and Sovereign. He knows, moreover, that creation is the handiwork and law sphere of the triune God because Scripture, God's revealed law, so declares it. Man can understand and validly approach creation law when he is first of all under Biblical law by God's grace. Only as we stand in terms of God's law can we contend with the dangerous legal heresies and paganisms which surround us.

Because of the prevalence of the idea that right reason is the voice of law, we have the increasing arrogance of modern science. Rebecca West, in *The New Meaning of Treason*, cited the belief of many scientists in their sinlessness. As an angry scientist told her, "Science is reason. Why should people who live by reason suddenly become its enemies?" (p. 173). As Rebecca West observes, this is simply "a new door into the old world of fanaticism."

For us, it must be a closed door. We have the Sovereign and triune God, and we have His enscriptured law. He is the Maker of heaven and earth and all things therein. "All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made" (John 1:3). The doctrine of creation is the starting point for valid sciences.

As we deal with the problems of man and society, we have the clear guide of God's law, a surer foundation than fallen man's unregenerate reason. For us, neither the reason of an intellectual elite, of would-be philosopher-kings, nor the law of the state give valid law. Only God can legislate, and only God's law is true law. Man's administration of law must express God's law, not man's reason or the state's will. On any other basis we have injustice and a world in chronic crisis. Isaiah 8:20 states it very plainly and clearly: "To the law and to the testimony [of the prophets to the law]: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them."

198

NECESSITY VERSUS LAW

Chalcedon Report No. 117, May 1975

One of the basic premises of Christian culture, as taught and developed very early by the church, is the insistence that the world and all men therein are under God's law. Power and authority are derived from God's law, and this is true of every area of life, the family, church, state, school, and all vocations. As a result, a fundamental principle of the medieval period was the doctrine that the king, and all others in authority, must rule according to law, God's law.

The too common backward look of medieval philosophers and their readiness to follow Greek and Roman thinkers, led to the adoption of a Roman premise, common also to the Germanic tribes and to all pagan antiquity, that "necessity knows no law." The forms of this proverb vary: some read, instead of necessity, "the public" or "common utility," "public welfare," "emergency," or "reasons of state," but the idea in all is the same. Necessity became the governing *public* principle, so that, as Post has pointed out, it came to mean, "necessity knows no *private* law" (Gaines Post, *Studies in Medieval Legal Thought: Public and the State, 1100–1322* [Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1964], pp. 8ff., 22).

In time, this came to mean that God's law was a private concern of religious man, and thus it could be overruled by the state. Instead of God's law as the higher and ultimate law, *necessity* came to be the new higher and ultimate law. Even churchmen began to see necessity as the higher law, and one result was the justification of theft in cases of necessity, i.e., to forestall hunger in some cases, or to alleviate extreme distress. Man's necessity was given priority over God's requirements, a logical result of the return to the humanism of antiquity and of the barbarian kingdoms.

The belief that "necessity knows no law" meant the breakdown of "private" law as well, and thus of morality, because a higher law always

supplants and negates all lower law. One result was a growing moral anarchism and the brutalization of the law, the courts, and public life, culminating in the Renaissance. The individual began to govern his own life in terms of his own priorities or necessities, and, the more widely men came to believe that "necessity knows no law," the more widely they defined necessity. Every desire and whim of man began to pass for necessity and thus was exempt from the governance of law.

The state was the biggest gainer from this new principle. Having used the idea of necessity to increase its power, the state began to define itself as the realm of necessity and therefore beyond all law. The state thus began to claim jurisdiction over every area of life, including the church.

Although the Reformation and Counter-Reformation for a time pushed back the pagan principle of necessity, it soon returned with the Enlightenment, and, since then, has become the governing principle of virtually all civil governments. *Reasons of state*, or necessities, are deemed sufficient to justify all policies and courses of action. In terms of the state as the necessary principle of life and law, the state has taken over education and is beginning to look towards more and more control of the churches. The state, claiming to be the new god of creation, claims jurisdiction over every area of life. State law is held to govern all of life, but the state is itself under no higher law.

The state cannot be neutral towards God. When it denies God's law as binding over itself, it affirms thereby that the law of the state is ultimate and binding over all things and bound by none. Its basic premise, then, is that the world is under the state's law, not God's.

The end result of the premise that "necessity knows no law" is total tyranny and terror under a totalitarian state determined to permit no independent existence to any man or institution. Such a consequence cannot be prevented merely by fighting totalitarianism but only by undercutting its basic premise. The priority of God and His law must be asserted, maintained, and acknowledged in faith and life.

The death of God school of thought was a logical result of the belief that necessity can be separated from God and His law. By declaring that "necessity knows no law," men in effect declared that God is dead and man reigns. By affirming and applying the principle that the only necessity is God and His law, men in effect declare that the totalitarian state is dead and God reigns.

Fear and hatred for, and opposition to, the totalitarian state are ineffectual and generally futile as long as men see it as the necessary order: they cannot by hatred nullify its power. Only as they by faith recognize the absolute necessity of God's law, and the absolute sovereignty of God

himself, will they cease, whether in love or in hate, to bow before that modern Baal, the sovereign state. Until then, men are impotent, and they continue to bow before the gigantic eunuch, the sovereign state, which claims all potency but can only kill, never make alive. Only then can men declare, "The Lord reigneth; let the earth rejoice; let the multitude of isles be glad thereof" (Ps. 97:1).

199

JUSTICE AND THE STATE

Chalcedon Report No. 208, December 1982

The modern state is profoundly religious; in every continent states pursue their religious goal with dedication and fervor. The problem, however, is that virtually all modern states are, in varying degrees humanistic. Instead of acknowledging that the God of Scripture is above and over them, they see man as ultimate, and the state as the expression of the collective or general will of man. This means that ultimacy is ascribed to the state, which, since Hegel, has been modern man's god walking on earth.

The implications of this shift from Christianity to humanism are far-reaching. Humanistic statism has evangelized the world for its cause, and, in every continent, salvation is earnestly sought on humanist and statist terms.

Salvation and the triumph of the state have, however, become identical, as they were in Rome. God having been denied, there is now no law nor justice that transcends the state. Since there is no God beyond the state, there is no justice beyond the state either. Justice is what the state does. This identification of justice with the state has been basic to Marxist civil governments and to National Socialism. For the Marxists, the dictatorship of the proletariat incarnates the general will of the workers and is infallibly just. For National Socialism, a similar equation prevailed.

If the state is justice, and there is no higher God nor law to give an assessment of the state and its law, then no one can legitimately judge the state. This equation has already been made. In *Institutes of Biblical Law, volume 2, Law and Society*, I cited the 1975 statements of the then Senator John V. Tunney. Tunney equated morality with legality. Whatever the state legislates against is immoral, but, if the state legalizes something, it is moral. Asked about theft, he answered, "If you repeal the law it would

not be a crime" (p. 372). Tunney's thinking was logical and consistent humanism. He made an equation which is increasingly common everywhere. In Nebraska, Christians in Louisville insisted on keeping open a Christian school closed by the state (and Pastor E. Siliven was jailed); their actions were nonviolent. State newspapers condemned the Christian resistance as illegal and immoral. (It was once a truism of Christian thinkers and civil courts that resistance to evil legislation is not illegal.) Two other Christian schools in Nebraska were also closed. In the second of these cases, all the parents will be tried for contributing to the delinquency of their minor children; if the state wins, the children will be taken from their parents and placed in foster homes. These children are receiving a superior education; the state, however, does not regard quality education as important as state control; this is totalitarianism, state power as the ultimate value.

But this is not all. In various states, pro-life picketers of abortion clinics are being sued for libel or slander. The premise is that abortion is now legal; because it is legal, it is therefore moral, and to declare by picket signs that abortion is murder, and that abortionists are murders, is to defame a moral man engaged in legal activities. Sadly, the first of these cases has been won by the abortionists.

Consider the implications of this fact. If what is legal is moral, and to speak of it as immoral is actionable, then free speech and freedom of religion are finished. Once a law is passed, attacks on it are attacks against law, morality, and justice. The great function (now much neglected) of the church has been, over the centuries, to uncover sin and to indict it. Men like Nathan, Elijah, and other prophets of old confronted kings and all sinners with the accusation, "Thou art the man." The early church fathers like Chrysostom, Ambrose, and others did not spare rulers nor commoners; in the name of God, they set forth the sins of all; they declared the law of God, and they set forth God's Savior, Jesus Christ. What the courts are now saying is that this prophetic task is illegal and immoral.

Because the state now recognizes no higher law, it therefore absolutizes its own will and law. The lawmaker and the court (with the bureaucracies) then replace God. Moreover, because the state identifies its will and law with justice, to gain total justice means to gain total power. Marxism and Fascism thus begin with the premise that total power is necessary to attain the good or just society. The democracies are no less dedicated to the same goal, total power, but by means of democratic persuasion. Roland Huntford, in *The New Totalitarians* (1971), documented the "democratic" road to totalitarianism. Whereas the older totalitarians (Marxist and Fascist) use terror, the new totalitarians use education. By controlling education, the new totalitarians control the minds of children, the future.

The goal is to gain a voluntary acquiescence to slavery, which, of course, these men view as salvation, the elite planners in control of the masses.

This makes understandable the savage hostility of the new totalitarians to the Christian-school movement. In this growing movement, they see the destruction of their control over the future. The Christian school movement is indeed growing rapidly, and its enrollment now in the United States is a major threat to humanistic statism. One has only to be in the courtrooms regularly, as I am, as a witness for the churches, to realize the extent of the hostility. The statists see this as a life and death battle, obviously.

The new totalitarians are resentful and hostile to the introduction of any higher-law concept. The testimonies of the persecuted Christians are that they must obey God rather than men; they take the stand to cite Scripture as their law and mandate. (One judge, earlier this year, spoke out against this use of Scripture texts; he saw clearly that the witnesses were citing God's Word as law against the laws of his state.) These Christians have become aware that a state which does not subordinate itself to God and His law will demand that all things be subordinated to the state; the result is tyranny. The true freedom fighters of the twentieth century are the Christian school peoples who are resisting state controls. The future generations will be deeply in their debt.

The sad fact is that most churches are indifferent to this battle. In the days of Athanasius, that saint stood almost alone against the forces of the Roman state and the heresies and cowardice of churchmen. Today, the resistance is far more widespread.

However, the death-like sleep of the churches is appalling, but not surprising. The source of law in any society is the god of that society. If our source of law is the state, then the state is our god. If our source of law is God and His Word, then God is our Lord and Sovereign. The modern church is antinomian. Because it sees man and the state as the source of law, it in effect abandons the God of Scripture for the modern Moloch. By viewing the state as the source of law, it surrenders man to statist law. Salvation then becomes either the social gospel of statism, or a rapture out of this world.

Justice, God's justice or righteousness, then ceases to be a concern for the Christian. For the statist, justice is whatever the state does. There is no escape from this impasse other than the Lordship of Christ as Savior, Lawgiver, and Ruler. Christ is King, and "of the increase of His government and peace there shall be no end," for the government is upon His shoulders (Isa. 9:6–7).

200

THE MODERN STATE, AN ANCIENT REGIME

Chalcedon Report No. 168, August 1979

LAWMAKING is an attribute of sovereignty; the source of law in any system of thought is the god of that system. Modern man, however, has become so used to the claims of the humanistic power state to be god walking on earth that he takes for granted the state's claims to be sovereign and to be the law source.

Combined with this claim to be the source of law, the modern state claims to be man incarnate. Louis XIV stated this in an earlier form, when he said, "In France the nation is not a separate body, it dwells entirely within the person of the King." A century later, Louis XV told the Parliament of Paris, "The rights and interests of the Nation, which you dare to make into a body apart from the Monarch, are of necessity one with my own, and lie in my hands only." The man within the state found his incarnation or corporation in the person of the king. With the French Revolution, the nation-state claimed to be the locale of the embodiment of man. Article three of the "Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen" (August 26, 1789), reads: "The essential principle of all sovereignty lies in the Nation. No body and no individual can exercise any authority not expressly derived therefrom." As this doctrine developed, in terms of Rousseau's general will, the state became the incarnation of man's general will and the federal head over man.

At this point, the Christian begins to see clear parallels to the doctrine of Christ. He is the last Adam, the federal head over the new humanity He creates, and He is its King. The old Adam brought sin and death for all who are members of him, whereas the new Adam brings forth righteousness and the resurrection (1 Cor. 15:21ff.). All men are members of Adam; the redeemed become members of Jesus Christ. In His deity, Jesus

Christ is one with the Father; in His humanity, He is one with the new mankind, the new Israel of God. He is their savior, their king, priest, prophet, and lawgiver.

The modern state says that it is the true Adam and therefore represents all men in the totality of all their lives. It is their lawgiver and therefore the source of morality. We cannot begin to understand the great revolution of the modern age unless we see that for man today, the state, not God and His Word, is the source of morality.

But this should not surprise us. The state sees itself as the moral arbiter because it is the source of law now. All law is simply enacted morality. Whoever or whatever is the source of law is thereby the source of morality. As a result, we see those moral zealots, the men of the U.S. Internal Revenue Service, laying down the moral law for Christian schools, colleges, churches, and organizations. In the modern world, and for humanism, the IRS is closer to the new Holy of Holies than the church!

The legislative program of the modern state is humanistic moral reform in terms of the gospel according to the new god, the state. Not the God of Scriptures but the state sets forth the moral law and path for modern man.

The modern state thus sees itself (1) as the true Adam, as corporate man, and as (2) sovereign, and hence (3) the source of law and morality.

Institutions arise to meet functions, real or imagined, which are neglected by other agencies. Modern man saw the state as the sound and safe substitute for the church, and as an agency capable of giving freedom and security to society. Men turned to the state with a religious trust, and the state at first seemed to be an answer to man's hopes.

The state, however, is increasingly an obstacle to man, the creator rather than the solver of problems. At every turn, man finds the state a threat to his freedom and security, in family, religion, work, school, business, medicine, and everywhere else. The benefits of the state are being dwarfed by its threats and evils.

There is still another factor: the state grows increasingly irrelevant where it should be most useful. Thus, most crime protection is now in private hands, where it is clearly more effective.

Pierre Goubert, in *The Ancien Régime: French Society, 1600–1750,* calls attention to an important aspect of the French Revolution. The old order disintegrated at an alarming rate. The revolutionaries should not have been able to topple France as quickly and easily as they did. But the old order was in too many areas obsolete, useless, or a roadblock. It was, Goubert points out, "deeply stained with the seigniorial dye," and, "noble or otherwise, the seigniors *qua* seigniors had long since given up

protecting anybody against anything" (p. 87). The old order was serving itself far more than it served France. Where it was better than what followed, the merit was accidental.

The modern state is, like the France of Louis XVI, an obsolete *ancien régime*, an old order serving itself rather than its people. The only growth it produces is of its own power. It seeks total power, because without total power it cannot forestall the forces of erosion it has itself created. In spite of this, its days are numbered.

The key question, thus, is not when will the humanistic state collapse, but, when will Christian Reconstruction establish forces sufficient to create a new and godly order? When will the change occur? The forces for change are already at work, and Christian schools and renewed Christian scholarship are basic to them.

201

SOCIAL JUSTICE

Chalcedon Report No. 146, October 1977

In a very interesting article in the September 1955 *Encounter*, Hugh Seton-Watson, writing on "The Russian Intellectuals" of the prerevolutionary era, pointed out that these men adopted Western humanistic and secular ideas wholesale. One might add that they adopted them more intensely and faithfully than did Western humanists at times. As a result, "The notion of law had little meaning for them. They could not conceive that the principle of the rule of law could be important." Their idea was "the reign of virtue on earth," and this reign meant the triumph of the intellectual and his ideas.

In the West, the façade of the rule of law was maintained, but a new content was given to it. In Biblical thought, law is the expression of the nature, holiness, and mind of God. God's law is repeatedly prefaced by the declaration: "I am the LORD," because God's law is an expression of the being of God and sets forth His ultimacy and lordship.

The same principle is true of humanistic law. The mind of the intellectual is seen as ultimate. Autonomous man and his reason constitute the final judge and standard of all things. As a result, the intellectual, whether Russian, Asiatic, African, or Western, sees his thinking as basic to the idea of law. Law is what humanistic man determines it when he thinks in purely autonomous terms, without reference to God. For the Russian, this has meant direct rule and power; for the Western intellectual, it means the façade of legal tradition. In either case, law is what the autonomous mind of intellectual man says it is. As a result, the modern intellectual has applied his faith to the world as a new revelation of law with all the fervor of a god who knows he is right. It was for this reason that Otto J. Scott titled his book *Robespierre: The Voice of Virtue* (1974). Not only Robespierre, but all the revolutionaries saw and see themselves

as virtue incarnate, and their enemies as demonic. Marx was insistent in his early writings that the imagery of hell and the demonic be retained and applied to the enemies of socialism. Such thinking is logical: if the elite intellectual is the new god, then his opponent is the new model of the devil. As Scott points out, the Jacobin edict which called for the confiscation of churches and church properties and the destruction of all Christian objects and symbols began, "All is permitted those who act in the Revolutionary direction."

The new gods ruled *divine justice, God's law,* out of court. Henceforth, a new doctrine of justice came into being from the new gods of creation, *social justice*. This was social in that it was the voice and justice of man and society as incarnated in the humanistic elite, the intellectuals.

This doctrine of social justice became a declaration of war against God, the church, the family, humanity, capitalism, and much more. Efforts to counteract it have been miserable failures. How can capitalists fight a humanistic concept of justice which means injustice to them and which robs them, when they themselves are humanistic and have no regard for God's law? They lack all moral, religious, and intellectual bases for any intelligent counteraction. The church is in even worse straits: it tries hard to prove that it is the best champion of social justice. It cannot challenge the humanism of that doctrine, because its own faith is humanistic. Man and man's salvation and welfare take priority in the churches, whether modernist, Reformed, or fundamentalist, Catholic or Protestant, over God and His glory. When the prophet Amos speaks of justice, it is *God's* justice, not *social* justice. His law comes from God, not man, and his grief and anger are due to man's contempt for God's law and justice.

Social justice reduces a large segment of humanity to a less than human status in the name of justice. For Scripture, men, however sinful, are God's creation and their need is regeneration. For Robespierre, the critics are less than man, and Robespierre demanded their purge. *Purge* was then a medical term, Otto J. Scott has pointed out, "meaning the forced expulsion of feces." Since Robespierre, the word has become political: it now means the forced expulsion and usually destruction of human beings as wastes. Thus, the enemies of humanism are not men: they are feces.

There were divisions in humanity in the days of kings and commoners, deep and important ones. In economic terms, men are closer together now, because of the Industrial Revolution. The gaps between rich and poor in Western society are the narrowest in history, as far as economics is concerned.

The cleavage between men, however, is greater than ever before in every other way. The conflict of interests idea is basic to modern society,

and the goal of politics is to purge society in the name of social justice. The doctrine of social justice has thus become a mighty instrument for the degradation of man.

202

INJUSTICE IN THE NAME OF JUSTICE

Chalcedon Report No. 209, January 1983

The modern age talks much about justice while denying its existence. Walter Kaufmann, in *Without Guilt and Justice* (1973), held that guilt and justice are theological concepts and hence no longer valid; if there be no God, there is neither good nor evil, nor guilt and innocence, and the idea of justice is a myth. Not all humanists are as honest as Kaufmann was, and, as a result, the concept of justice has been retained as a façade for the perspectives of humanism.

The humanistic state, as its own god and law, thus identifies its will with justice. This identification is increasingly ruthless. In Red China, legal restrictions have been placed upon birth. Guangdong Province, for example, sets an annual quota for births, and prospective parents must apply for an allotment. When in one area, two women urged pregnant women to hide from the family planning workers, they were imprisoned for 15 days; all but 9 of the 325 women with unlicensed pregnancies were given forced abortions and fitted with IUDs; forced abortions in this province numbered into the thousands.

In this country some schools supply children with contraceptives (*Review of the News*, November 3, 1982, p. 76). A part-time English professor, Suzanne Clarke of Bristol, Tennessee, has been sued for calling contemporary public education humanistic (*Bristol Herald Courier*, January 24, 1982). Recently, some writers, besides calling Christians neo-fascists, have called for the limitation of civil liberties to Christians. It is obvious, in reading and hearing some of these people, that the only freedom of religion they will allow us is one confined to the area between our two ears.

Anyone who opposes the growing trend to control the churches and to destroy our freedom of religion is likely to be subjected to slander, hate mail, and even worse. The Reverend Jerry Falwell, whose stance is a mild

and gracious one, is subjected to about 200 death threats monthly, and his ministry has been the target of vandalism. This should not surprise us. Scripture tells us that the ungodly have always raged and taken counsel together against the Lord, and therefore against His people (Ps. 2).

What is distressing is that so many who call themselves Christians take part in this attack. In the past few weeks, three "Christian" periodicals have attacked and misrepresented a Christian leader of another country, whose main offense is that he is a Christian and not a Marxist. Such periodicals are equally hostile to Pastor Falwell. (Does this mean that I agree with Falwell? For starters, he is premillennial and Arminian, and I am postmillennial and Reformed. We are, however, in the same battle and the same army, whose commander is not I but Jesus Christ. I prefer as a general principle to critique ideas, not men. I believe that, if a man spends much of his time shooting at his fellow soldiers, he is in the wrong army.)

Why do these churchmen do it? The answer takes us back to the question of justice. *Justice* and *righteousness* are one and the same word in the Bible. If we are dedicated and true antinomians, there is then for us no law of justice from God. Several articles of late in "Christian" periodicals have attacked the idea of a Christian society and state; the faith is something to be *confined* to a closet, and one person wrote me recently that praying should be confined to a closet also! Some, in writing to me, have insisted that the state is "safer" for all if left in the hands of humanists! The humanists who, like Kaufmann, are logical, deny that justice can exist. All too many churchmen are ready to agree; the law and justice are done away with, and we are in an era of grace only (or, the modernists would say, love only). The result is a license to and freedom for injustice.

Moreover, these men in effect deny the sovereignty or lordship of Jesus Christ. The lordship of Christ is not restricted to the church or to the soul of man but is total. It extends to the whole universe, to church, state, school, every institution and calling, to the arts and sciences, and to all things else. God the Father, with Christ's resurrection and ascension, has made Him sovereign over all creation and has put all things under His feet (Eph. 1:19–23). It is civil religion to allow the state's claim to sovereignty to stand. It is a return to Caesar worship to give in to the age-old claim to license and accredit the church and to allow Caesar's claim to be lord to stand.

Moreover, the state cannot be the source of law nor of justice. Law is a theological concept; justice has to do with ultimate right and wrong. If we see the sources of law and justice in anything other than the God of Scripture, we thereby confess another god, usually man or the state. The result, then, is injustice in the sight of God.

When Paul says "There is none righteous, no, not one" (Rom. 3:10) before God, the word *righteous* is in the Greek, *dikaios*, just (before God). Because we are not righteous or just before God, Paul does not thereby abolish the justice of the law. Rather, God through Christ by His grace makes us justified before His court and then gives us a new heart to serve Him in righteousness or justice, and holiness. Paul concludes, "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law" (Rom. 3:31). Men now love the law (Ps. 119), because it is the law of their Lord and King, His way of life and therefore our own in Him.

When men disregard God's law, they turn their back on justice. All too many who profess to believe the Bible are critical of and hostile to those who fight against abortion. The "pro-life" movement is called by all such persons a "social gospel" effort. The result is an unconcern with God's justice and a preference for the dictates of a humanistic state. Injustice is "vindicated" and defended in the name of the gospel! Civil religion then triumphs, and it goes under the names of humanism, modernism, and evangelicalism, as well as Calvinism. The adherents of civil religion are agreed on the sovereignty or lordship of the state. Injustice for them becomes any insistence on the crown rights of Christ the King as Lord over all men, nations, and the universe. Unless we insist on the priority and sovereignty of Christ as King over every area of life and thought, we enthrone injustice and deny Christ.

The psalmist asks, "Shall the throne of iniquity have fellowship with thee, which frameth mischief by a law?" (Ps. 94:20). The word *mischief* can also be translated as misery. The throne of God cannot be in fellowship with ungodly or nontheistic doctrines of so-called justice. Justice or righteousness is an attribute of God and is revealed in His law-word. When man seeks to establish his own doctrines of justice or of good and evil (Gen. 3:5), he sins, and he produces injustice. He frames, as the psalmist declares, mischief or misery by law. Our present law structure is producing a growing misery and injustice. The more it departs from God's law-word, the more deeply it moves into misery and injustice. "Except the Lord build the house, they labour in vain that build it" (Ps. 127:1).

203

RESTITUTION

Chalcedon Report No. 160, December 1978

BASIC to Biblical law is the fact of restitution. God's law requires restitution and sets it forth as the essence of justice or righteousness. Between man and man, restitution is required, as such laws as Exodus 22:1–6, etc., make clear, and this restitution must be at least double and can be as much as fourfold or fivefold (Exod. 22:1; Luke 19:8). Between man and God, restitution is also basic to justice, and Christ's perfect obedience to the law, and His atonement on the cross, assuming the death penalty passed upon us, constitute Christ's work of restitution for His people.

Wherever the law of restitution prevails, it follows that crime does not pay. If the minimum restitution for a crime is the restoration of full value, plus the same (i.e., for a theft of $100, $200 is restored), it follows that crime, and sin in any fashion, is highly unprofitable. The ultimate penalty of restitution can include death ("then thou shalt give life for life," Exod. 21:23).

Although there were periods of apostasy, and also the common rebellion of civil governments against God's law, the usual practice of the Christian community over the centuries has been to require restitution as God's mandate. This meant too that the habitual criminal, in terms of the case law of the incorrigible son (Deut. 21:18–21), was to be executed. The execution of habitual criminals was once common in the United States; later, third or fourth offenders were given life imprisonment, and then even this disappeared.

Biblical law has no prison system. A criminal was held in prison only pending a trial, and then either made restitution, or was a bondservant until he worked out his restitution, or was executed.

As late as 1918, the United States echoed this principle of restitution in its foreign policy. In a report on "Armenia and Her Claims to Freedom

and National Independence," it was stated: "According to the law of all civilized people, including the Sheri law, no murderer can inherit the property of the victim of his crime. That inheritance or estate must pass not to the murderer but to the next of kin of the victim" (U.S. Statutes at Large, 65th Congress 1917–1918, 3rd Session, Senate Document No. 316). This statement, while not specifically Christian, did all the same set forth restitution.

In recent years, the erosion has been rapid. Instead of seeing love as the fulfilling or keeping of the law (Rom. 13:8), modern churchmen have seen love as replacing law. Judges have readily picked up this doctrine. I recall the shock of a small businessman, in the late 1950s. A man with a record of passing bad checks had bilked him also. When he went to court, the businessman saw the guilty man given a suspended sentence and placed on probation. He himself was savagely lectured by the judge for demanding restitution and treated as unloving and un-Christian.

Since then, of course, this evil has proliferated, and law has decayed because of this hostility to restitution. Crime is now highly profitable, and injustice prevalent.

But the fact remains that restitution is God's law, and it is God's law not only for all relationships between man and man, but also between man and the earth, and man and God. Remember, God required the land to have seventy years of sabbaths by sending the people into captivity "until the land had enjoyed her sabbaths" (2 Chron. 36:21). In one way or another, in His own time and way, God requires and effects restitution. At the end, the final accounting is rendered.

Restitution thus can no more be abolished than God can be abolished. When men sidestep or bypass restitution, God exacts a penalty. We can evade and play games with man's law, but never with God's law.

Without restitution, man's idea of law loses its center and becomes erratic and unstable. Among the more common eccentricities of law have been emphases on class, caste, race, or status, whereby the law becomes an instrument for inequality. A related eccentricity is the emphasis on equality, so that law and justice are separate from justice as restitution and made the instruments of a drastic levelling of men, circumstances, and institutions. Eccentric law loses its orientation towards righteousness or justice and becomes governed by social standards, mores, and pressures. Law then becomes the product of pressure politics, not of a principle of justice.

But restitution cannot flourish on the social and civil scene if it is weak or absent on the theological level. Where the legal aspect of Christ's atonement as His work of satisfaction or restitution for the sins of His

people is weakened or denied, there too all of the foundations of law are affected. The cross of Christ sets forth restitution as the essence or nature of God's law. It makes it clear that there is no reconciliation between God and man apart from Christ's satisfaction for our sins and the imputation of His work to us. The heart of the gospel is this legal fact of the atonement. Regeneration and conversion, basic as they are, still rest on Christ's work of atonement. Justification by faith in and through Christ's work of satisfaction is the foundation of our standing before God.

The cross requires us to see the centrality of restitution in our standing before God and in our world of law and human affairs. If we do not require restitution of ourselves and all men, God will require it of us.

204

TWO-COW, NO-COW JUSTICE

Chalcedon Report No. 326, September 1992

It was over sixty years ago, I believe, that I was listening to this old missionary. He had spent most of his life in China, and he had a deep love for the country, its art, the people, and the countryside he knew in interior China. When I heard him, it was after the Depression began (1929), and before the invasion of Manchuria (1931), as I recall it. I do not remember his name, but I remember vividly what he said. My wife Dorothy heard the story from me, and we often refer to two-cow, no-cow justice.

The man who told the story saw it as the key to China's weakness, and why, with sorrow, he saw no good future for a land he loved.

He lived in a missionary compound in inner China, on the edge of a rural community's village. There were a few missionary families, including a doctor. From this center, they covered a wide area with their ministries.

One morning, a few children were playing outside the compound; some were Chinese, and two were the children, about five or six years of age, of a missionary. As they walked toward the village, the boys idly picked up small pebbles to throw at the cow of a Chinese farmer whose son was one of the "offenders." Later that day, the cow died, and the village elders summoned the missionary father to stand trial for his children's "offense." This missionary had two cows and provided milk for all those in the compound.

The missionary was held guilty and ordered to give one cow to the Chinese farmer. He protested, calling attention to the fact that the dead cow had been sickly; the medical missionary had warned the Chinese farmer of the danger in drinking that cow's milk.

The village elders were shocked at the missionary's attitude. How could he, as a religious man, be so indifferent to justice in so obvious a

case? After all, he had two cows, and the Chinese farmer now had none, and he was very poor. The cow had to be surrendered!

The old missionary said that he saw no future for China: there was no true justice, only the prevalence of envy.

Many years later, after Mao Tse-tung came to power and enthroned socialism, a young Chinese who left his village and escaped to freedom told of how envy was used to destroy communities. The poorest peasants were encouraged to denounce the more successful ones as exploiters, and they who were denounced were killed but first they were required to see the seizure of all their possessions. Little by little, the successful peasants were eliminated as "enemies of the people."

The same mentality that destroyed China is now destroying us. In 1945, Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy saw John Dewey's pragmatism and educational philosophy as the Chinafication of America (*The Christian Future*, pp. 43ff.) and called him "Master Confucius Dewey." The relativism of China, however, was worsened by Dewey. Old China had a strong family system as an anchor. Dewey's progressive education has worked against the family, has promoted purely subjective, personal moral "values," and has been militantly anti-Christian. As a result, we are worse off than China in circa 1930. Our only advantage is that some in the United States still insist on God's law-word as the standard, and we do have a Christian background, even though it is receding. The churches, with their antinomianism, pietism, and sentimentalism, have contributed heavily to the two-cow, no-cow doctrine. I regularly hear of judgments made by churches which document this. We are in deep trouble. Since God did not spare China, He is much more likely to judge us. As Peter tells us, "For the time is come that judgment must begin at the house of God: and if it first begins with us, what shall the end be of them that obey not the gospel of God?" (1 Pet. 4:17).

Our courts commonly give judgments based on the two-cow, no-cow idea of justice. The media's reaction to, and biased reports in, the Rodney King case reflected this evil idea of justice. If you are a member of a "minority," poor, or "alienated," you get two-cow, no-cow "justice," and the country reaps a growing disaster.

There will be no change of any consequence in this country nor elsewhere until this evil doctrine is overthrown and is replaced with God's justice, His enscriptured law-word. Until then, conditions will only get worse. The false preaching in churches has led us into these evil straits, and only systematic Biblical preaching will alter our condition.

205

THE FIFTH AMENDMENT

Chalcedon Report No. 6, March 1, 1966

Recently, someone passed on to me a very interesting article. The November 1965 *American Legion Magazine*, in an article on "The Systematic Terror of the Vietcong," by Deane and David Miller, cites among the instances of terrorism, the execution of a farmer who "was 'tried' by a 'People's Court,' sentenced to death, made to dig his own grave, shoved in and burned alive" (p. 11). This incident is a practical application of two major Communist principles, the use of terror and the idea of making the enemy dig their own graves. The use of terror rests on both a delight in terror and a belief in its power to intimidate opposition. Making people dig their own graves is again a strategic tactic and an evidence of a vicious and incorrigible will to evil.

The question we need to ask is very simply this: are we being misled into digging our own graves? The evidences indicate that we are, and in a great many directions and ways. Our purpose now is to analyze the use made of one bulwark of liberty, whereby American indignation is turned against this bulwark to its own destruction. This is the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution:

> No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or other infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service, in time of war or public danger; nor shall any person be subject, for the same offence, to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled, in any criminal case, to be a witness against himself; nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.

Our concern is particularly with the prohibition against compulsory

self-incrimination. The roots of this Fifth Amendment are Biblical. Apart from Biblical law, all law has made legal the use of force to compel a witness to testify against himself. The result has been torture and terror, and the certainty of conviction, whether the victims of such compulsion were guilty or innocent. The Biblical law recognized voluntary confession, but, apart from that, conviction had to be on the basis of the testimony of two or three witnesses (Deut. 19:15), and under oath (Exod. 22:10–11). An oath was a conditional curse, and the penalties for false testimony were severe, requiring restitution (Lev. 6:1–6). A witness to a crime had an obligation to testify. "When a person sins by being adjured to testify and has seen or has learned of the matter, but fails to inform, he assumes his iniquity" (Lev. 5:1, Berkeley Version). In other words, the witness becomes an accomplice by his failure to testify against the criminal. Two witnesses were the minimum necessary for conviction (Deut. 17:6–7; 19:15). The requirement of witnesses was clear-cut: "Present no hearsay, unsupported evidence; do not cooperate with an evil-minded person to become a malicious witness. Do not follow the crowd in wrongdoing, nor, when witnessing in a lawsuit, lean toward the majority to thwart justice; neither be partial to the poor man in his suit" (Exod. 23:1–3, Berkeley Version). The place for testimony is in a court of law, not in neighborhood talk: "Practice no unfairness in a court decision; you shall neither favor the poor nor show deference to the influential; judge your neighbor with fairness. You must not go around among your people as a gossiper or take your stand against your neighbor's life. I am the LORD" (Lev. 19:15–16, Berkeley Version). The witness had to be prepared, in a capital offense, to back his testimony by assisting in the execution (Deut. 17:7). The Ninth Commandment prohibited false witness (Exod. 20:16; Deut. 5:20, Lev. 19:20). A perjured witness incurred the same punishment as that to which the defendant was liable: "ye shall do to him what he had planned to have done to his brother" (Deut. 19:15–21, Berkeley Version). This was in terms of a major Biblical principle which sentimental humanism ignores "as thou hast done, it shall be done unto thee: thy reward shall return upon thine own head" (Obad. 15; in the Berkeley Version, the latter part reads, "your doings will come back upon your own head"). In Jeremiah 50:29, we see this same principle: "according to all that she hath done, do unto her" (cf. Lam. 1:22).

The emphasis on honest testimony and the necessity for unforced evidence, i.e., not forced from the defendant but resting on the moral conscience of witnesses, was basic to the procedures of justice. The goal of justice was defined as God's order, and the true judgment is thereby the judgment of God: "You must show no partiality in your decisions. You

must listen to low and high alike without being afraid in the presence of any man; for judgment belongs to God" (Deut. 1:17, Berkeley Version). God's curse was upon all violators of their oath.

The establishment of these Biblical laws of justice and of testimony were basic to the American tradition and to the Constitution. The Constitution established the independence of the courts from political coercion, and of the witnesses from self-incrimination and the rule of terror and torture. We have seen the courts become major political instruments. Now the integrity of the defendant is under attack. If we are persuaded to weaken in any way the protection of the Fifth Amendment, we are being made to dig our own graves and to assist in our own destruction.

Some will immediately object, "But haven't the Communists made evil use of the Fifth Amendment? Mustn't we do something to prevent that?" Let us examine a specific case of such use of the Fifth Amendment. A minister was several times identified before a congressional committee as a party member from the 1930s on. He had served as president of a party organization, and he had a long record of prominent membership in a variety of Communist front groups. The testimony on these things was clear-cut and telling, and it would have been impossible for the man to have denied the validity of a massive documentation. What was gained by putting this Communist on the stand? It was obvious, *first*, that he had no intention of confessing, and *second*, that he would sit there by the hour, taking the Fifth Amendment as his ground for refusing to testify. It was equally obvious that this man *wanted* to be on the stand. *First*, it gave him a national platform from which he could denounce the entire hearing as a "witch hunt"; he thereby took attention away from himself and the testimony against himself and centered it on the House Committee and its "persecution" of him. *Second*, by pleading the Fifth Amendment by the hour, he aroused the hostility of many Americans to that law, thereby contributing to the breakdown of that law. As a result, other issues than the testimony against him became the focus of public attention.

What has happened? The courts have weakened or destroyed laws against subversion, while the Communists have made the Fifth Amendment a "dirty word" for many Americans. The answer is not to weaken or destroy the Fifth Amendment but to reestablish and enforce laws against subversive activities. Instead, such laws are progressively being destroyed, and the Fifth Amendment is under attack.

The Fifth Amendment is being breached from two directions. *First*, the Bureau of Internal Revenue requires the taxpayer to produce his records, i.e., to incriminate himself. Thus, a law which broke with the spirit of the Constitution as it was framed is now being used to destroy the citizen's

liberties. *Second*, members of the criminal syndicate are being promised immunity from prosecution if they will testify against their associates (which would mean incurring death at the hands of their associates), and are being sentenced for contempt for refusing to testify. We cannot be sympathetic with criminals, or defend them, but we must defend godly law and such testimony is only technically not self-incrimination. Such a requirement weakens the force of the Fifth Amendment and paves the way for the return of torture and terror as the instruments of "law," and this certainly is a Communist goal. The courts are making it harder for law-enforcement agencies to convict criminals legitimately. Are they paving the way for a demand for illegitimate demands and means? Is anarchy and disorder promoted in order to make us cry out for totalitarian force to suppress it? The defenses of the Constitution are being steadily replaced by the offenses of the totalitarian state.

The roots of this waywardness are in the religious apostasy of Americans. Their conception of law is increasingly humanistic and man-centered rather than Biblical and God-centered. As a result, they have no yardstick, no true standard of measurement, and they are easily misled. Isaiah declared of old, "To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them" (Isa. 8:20).

206

SOCIAL UNREST

Chalcedon Report No. 4, January 1, 1966

Recently, a very fine man, who should know better, sent me a statement containing his answer to the rising tide of evil: "Let's pray about it." I believe that such statements are blasphemous. We are commanded in Scripture to pray, but prayer can never be a substitute for responsibility. If, for example, we refuse to work, and then we pray to God for food for our family, we are doubly guilty before God, guilty of improvidence and of blasphemy.

How, then, shall we deal with the problem of evil? Only God can change the heart of the wicked. We need to proclaim the gospel of Jesus Christ and His salvation, and to pray for the conversion of the unregenerate. Prayer here, if coupled with Christian efforts, is not only proper but absolutely necessary. But, while only God can *convert* the wicked, men have the power to *control* the wicked. And the means of control is a strict sense of law and order, of justice. But today the sentimentalism that parades as Christianity, instead of seeking to control and to convert the evil, seeks instead to love it and subsidize it. The result is a destruction of civilization and harm to both the godly members of society, as well as to the wicked who cause the destruction.

I was interested recently in rereading a passage in a book I first read in 1957, and which was written a few years earlier. Felice Bellotti, in the study of *Fabulous Congo*, wrote (on p. 189):

> Like all primitives, the negro only recognizes force, and the result of a policy of gradual concession of rights is easy to foresee: as soon as he realizes clearly that no one can hang him or kill him out of hand and that the white men are incapable of casting the evil eye on him there will be no holding him back. He has no conscience, no western code of ethics to guide him in his actions, and when his heart is really free of physical punishment he will become a hopelessly intractable rebel.

The Congo is a shambles today, and the major victims are the blacks, not because there are more evil men today, but because good men have surrendered control.

Another illustration: In the 1830s, American ships began to suffer savagely at the hands of Malay pirates. One incident is especially memorable. Captain "Josh" Stevens and his bark *Aurora* from Boothbay, Maine, were becalmed and unable to sail away from the vicinity of an island. The Malay pirates attacked repeatedly, knowing the ship to be undermanned, and finally, all but four men were killed. These four men, all wounded, escaped in the longboat, led by the second mate, Avery. Their only supply was a small store of water and dry biscuits. They could have rowed to a friendly island five hundred miles away. They chose instead to make for the *Polestar*, from Rockport, Maine, under Captain "Hen" Crossley, a hundred miles away and no doubt becalmed like themselves. With only the briefest pauses, never wasting breath for speaking, the men rowed night and day until they reached the *Polestar.* Captain Crossley immediately sent men by longboat to Captain Edwards of the *Emerald*, of New Bedford, and Captain Nye of the *Southern Cross* sent fifteen men, and the Emerald ten men, to give a total of over fifty with extra weapons also loaned. The *Polestar* sailed to *Perang*, where Crossley, pretending that his ship was disabled, began "repairs," keeping most of his men hidden and his weapons concealed. The Malay pirates poured out in great numbers, happy to have another Yankee ship to loot. The climax is dramatically recounted by A. Hyatt Verrill (in *Perfumes and Spices, Including an Account of Soaps and Cosmetics*, pp. 4–5):

> Onward came the Malays. Once again a helpless vessel was at their mercy. Once more they felt sure they could satiate their lust for white men's blood and white men's rum, and confident of victory, they dashed alongside the *Polestar*, leaped from their proas with savage yells, and swarmed-up the ship's sides.
>
> Not until the natives' heads appeared above the rails did Captain Crossley give the word to his impatient men. Then, with lusty shouts and curses, the fifty-three whale-men sprang up. With blazing muskets and pistols, with deadly spades and heavy lances, they and the merchant seamen fell upon the utterly astounded Malays. Turbaned heads were sliced from shoulders by the blubber spades; heavy lances were plunged through naked bodies by arms that had driven the weapons to the hearts of sperm-whales, broadaxes cut through limbs and skulls, and shot and bullets mowed down scores of the savages. Not a Malay lived to set foot upon the *Polestar's* decks. Not one who had attempted to board the ship remained uninjured to drop back to the proas. Dozens, terrified, utterly demoralized, thinking only to escape the fearsome weapons and demoniacal fury of the white men, flung themselves

into the sea where they were instantly torn to pieces by the ravenous sharks attracted to the scene by the blood that flowed in crimson streams from the ship's scuppers.

And when the occupants of the last two proas saw the awful carnage and heard the terror-stricken yells of their fellows, and hastily tried to turn back, Captain Hen trained his single cast-iron cannon upon them and sent a deadly hail of nails, bolts, screws, links of chain and other junk into them with terrible effectiveness. Not a single Malay ever reached the shore alive. Within ten minutes the battle was over. Without the loss of a man the Yankees had completely annihilated the natives and had exacted a terrible vengeance for the murder of Captain Stevens and his crew.

As the yards were swung and the *Polestar* headed to the open sea, Captain Crossley gazed with grim satisfaction upon the carnage he had wrought. Spitting reflectively to leeward, he glanced at the receding bulk of Perang, at the drifting, shattered, corpse-filled proas, at the sharp black fins cutting the surface of the blood-stained water.

"I calc'late that's what ye might call a good deed well done," he remarked to Mr. Avery. "Derned if I didn't say I'd learn 'em a lesson, and by glory I reckon I done so."

He had. For years thereafter no Yankee ship was every again attacked by the natives of Perang. The mere sight of a weather-beaten, lofty-sparred ship would send them in terror to their jungle lairs, and for generations the islanders spoke in awed tones of the white devils who had avenged their slain countrymen.

There was no lack of evil in past years, *but* there was also no lack of control over evil. Delinquency, crime, and evil were major problems in the nineteenth-century America, *but* the controlling forces were also vigilant. Today, the rapid growth of crime (and subversion) is *basically a problem of the removal of controls*. Crime in the United States has risen 58 percent since 1958 and is increasing six times faster than the population. Significantly, in 1964, there was a deliberate assault on one out of every ten U.S. policemen, and fifty-seven policemen were murdered. Even more significantly, 15 percent of the population are in the age ten to seventeen group, but this element of the population was responsible for 43 percent of all crimes against property in 1964. But this is the age group which should be almost the most easily controlled in a country *if* there is any sense of discipline.

Our problem is thus *not* evil as much as it is the *lack of control over evil* by the forces of righteousness. On the one hand, we have vast portions of "good" America talking about "love," which amounts in practice to a tolerance of and a subsidy for evil, and, on the other hand, we have other portions of "good" America whose answer to the problem is, "Let's

pray about it." Because God is a righteous God, there is every reason to believe that such talk, on both sides, only angers Him and invokes His judgment.

A quick glance at the current scene easily reveals the causes of our crisis. The following item is important, with respect to the Watts "riots."

> A few Mexican-American "direct action" advocates are already saying that the way to get attention — and millions of dollars of aid — is to start a riot. So far this feeling is only in the grim-faced grumbling state. However, if all of the anti-poverty money starts flowing to Watts, another hot spell could mean trouble on the East Side. (Joyce Peterson, "Start a Riot — Get $29 Million Aid," reprinted in [Los Angeles] *California Jewish Press*, September 10, 1965, pp. 1, 5)

We have two powerful forces at work to destroy law and order. *First*, we have subversives, who are working to destroy America by destroying its legal and moral structure. *Second*, and even more important, we have the vast majority of "good" Americans, who, by indulging in sentimental and unrealistic fancies, refuse to exercise the hard and necessary control over evil. And thus control must begin in the personal life, in the family, and it must be rigorously applied to every aspect of American life.

This is not a merciless attitude. True mercy can only flourish where justice prevails, whereas, in the words of Solomon, "the tender mercies of the wicked are cruel" (Prov. 12:10). These "tender mercies of the wicked" are today cruelly destroying the fabric of American life.

We have always had evil in the world. We always will have it. The problem lies elsewhere: will it be controlled? Will godly men meet their responsibility to "occupy" in Christ's name and enforce God's law in every area? The world will either be under God's law, or under His judgment.

207

WHAT IS LAW?

Chalcedon Report No. 216, July 1983

Not too many years ago, an American scholar who in his day was regarded as a very great legal mind and authority, wrote an influential book entitled, *The Sanctity of Law: Wherein Does it Consist?* (1927). The author, John W. Burgess, very soon was set aside as a conservative and then as a reactionary, and his once widespread influence faded. In retrospect, perhaps we had better reclassify Burgess as a radical of sorts.

Burgess began his study by citing and then objecting to Sir William Blackstone's definition of law. For Blackstone, law was "the rules of civil conduct prescribed by the supreme power in a state *commanding what is right and prohibiting what is wrong*." For Burgess, this definition "confused" morality (and religion) with law, and "to rid the definition of this embarrassment," he eliminated the last nine words "as not belonging to the etymology of the law." His definition read: "Law is a rule of civil conduct prescribed by the supreme power of a state." It is an exercise of sovereignty. Burgess turned away from a religious, i.e., for him Christian, definition of law to define it historically. Blackstone still saw law as essentially related to revelation, God's law. Subsequently, law was viewed as logic, but Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., in *The Common Law* (1881), held, "The life of the law has not been logic: it has been experience." Both Burgess and Holmes were by choice limiting the concept of law to the written laws of nations. The ground of the law could not be moral or religious validity but political legitimacy. The law was valid if it was the instrument of a legitimate sovereign state and enforced by a physical penalty when necessary. Man in his social infancy looked to God for law, but he must now look to his social experience. The triumph of Christianity was for Burgess "a black pall over the entire Continent" of Europe. The only advantage of the medieval order was that it prevented anarchy

and gave sanctity to law. With the twentieth century, the outworn creeds gave way to a new answer: "It was that the national consciousness of truth and right was the source of law — of sovereignty — in the modern state, and that a genuine *national* consciousness, from the point of view of the sanctity of law, was produced by a conjunction of the geographic and economic entities with the ethical and the political." The one higher step in the growth and the sanctity of the law would be the rise of an international order. The League of Nations did not impress Burgess as that hoped for order.

Thus, for Burgess the voice of the people had become the voice of law and of true sanctity. For him, God was replaced by man and by the state as the true sovereign and the valid source of morality and the law.

Holmes, in an 1885 speech before the Suffolk Bar Association, had seen the law also as the reflection of the people. "What a subject is this in which we are united — this abstraction called the Law, wherein, as a magic mirror, we see reflected, not only our own lives, but the lives of all men that have been! When I think on this majestic theme, my eyes dazzle." In 1897, in a speech at the Boston University School of Law, Holmes called attention to the fact that "[T]he law talks about rights, and duties, and malice, and intent, and negligence, and so forth, and nothing is easier, or, I may say, more common in logical reasoning, than to take these words in their moral sense, at some stage of the argument, and so to drip into fallacy." The language of the law is radically moral; there is more morality in the pages of the law, whether good or bad morality, than in most sermons, but Holmes saw this as a fallacy. He spoke sharply against "the confusion between legal and moral ideas." The forces for him which determine the law are not religion nor logic, but, rightly, social experience, and this should not be confused with morality. Laws are historical, not moral, facts, and this for Holmes was as it should be. This represented an evolutionary view of law, an Hegelian concept in part, and the religious (i.e., Biblical) aspect was treated as an archaic relic. This was "legal realism." It was in reality a humanistic religious faith which Holmes at times expressed with lyric power and hope, as in his speech to the Harvard Law School Association of New York, February 15, 1913. This strong affirmation of a Darwinian humanism was reprinted by the U.S. Senate, sixty-second Congress, third session, as deserving of wider attention.

In such a social order, what does the law then become? If it is separated from justice, what is the function of the law? The term *justice* continues to be used, but the concept has been separated from God and humanized, i.e., made humanistic. It is now *social justice*.

But what, then, does social justice mean? It means a social order in which the state gives protection and material aid to "the common man." Law and justice thus are separated from God and His revealed law-word and become aspects of the life of the state. Justice is by some scholars related to "human dignity." Man's sense of injustice is "an active, spontaneous source of law," according to Edmond Cahn. Justice is thus related to a sense of security in one's human dignity and status. Law, justice, and power are harnessed to broad social purposes and concerns in order to create a better commonwealth.

Given these humanistic definitions of law and justice, it is not surprising that social orders based on these dogmas, such as Soviet Russia, Red China, and Sweden, have many apologists and defenders in humanistic circles. These social orders exemplify various facets of the humanistic dream.

The God-centered nature of law and justice has ostensibly been eliminated and relegated to the museum of history. The modern state is a humanistic state, and the law is its creation, and justice is what the state does. "Justice" is also the title, although not the nature, of U.S. Supreme Court judges, and other judges in other countries.

This humanistic justice, however, satisfies very few, certainly not those who receive the protection and material aid called "social justice." The major consequence is the corruption of the recipients, their loss of responsibility, and the massive cultivation of envy. Envy is as corrosive a social force as man has ever known. It does to the societal sphere what earthquakes do to the physical. Envy fractures a society and turns it steadily into a hostile and even armed camp. Social classes, races, minorities, and other groups view one another with hatred and suspicion. Envy solves no problems and creates new ones.

The modern state, however, is increasingly prone to legislating envy. Since it derives its law from man, not God, its law and "social justice" become revelations of the nature of man, not God. The law of God is a revelation of the righteousness or justice of God. The Ten Commandments give us in summary form not only God's covenant law for man but a revelation of the righteousness and holiness of God. The law is often prefixed with the words, "Sanctify yourselves therefore, and be ye holy: for I am the Lord your God" (Lev. 20:7). The law governs man, and it reveals God. The law gives to man the way of holiness, because God is holy, and His law is holy. It separates good and evil, and the just and the unjust.

Man, like God, legislates his nature, but man's nature is not justice but sin, a fallen nature, and he legislates his sin. The law thus, as man

becomes more and more humanistic, becomes more and more evil. It vindicates homosexuality, and it kills millions of unborn babies. It legislates covetousness, and it enforces legalized theft against every social class. The end of sin is death, and so too the humanistic state is suicidal. In every age, the word of Wisdom stands: "But he that sinneth against me wrongeth his own soul: all they that hate me love death" (Prov. 8:36).

The future of humanistic laws and states is death. "Except the LORD build the house, they labour in vain that build it" (Ps. 127:1).

208

JESUS AND THE TAX REVOLT

Chalcedon Report No. 277, August 1988

In Matthew 22:15–22, we read of a challenge to our Lord to give grounds to justify a tax revolt. In view of the fact that this episode is sometimes cited by contemporary tax-revolt advocates, it is important to examine it closely to see what its meaning is.

We are told that its purpose was to "entangle" Jesus, i.e., to place Him in an intolerable predicament. Paying taxes to Caesar, a foreign ruler, was highly unpopular with many; to deny the validity of a tax revolt would cost Jesus, the Pharisees reasoned, popular support. The populace in disgust would regard Him as an appeaser, an ally of an unpopular and hated regime. However, to favor the tax revolt would invite reprisals against Jesus by Roman authorities. The question, then, was carefully designed to be deadly in its consequences to Jesus, and it was asked with flattering guile, asking Him to tell the truth without fear of consequences: "Master, we know that thou art true, and teachest the way of God in truth, neither carest thou for any man: for thou regardest not the person of men. Tell us therefore, What thinkest thou? Is it lawful to give tribute unto Caesar, or not?" (Matt. 22:16–17). Jesus, after condemning the Pharisees as *hypocrites*, went directly to the heart of the matter. To understand His answer, we must appreciate the distinction made then and now by tax-revolt advocates. They were not anarchists. They were ready to pay taxes to a legitimate civil government, but not to an illegal one, i.e., one illegal in their eyes. Similarly, contemporary tax-revolt advocates are able to document at length the unconstitutional aspects of the federal government of the United States and to give a lengthy analysis of legal justification for denying taxes to an unconstitutional regime.

The distinction made by the Judeans then was one which we still have with us in Latin form, common to our dictionaries now as good English.

It is the distinction between a *de facto* civil government and a *de jure* one. A *de jure* civil government is one which rules rightfully and legally, by right of law; modern Americans would say that it is truly constitutional civil government. A *de facto* order is one which actually exists and is in command and is not necessarily or at all legal. Thus, to cite an extreme case, the communist rule over Poland is a *de facto* one, not *de jure*. Rome was an outsider in Palestine, a foreign invader and conqueror; its rule was plainly *de facto*. Although Rome was trying to give good administration and to win over the people to its rule, its rule was all the same *de facto*, not *de jure*, and there were many among the Jews who argued that taxes paid to a *de facto* ruler were not legal and hence should *not* be paid. Hence the framing of the question in terms of the tax-revolt theory of the day: "Is it *lawful* to give tribute unto Caesar, or not?" The argument was that it was an unlawful tax. The reasoning was identical with what we encounter today. The *de jure* argument is used, by the way, by radicals and conservatives alike. It is an easy argument. History is so rife with illegality and evil, that there is little that cannot be nullified by an appeal to a *de jure* argument. One man once argued with me that, because white Americans had not legal title to America but seized it from the Indians, the Indians should be compensated at current value for it. I pointed out, first, that the current value was a product of the white settler's work, and, second, the Indians themselves had seized the continent and killed off entirely a previous dweller, a pygmy people. Should we throw out both Indian and white, and locate pygmies to compensate, or to use to resettle America? Such arguments end in absurdity, and they begin by idolizing or deifying a particular model as the *de jure* factor. I believe that I regard the U.S. Constitution with equal or more respect than the tax-revolt advocates, but its framing was a *de facto* act. The so-called Constitutional Convention had no authority given to it to frame a constitution. Should we therefore call for its abolition until a *de jure* status can be given it?

Our Lord's answer was unequivocally grounded on the *de facto* aspect: "Shew me the tribute money. And they brought him a penny. And he saith unto them, Whose is this image and superscription? They say unto him, Caesar's. Then saith he unto them, Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; and unto God the things that are God's" (Matt. 22:19–21). Caesar was the *de facto* ruler; he provided the coinage, the military protection, the courts, the civil government, and the basic civil authority. This *de facto* status was a reality which could not be ignored. They were duty bound, not only by Caesar's demands, but by Christ's, to render to Caesar the things which by a *de facto* state belonged to Caesar. A *de jure* argument can be used to deny virtually all

authority, civil, parental, religious, vocational, etc., in a fallen world. A fallen world is itself a *de facto* world, not a *de jure* world; it is the reality, but it is not a lawful reality.

Does this mean that we content ourselves with evil? Do we relax and accept all things as inevitably *de facto* in a fallen world, and therefore beyond remedy? Far from it: what our Lord ruled out was the tax *revolt*, revolution as the way, rather than regeneration. Sinful man cannot create a truly *de jure* state; he is by nature doomed to go from one *de facto* evil to another.

The key is to "render unto God the things that are God's." We render ourselves, our homes, our schools, churches, states, vocations, *all things* to God. We make Biblical law our standard, and we recognize in all things the primacy of regeneration. Only as man, by the atoning blood of Jesus Christ, is made *de jure*, made right in his relationship to God by God's law of justice, can man, guided by God's law, begin to create a *de jure* society.

A tax revolt is exactly what Karl Marx in 1848 hoped it would be: a short-cut to anarchy and therefore revolution. In his articles of November 12, 1848, "We Refuse to Pay Taxes"; on November 17, 1848, "The Ministry Under Indictment"; and November 17, 1848, "No More Taxes," he called upon Germans to break the state by refusing to pay taxes (see Saul K. Padover, ed. and trans., Karl Marx Library, vol. 1, *On Revolution* [New York, NY: McGraw-Hill, 1971], pp. 452–455). While much earlier he had argued against the legality of taxation without proper representation, on December 9, 1848, he said plainly, "Our ground is not the *ground of legality*; it is the *ground of revolution*" (ibid., p. 456, "The Bourgeoisie and the Counterrevolution"). Marx believed, as Gary North has shown in *Marx's Religion of Revolution*, in the regenerating power of chaos, anarchy, and revolution.

Those who render unto God the things which are God's believe rather in regeneration through Jesus Christ and the reconstruction of all things in terms of God's law. In such a perspective, a tax revolt is a futile thing, a dead end, and a departure from Biblical requirements.

209

REACTING INSTEAD OF ACTING

Chalcedon Report No. 336, July 1993

Recently, in Jamestown, California, some eighteen miles southwest of us, a murder took place. A man was on trial for sodomizing young boys at a church camp. He had been convicted in 1983 of a like charge and had simply been put on probation. The man had told one of his victims that if he ever told anyone what he had done, he would kill his mother. In the courtroom, the man smirked as he saw the frightened boys, one of whom had vomited at the thought of testifying. The boy's mother went to her car, came back with a twenty-five caliber pistol, and shot the man five times, killing him.

There was a coast-to-coast reaction in favor of the mother, and money was sent for her defense. Law enforcement officials were on television repeatedly to condemn the murder. One preacher called any pastor who condemned the murder a "Baal-priest." Feelings were and still are intense.

It is certainly a fact that most people felt a strong sympathy for the mother, while regretting the murder. The growing lawlessness, the laxity of judges and jurors, the failure to exact the death penalty where due, and more, all contributed to the growing anger of many people. It would be difficult for any of us to say that, given the same circumstances, we might not also have killed the man. But that does not make it right. The Bible gives us a precedent in Phinehas (Num. 25:6–15); but Phinehas was a high-ranking leader, the grandson of Aaron, a close relative of Moses, and, later, a high priest. He was a man of authority in the nation, and a part of the law order. There is here no warrant for us to take the law in our own hands. Calvin limited all such acts to men who, as magistrates, could legitimately intervene to reestablish law.

We live in a time when too many church people see "direct action" as the solution. And, all too often, they have bypassed godly avenues of

action. They are antinomian; they do not tithe; many do not vote; and they do not support godly men who seek to enter the political realm in terms of Biblical premises of action. They do not act; they react. They do not work to create a Christian order; they simply manifest wrath against things. They react, and this is simply negation, not Christian Reconstruction.

I hear much too often of rapes. Is the answer for churchmen to lynch or kill in some way all the rapists? We live in an ungodly society. Should we begin to kill off the ungodly, the lawbreakers who deserve death? The early church faced all these problems. Their daughters were seized and raped, and then placed in brothels. Would Christianity have survived if they had taken to the sword? St. Cyprian forbad even demonstrations against such things. The Christian calling he saw as the *conversion* of men and nations to Jesus Christ as Redeemer and King. Facing much more evil in that time than we do, the church fought *in the Spirit*. It became the force for healing and renewal, for regeneration through Christ the Lord. In time, the corrupt courts were changed, not by violence, but by God's grace.

The only good we have in our society comes from God's grace and mercy. This is also our only hope for the future. Certainly our hearts are moved by this mother's act, but this does not change the Word of God. The gospel, not the sword, is our strength, and life in Christ is the only regenerating power.

ECONOMICS

210

THE ECONOMICS OF DEATH

Chalcedon Report No. 192, August 1981

The Bible is full of economic wisdom which often goes neglected in our day because the Bible, the book for all of life, is too commonly reduced to a devotional manual and all "non-spiritual" truth is discarded. Solomon, for example, tells us, "Cast thy bread upon the waters: for thou shalt find it after many days" (Eccles. 11:1). The reference here is to rice planting. The rice is broadcast into water paddies, as it were; the family's "bread" or food is thrown away, in a sense, but only thereby is a harvest possible in the days to come. In Psalm 126:5–6, the same fact is stated even more vividly: "They that sow in tears shall reap in joy. He that goeth forth and weepeth, bearing precious seed, shall doubtless come again with rejoicing, bringing his sheaves with him." Here we have a famine in view; the precious grain is sown with tears, because life depends upon its harvest. In both texts, the *first* emphasis is that present advantages must be sacrificed for future benefits; there is no harvest tomorrow without a sowing today. Sowing seed constitutes an investment in the future.

Second, very obviously, the man who sows seed has, on the most basic and elementary level, some hope for the future. A society without hope is present-oriented. It is a consumer society; it eats up its seed grain rather than planning for a future harvest. It becomes, therefore, something that God condemns, a debt-oriented society rather than a saving and sowing one. It pays no heed to the six-year limitation on debt, nor to the principal that the godly goal is to owe no man anything save to love one another (Rom. 13:8). A debt society is death-oriented; it makes saving, thrift, and future-oriented planning difficult or unprofitable, because it encourages consumption but not production. A "tax break" is offered to debtors on their interest payments; savings are taxed (for accrued interest) as well as production and profit (or harvest). The tax structures of our time are

anti-Scriptural with a vengeance. Moreover, the moral order is reversed; debt becomes an asset to these statist humanists, and wealth a liability and an evil. Money today does not have gold or silver behind it, but debt. The Monetary Control Act of 1980, which went into effect on March 31, 1980, allows the United States to monetize debts other than those of the federal government, debts both domestic and foreign. This is eating our bread or grain, not casting it upon the waters!

The power of a popular existentialism on the twentieth-century mind is apparent in its present-oriented economics. For existentialism, the moment, stripped of all morality and religion, and all considerations from the past or about the future, is everything. This too is the essence of all the varieties of Keynesian economics. Keynes despised the future; his premise was, "In the long run, we are all dead." This death orientation marks modern economics, and it marks the reprobate. As Proverbs 8:36 declares, "But he that sinneth against me wrongeth his own soul: all they that hate me love death."

The Bible requires a future orientation of us not in terms of ourselves, but in terms of Christ, the gospel, and the Kingdom of God. Our Lord says, "For whosoever will save his life shall lose it; but whosoever shall lose his life for my sake and the gospel's, the same shall save it" (Mark 8:35; cf. Matt. 10:39; 16:25; Luke 9:24; Luke 17:33). Our Lord here, in speaking of "losing" our lives, is not talking about martyrdom, but about "sowing," casting our lives by faith on the waters of the future, to yield a harvest to Him, and ourselves in Him.

Third, we are told that our godly investment in the future, God's future, shall certainly bear fruit: "Cast thy bread upon the waters; *for thou shalt find it after many days*." Again, "He that goeth forth and weepeth, bearing precious seed, *shall doubtless come again with rejoicing, bringing his sheaves with him*." Humanly speaking, while there is no harvest without sowing, there is still no certainty of a harvest. Drought, blights, floods, insects, war, and other disasters can wipe out a potential harvest. We are, however, promised a certain and inescapable harvest if we, in all our ways, seek to serve and glorify God: "And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose" (Rom. 8:28). This same fact is set forth powerfully and in detail in Deuteronomy 28.

Deuteronomy 28 emphasizes beyond any possibility of misunderstanding the moral and economic consequences of faithlessness to God. Inescapable curses and blessings are set forth: the religious, political, economic, personal, and agricultural consequences of denying God's law (and becoming present- and man-oriented) are clearly spelled out.

The economic world of humanism is a world of present possibilities and no future certainties. Hence, existential economic experimentation is held to be both possible and necessary. We have, then, fiat money and economics, with man playing God and seeking to determine all possibilities by his fiat will. The world of causality is replaced by a world of nonconsequential possibilities. Such a perspective leads to the economics of death: a thousand and one ways of economic death are experimented with rather than to pursue an economics of life, because only the economics of death reserves determination to man. The world of law is replaced by the fiat word of man.

As a result, by March 31, 1980, what Martin D. Weiss, in *The Great Money Panic* (Arlington House, 1981) calls "The Debt Monster," meant a $1.5 trillion debt for the nation's corporations; a $949 billion federal debt; and, for homes, office buildings, and shopping centers, a $1,362 billion mortgage debt. At the same time, cash liquidity is at an all-time low; unemployment in the United States and abroad is increasing, and the "solution" more and more in view is increased inflation. This is like prescribing more liquor to an alcoholic!

With all this, we have seen a reversal in moral order. As even one "Reverend Doctor" wrote me recently, "gay" is good, and heterosexual is evil (and all "straights" should be put into concentration camps, he held!). Abortion is good, and pro-life is fascistic, it is also held. Such moral disorder is to be expected in an era which sees debt as an investment in the future and an economic asset.

One of the great evils of modern economics is its purported scientific basis. Mathematics of a sort, and science of a sort, are substituted for morality. It will not do to tell our statists that their economics is a form of theft by law; their graphs and statistics are designed to replace economic morality with economic "science."

Economics was once taught as a branch of "moral philosophy." Adam Smith himself was a professor of moral philosophy (although his ethics followed Hume, unhappily, but his economics presupposed an "Invisible Hand"). Today, moral considerations are banished from economics in favor of pseudoscience.

As a result, economic issues are seen, not in terms of moral considerations, which require character, work, and a future orientation, but in terms of "needs" and "lacks." Because of this, we speak of "underdeveloped" nations, which Peter F. Drucker, in *Toward the Next Economics, and Other Essays* (Harper and Row, 1981, p. 64) calls an error: no country, he holds, is underdeveloped because it lacks resources; rather, it does not utilize its resources; its capital in such forms is not productively

employed. Neither its human resources nor its physical resources are put to productive use.

We must add that productive use requires a faith and character geared to the future, and to a vision of a growing and dominion-oriented society. Unless such a faith revives, all nations will soon be "underdeveloped." As Proverbs 29:18 summarizes it, "Where there is no vision, the people perish: but he that keepeth the law, happy is he."

To abandon moral and theological considerations in any area, including economics, is to abandon reality and meaning. It is to deny knowledge. Drucker cites the shift to a new definition of knowledge as "whatever has no utility and is unlikely to be applied" (p. 49). We can add that such "knowledge" cannot successfully be applied. This certainly would cover the contemporary economics of death and suicide.

When a civil government rules by fiat, and when its economics is a violation of moral order, the result is either anarchy, or a return to or a revival of, the most conservative forms of moral order, or, usually, both of these at the same time. The Soviet Union has no lack of anarchy; it is a way of life for many. For many others, very ancient forms of family life and order are providing a close world of meaning. As a result, even the levirate continues within the Soviet Union (Helene Carrere d'Encausse, *Decline of an Empire: The Soviet Socialist Republics in Revolt* [Newsweek Books, 1979], p. 256).

The preoccupation of contemporary national economic policies is with "the problems of unemployment and inflation," as Lewis E. Lehrman has pointed out ("The Creation of International Monetary Order," in David P. Calleo, editor, *Money and the Coming World Order* [New York University Press, 1976], p. 71). Economic order having been violated, the consequences of national economic policies are disorders and increasing problems.

In the face of all this, the silence of the church on economic evils is amazing. Not only so, too often it manifests hostility to any mention of the critical issue of debt. In the past decade, my own comments and those of Gary North on un-Biblical debt policies have brought forth some outraged responses. Just recently, because of references to the question of debt in some Chalcedon position papers, some highly emotional and angry letters have come in from people who have been handed copies of these papers. This is not surprising. We have in such cases a very obvious fact. The person of the church is heavily in debt, and in debt for many, many years to come. They are also in a serious economic "bind." Instead of confessing to the Lord that their debts are violations of His law, and seeking His help to reorder their lives, they pray for "blessings," i.e., to

be relieved of their debt situation by some miracle, and without penalties. To be told that they are in sin, and that the wages of sin are always death (Rom. 6:23), triggers in them an angry hysteria. They want a god who will let them eat their cake and have it too.

There is a *fourth* aspect to the religious, moral, and economic implications of Psalm 126:5–6: he who is future-oriented and sows with hope in the Lord, "shall doubtless come again *with rejoicing*, *bearing his sheaves with him*" The result is not only productivity, but joy. David, in Psalm 144:12–15 prays for an obedient people, a faithful people, faithful to their covenant God and His law, "That our sons may be as plants grown up in their youth; that our daughters may be as corner stones, polished after the similitude of a palace; That our garners may be full, affording all manner of store: that our sheep may bring forth thousands and ten thousands in our streets: That our oxen may be strong to labour; that there be no breaking in, nor going out; that there be no complaining in our streets. Happy is that people, that is in such a case: yea, happy is that people, whose God is the LORD."

Such a society begins with your faithfulness and mine. It is time to say, "as for me and my house, we will serve the LORD" (Josh. 24:15).

211

TOWARDS A BIBLICAL ECONOMICS

Chalcedon Report No. 319, February 1992

On his visit here in November 1991, Ian Hodge, the leader of Australian Christian Reconstruction, raised a fundamental question about economics. Himself a practicing economist, he asked if economics had any right to exist as an autonomous realm? Of course, socialists have an answer to that: they subordinate economics to politics. But what is the Christian solution?

The Christian must begin by separating himself from the world of John Locke. In Locke's thinking, *property* took priority over everything else. To a very real degree, it can be said that for Locke the state is a social contract whose fundamental purpose is to protect property for the individual. In his *Second Treatise on Civil Government*, Locke said:

> Though the earth and all inferior creatures be common to all men, yet every man has a *property* in his own *person*. This nobody has any right to but himself. The labour of his body, and the *work* of his hands, we may say, are properly his. Whatsoever, then, he removes out of the state that nature hath provided and left it in, he hath mixed his labour with it, and joined to it something that is his own, and thereby makes it his property. It being by him removed from the common state nature placed it in, it hath by this labour something annexed to it that excludes the common right of other men. For this labour being the unquestionable property of the labourer, no man but he can have a right to what that is once joined to, at least where there is enough, and as good left in common for others. (chap. 4, para. 27)

We have here the foundation for non-Biblical capitalism, as well as socialism in every form. We have the essential ingredient for the labor theory of value, and labor's "right" to property. Although John Locke paid lip service to Christianity, he did not recognize God's sovereignty over man and the earth, nor man's status as a steward or trustee under

God. Neither did Locke recognize the fallen nature of man, because his belief, after Aristotle and Aquinas, in the mind of man as an innocent and blank tablet undercut the basic premise of Christian faith, man's fallen estate and his need of a Savior. Having separated property from a theological to a natural origin, he became thereby the father also of Marxism. If property is not under God ("The earth is the LORD's, and the fulness thereof; the world, and they that dwell therein" [Ps. 24:1]), why should it be under the individual's rather than the community's control? The world of Locke leads straight to Karl Marx.

Now, God's law not only controls property (not taxable by the state because under God), it also controls money and debt. The law against false weights and measures had essential reference to money: gold and silver were not coined but were used by weight (Lev. 19:35–37; Deut. 25:13–16). American coinage began by weight, a $20 gold piece being ounce of gold, 90 percent fine, and so on. Debts could not be contracted by believers beyond six years (Deut. 15:1–11); they were cancelled in the seventh or Sabbatical year. When Rome fell, the land tax disappeared, although William Carroll Bark, in *Origins of the Medieval World* (1958, p. 14ff.), could not understand why.

As Christianity began to penetrate the European mind, men's views began to change. "A man's affairs were everybody's business." A debt was seen as *a promise*, a commitment which had community-wide ramifications. In England, Magna Carta forbad the seizure of any man's land or person for debt: every man was king in his own palace under God. "Neither the debtor's person nor his land could be seized . . . The sheriff could go on receiving rent and other income from the land until the debt was paid, but he could not *take* the land." (The United States reverted to this for a time after the War of Independence. Talk of Magna Carta was not hyperbole but an insistence on Christian freedom.) Moreover, "As religion was a state matter, so was business." The idea of a just price did not mean taking a loss; it meant that a man could not take advantage of a crisis to charge a price far in excess of his cost. While the gilds had a monopoly, they also had a responsibility to make good the dishonesty or debt of a member (see Hugh Barty-King, *The Worst Poverty: A History of Debt and Debtors*, 1991, p. 116).

Roman law, in its fundamental Twelve Tables, gave a creditor the right to seize and dismember the debtor and to sell his wife and children into perpetual slavery. This premise in part came into English law, although Cromwell sought to alleviate it. (Another evil borrowing was the essential Roman legal premise: "The welfare of the state is the highest law." This now governs all countries.)

After Locke, the debtor's prison became an increasing force in English life. A man sent to debtor's prison was not discharged until his debt was paid. Unlike other prisoners, he was not fed, so he routinely starved to death. Many of these debtors were men who lost everything in some natural disaster. From 1750–1950, 10,000 or so debtors were sent to prison each year. "Imprisonment for ordinary civil debt was abolished by a statute in 1970" (Barty-King, p. 173). Contemporary culture, being consumption rather than production oriented, has seen a startling increase in debt, unprecedented in all of history. The result is a debt ridden world, currencies with only debt behind them, and a coming worldwide economic collapse. Economics separated from religion, from a Biblical theology, are leading to history's greatest disaster.

If economics be separated from Biblical faith, it becomes a form of totalitarianism. The marketplace becomes the new god, and all things are governed by the premises of Lockean economics. I am regularly told by some that they *cannot* support me because they do not *believe* in nonprofit activities. This would eliminate all churches and charities, and good music, and replace God with the marketplace. Not surprisingly, it leads, as Lew Rockwell and Murray Rothbard have often said, to libertinism. I have been told by such economic totalitarians that prostitution is good because it operates in terms of a free market, whereas marriage does not. Totalitarianism bears more labels than simply Marxism and fascism.

If all life is a stewardship under God, and all property and economic activity are stewardships, then our contemporary economic theories of the right and the left are alike immoral. Republican George Bush and Marxist Gorbachev are indeed bedfellows of an anti-Christian order. (Howard Phillips has rightly termed some members of Congress "Gorbachev Republicans.") It means, too, that Ian Hodge is right: all our economic theory needs rethinking in terms of Biblical faith.

Solomon was right: "Can a man take fire in his bosom, and his clothes not be burned?" (Prov. 6:27). We have taken fire into our bosoms, and more than our clothes will be burned. It is time to renounce the evil heritage of John Locke. May God have mercy on us, but some Christian schools have in effect canonized him!

We cannot begin our economic theories with property, nor anything other than the triune God and His law-word. In every sphere of life and thought, this must be our starting point. But the church has become antinomian with respect to God's law, and devout nomians with respect to man's law. There is no fear of God before their eyes (Ps. 36:1). To them we can say, when we believe and obey God, "Come and hear, all ye that fear God, and I will declare what he hath done for my soul" (Ps. 66:16).

212

ARE WE USING LANGUAGE TO CONFUSE OURSELVES?

Chalcedon Report No. 204, August 1982

Too often in our time, the terms we use to organize our thinking are created by statist agencies and serve to mislead us. One such set of terms, created by the Internal Revenue Service, is profit versus nonprofit. Profit-making activities are taxed; nonprofit enterprises and agencies are not. People have come to classify activities in terms of these two terms, as though they described reality instead of a statist taxing category. Would it not be much more realistic to classify things without reference to IRS? If the IRS were to disappear in the next decade, how useful would these terms be? After all, they have reference only to tax status.

I submit that the terms productive versus nonproductive are much more useful. Churches, schools, and libraries are "nonprofit," but they are at the same time among the most productive agencies civilization has ever known. To eliminate them would be to eliminate civilization. Civil government is emphatically nonprofit; often it is not productive of too much good, but, when kept within its limits, can be productive of social order. The family is a nonprofit community, but it is a most emphatically productive agency, and its decay is the decay of society and civilization.

Because we have emphasized the profit versus nonprofit perspective, we have tended to falsify our view of life. In every area, intellectual, industrial, and personal, we have downgraded the productive man in favor of the profiting man. Production has thus been displaced by administration, i.e., the visible symbols of profitable power in church, university, state, and business, have gained ascendancy over the productive mind and hand.

Religiously speaking, this means that form has become more important than substance, and pragmatism has replaced theology. When we

look at the world through categories governed by the IRS, we have beggared ourselves intellectually, and we have allowed the tax man rather than the Lord God to frame our thinking.

We need to remind ourselves of St. Paul's words: "Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth" (2 Tim. 2:15).

213

CAPITALIZATION AND DECAPITALIZATION

Chalcedon Report No. 19, April 1, 1967

Since we are in the midst of inflation, it is important for us to realize what inflation does. One of the central results of inflation is *decapitalization*. Decapitalization means the progressive destruction of capital, so that a society has progressively less productive ability. Capitalization is the accumulation of wealth through work and thrift, and decapitalization is the dissipation of accumulated wealth. A free economy, capitalism, is an impossibility without capitalization. Some of the potentially wealthiest agricultural countries are importers of agricultural produce, such as Venezuela and Chile. The fishing grounds off the Pacific coast of South America are some of the richest known to the world, rich enough to feed the countries of that area. Chilean fishermen cannot market fish properly, and dump marvelous catches of fish into the sea, because they have neither storage nor transport facilities to take their fish to the markets. Thus, there is neither a lack of labor nor a lack of markets for the fish, but the necessary capitalization to provide the facilities for bringing labor, produce, and market together is lacking. Much of the world is in the same predicament: it has the labor, the natural resources, and the hungry markets for its produce, but it lacks the necessary capital to make the flow of goods possible. Socialism tries to solve this problem but only aggravates it, because it furthers the poverty of all concerned. Socialism and inflation both accomplish the same purpose: they decapitalize an economy.

Capitalization is the product of work *and thrift*, the accumulation of wealth and the wise use of accumulated wealth. This accumulated wealth is invested, in effect, in progress, because it is made available for the development of natural resources and the marketing of goods and produce.

The thrift which leads to the savings or accumulation of wealth, to capitalization, is a product of *character*. Capitalization is a product in every era of the Puritan disposition, of the willingness to forego present pleasures to accumulate some wealth for future purposes. Without character, there is no capitalization but rather decapitalization, the steady depletion of wealth. As a result, capitalism is supremely a product of Christianity, and, in particular, of Puritanism, which, more than any other faith, has furthered capitalization.

This means that, before decapitalization, either in the form of socialism or inflation, can occur, there must be a breakdown of faith and character. Before the United States began its course of socialism and inflation, it had abandoned its historic Christian position. The people had come to see more advantage in wasting capital than in accumulating it, in enjoying superficial pleasures than living in terms of the lasting pleasures of the family, faith, and character. Inflation succeeds when people have larceny in their hearts, and the same is true of socialism. Socialism is organized larceny; like inflation, it takes from the haves to give to the have-nots. By destroying capital, it destroys progress and pushes society into disaster. As the products of capitalization begin to wear out, new capital is lacking to replace them, and the state has no capital of its own: it only impoverishes the people further and therefore itself by trying to create capital by taxation. Every socialist state decapitalizes itself progressively.

When inflation and socialism get under way, having begun in the decline of faith and character, they see as their common enemy precisely those people who still have faith and character. In 1937, Roger Babson, in *If Inflation Comes*, wrote, "Only righteousness exalteth a nation today, as it did 3000 years ago. Hence, speaking strictly as a statistician, I say that the safest hedge against inflation is the development of character" (p. 178). We can add that the greatest enemy of inflation is faith and character. Inflation and socialism attack as the enemy Biblical Christianity, because it is their common purpose to destroy the roots of capitalization. By taxation and inflation, thrift is made both difficult and economically unsound, since money ceases to be gold and silver and becomes counterfeit, unredeemable paper. People are barred from possessing gold and silver in some countries; inheritance taxes work to destroy capital, as do income taxes. Education, television, the press, and all other media foster relativism and humanism; they promote *the decapitalization of character*. We have seen the progressive decline of public and private morality. Missionaries on furlough who return home every seventh year, have commented on the sharp erosion they witness with each return. Things which were once intolerable and forbidden are now openly promoted and sponsored.

We who stand for Biblical Christianity thus face a steadily more hostile world. We are everything which socialism and inflation hate most.

How are we to defend ourselves? And how can we have a return to capitalism? Capitalism can only revive if capitalization revives, and capitalization depends, in its best and clearest form, on that character produced by Biblical Christianity, by the regeneration of man through Jesus Christ. This means that we must begin afresh to establish truly Christian churches, to establish Christian schools and colleges, to promote Christian learning as the foundation of Christian character. Capitalization does not depend on winning elections, important as elections are. No election has yet really reversed decapitalization. The demand is for increasing decapitalization in the form of more welfare, more Social Security, more Medicare, and the like. For the past generation, no officeholder has done more than to slow down this process very slightly. An election does not produce character, which is the foundation of capitalization.

Socialism and inflation work to create a depletion of spiritual resources as a necessary step towards their success. No countermovement can succeed if the depleted spiritual resources are not replenished. When modern capitalism began, its critics love to point out, every capitalist was a Bible-toting, Bible-quoting man. He knew the Good Book from end to end far better than most clergymen do today. The Fabian Socialist, R. H. Tawney, in *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism* saw modern capitalism as substantially a product of Calvin and Puritanism. Calvinism, he said, produced "a race of iron" because of its "insistence on personal responsibility, discipline and asceticism (i.e., self-denial), and the call to fashion for the Christian character an objective embodiment in social institutions." In England, as capitalism began to develop as the new power in the state, Tawney said, "the business classes were . . . conscious of themselves as something like a separate order, with an outlook on religion and politics peculiarly their own, distinguished not merely by birth and breeding, but by their social habits, their business discipline, the whole bracing atmosphere of their moral life, from a Court which they believed to be godless and an aristocracy which they knew to be spendthrift." Instead of holding that "business is business," these men held instead that business is a calling under God to be discharged in terms of His Word and law. It was held that it was the *first* duty of man to know and believe in God. A Scottish divine of 1709 wrote of Glasgow, "I am sure the Lord is remarkably frowning upon our trade . . . since it was put in the room of religion." Priority in every man's life belongs to God alone. The *second* duty of man is to fulfill God's calling in his chosen vocation. A Puritan divine wrote, "God doth call every man and woman . . . to serve Him in

some peculiar employment in this world, both for their own and the common good . . . The Great Governor of the world both appointed to every man his proper post and province, and let him be never so active out of his sphere, he will be at a great loss, if he do not keep his own vineyard and mind his own business . . . "

It is a liberal and romantic myth that America and the frontier was colonized by people who had nothing. Men came here with capital, or worked to accumulate it, but their basic capital was *spiritual*: it was their Christian faith, and this led to economic capitalization. Far more actual capital migrated to Latin America than to North America, but it was an accumulated aristocratic wealth which either barely sustained itself on landed estates or else rapidly decapitalized because it had little spiritual capital.

This letter is written by one who believes intensely in orthodox Christianity and in our historic Christian American liberties and heritage. It is my purpose to promote the basic capitalization of society, out of which all else flows, *spiritual capital*. Without the spiritual capital of a God-centered and Biblical faith, we are spiritually and materially bankrupt. We will only succumb to the inflated and false values which govern men today and which are leading them to destruction. Where do you stand?

214

CAPITALIZATION IS THE PRODUCT OF WORK AND THRIFT

Originally a brochure produced for Coast Federal Savings in the late 1960s, this article was published with Rushdoony's other brochures as part of a two-sided paper titled "Comments in Brief" with Chalcedon Report No. 225, April 1984.

Capitalization is the product of *work and thrift*, the accumulation of wealth and the wise use of accumulated wealth.

This accumulated wealth is invested, in effect, in progress, because it is made available for the development of natural resources and the marketing of goods and produce.

The thrift which leads to the savings or accumulation of wealth to capitalization is a product of *character* (Prov. 6:6–15).

Capitalization is a product in every era of the Puritan disposition, of the willingness to forego present pleasures to accumulate some wealth for future purposes (Prov. 14:23). Without character, there is no capitalization but rather decapitalization, the steady depletion of wealth.

As a result, capitalism is supremely a product of Christianity, and, in particular, of Puritanism which, more than any other faith, has furthered capitalization.

This means that, before decapitalization, either in the form of socialism or inflation, can occur, there must be a breakdown of faith and character. Before the United States began its course of socialism and inflation, it had abandoned its historic Christian position. The people had come to see more advantage in wasting capital than in accumulating it, in enjoying superficial pleasures than living in terms of the lasting pleasures of the family, faith, and character.

When socialism and inflation get under way, having begun in the decline of faith and character, they see as their common enemy precisely

those people who still have faith and character.

How are we to defend ourselves? And how can we have a return to capitalism? Capitalism can only revive if capitalization revives, and capitalization depends, in its best and clearest form, on that character produced by Biblical Christianity.

This is written by one who believes intensely in orthodox Christianity and in our historic Christian American liberties and heritage. It is my purpose to promote that basic capitalization of society, out of which all else flows, *spiritual* capital. With the spiritual capital of a God-centered and Biblical faith, we can never become spiritually and materially bankrupt (Prov. 10:16).

215

LAISSEZ-FAIRE

Chalcedon Report No. 129, May 1976

It amazes me, as I travel, how many people who are Christians will attack the idea of laissez-faire as though it represents some pagan abomination. Not only that, but they mistakenly assume that modern corporate structures are dedicated to laissez-faire, when in fact, with a very few exceptions, most are intensely hostile to it.

What is involved in the doctrine of laissez-faire, the idea of built-in laws which ensure that freedom will produce the best results? What lies behind the "Invisible Hand" doctrine? Laissez-faire is a secularized form of the Biblical doctrine of providence. The Bible makes it clear that God is sovereign Lord and Creator, and that His law and predestinating counsel absolutely govern all things, so that all creation moves, not in terms of chance or chaos, but in terms of God's master plan. Faith in this plan and purpose means that it is not man's plan but God's which must govern reality. The consequences of such a faith, as developed by such a medieval thinker as Bishop Oresme, were the theoretical foundations of classical economics.

Modern man, however, wanted the consequences of God's being and government, but not God Himself. As a result, the modern era shifted the emphasis from Biblical law to natural law, and from providence to laissez-faire. In writing about laissez-faire, eighteenth-century thinkers were in essence reformulating the doctrine of providence to gain the full effect of God without acknowledging God openly. Their adoption of this doctrine of providence, and their emphasis on it, made for a tremendous input of social energy and vitality, as men proceeded to act, in the economic realm and elsewhere, in the assurance of an invisible hand which provided a total and absolutely providential government. However secular their interest, their work was a major theological development in Western thought.

Its ties to the Reformation doctrine of God's sovereignty and decree were very strong, however humanistic the framework of their concern.

Laissez-faire gave men a freedom from church and state, and from the law of institutions, in the name of a higher law. It thus developed to an unprecedented degree the implications of the doctrine of creation. The church had too often sought to act as the visible hand of God in a presumptuous manner, and the state had surpassed the church in playing the role of manifest providence. Laissez-faire placed the institutions in the background and gave the ultimate and active workings of providence priority. The social implications of this were far-reaching, and the growth created thereby dramatic in its historical consequences.

Laissez-faire, however, collapsed because of its humanistic framework. The logic of humanism continued to develop the implications of its separation from the doctrine of God. This meant that the doctrine of creation had to be dropped. Hegel developed the concept of social evolution, and Darwin applied it to biology and the sciences. With Darwin's acceptance, laissez-faire became an obsolete doctrine. The world of Darwin is a world of chance, a world of meaningless and brute factuality in which whatever develops does so accidentally rather than in terms of a cosmic plan. Social Darwinism could mean a ruthless economic individualism (not laissez-faire), as in Andrew Carnegie, but there is no law beyond man to govern him. It can lead to economic interventionism and socialism, as in the Rockefellers and others, but again it is a human decision, not an aspect of a cosmic plan.

In a meaningless universe, there is no invisible hand, and laissez-faire means a senseless chaos. The implications of Darwinism were quickly grasped. Men like John Stuart Mill moved from laissez-faire into socialism, because no doctrine of providence was possible in a Darwinian worldview.

But man cannot live without a doctrine of providence. The idea of predestination is an intellectual necessity, because the alternative is a world of total chance and meaninglessness. The doctrine of laissez-faire had shifted the government and decree from God to Nature, while tacitly retaining all the forms of the theological formulation of the doctrine. With Darwin, a further transfer took place. Now the state (or, with libertarians, anarchistic man) became the source of providence and predestination.

The result has been the rise of socialism and economic interventionism. Social planning and control mean that the state now issues the decree of predestination. The providential government of all things has become a function of state, and churchmen solemnly approve of this blasphemy

and condemn the mild departures which laissez-faire represented. Not surprisingly, we are in the midst of a major theological decline and collapse, because the heart of the doctrine of God has been transferred to the state. Sovereignty and control now belong to an institution of man, and scientific socialism logically calls for the total control of man. This includes not only economic control but genetic control and engineering.

Even as Scripture, because of the fall, calls for the re-creation of man in Jesus Christ, so too the modern sovereign, the state, calls for the remaking of man by scientific engineering. Man must be changed from God's creation into the state's creation, and this change is necessary in order to establish the state's sovereignty, so that we can expect more and more emphasis on the remaking of man by science and the state.

Despite its serious defects, laissez-faire had as its great virtue the fact that it did concentrate on the doctrine of providence. Its failure was that it could not maintain the doctrine of providence without the sovereign and absolute God. On the other hand, the church has not been able to defend its doctrine of God when it has abandoned implicitly the doctrine of providence. As a result, the church condemns itself to impotence. It clings formally to doctrines it castrates in fact. It affirms predestination by God and bows down to predestination by Caesar, by the state.

Where are the theologians who are discussing the implications of the doctrines of creation and providence in terms of the realities of everyday life, in terms of economics, politics, and all things else? The answer is that, outside of Chalcedon, they are almost nonexistent. Is it any wonder that we are in trouble? Can we affirm providence without far-reaching personal, social, economic, and political consequences? Can we believe in the God of Scripture without such consequences?

The consequences of our day are those of humanism in church and state, in economics, politics, education, and theology. Until we begin to think theologically, the consequences will not change. Are you with us?

216

REWARDS AND PUNISHMENTS

Originally a brochure produced for Coast Federal Savings in the late 1960s, this article was published with Rushdoony's other brochures as part of a two-sided paper titled "Comments in Brief" with Chalcedon Report No. 225, April 1984.

A common opinion in recent years holds that rewards and punishments represent an unsound means of dealing with children or adults. We are told that rewards produce an unhealthy motive in those who win, and are traumatic for those who lose. It is also said that punishment is merely vengeance. On these premises some educators have eliminated grading as well as other forms of rewards and punishments. This hatred of rewards and punishment is one form of the attack on the interrelated concepts of *competition* and on *discipline*. Whether in the spiritual realm, with respect to heaven, or in the academic world for grades, or in the business world for profits, rewards and punishment (or penalties) motivate people (Psa. 19:11; 58:11; 91:8; Matt. 5:11, etc.). This motivation leads to competition, and competition requires discipline, self-discipline, discipline under civil and criminal law, and discipline under God (Heb. 12:1–11). And a result of honest competition is character.

But some people object, why not by cooperation? Isn't cooperation a superior method to competition? But as stated by Campbell, Potter, and Adam, in *Economics and Freedom*, "in a free market, voluntary cooperation and competition are names for the same economic concept." Historically, the competition of the free market has only been possible where a common culture and a common faith lead individuals to cooperate with each other. Men compete for cooperation in the confidence that others respect quality, and they constantly improve their products and service to earn that cooperation. Cooperation dies if competition dies, because then "pull" compulsion, and force replace the free, cooperative operations of the market.

Ultimately, rewards and punishments presuppose two things. *First*, they presuppose God, who has established certain returns in the form of rewards and penalties in the very nature of the universe as well as in moral law (Exod. 20:5–6; Judg. 5:20). Thus, any attack on the idea of rewards and punishment is an attack on God's order. *Second*, rewards and punishments presuppose liberty as basic to man's condition. Man is free to strive, to compete, to work for rewards and to suffer penalties. Thus, any attack on these concepts is also an attack on liberty: it is an insistence that a levelling equality together with total controls is a better condition for man than liberty is or can be. St. Paul declared, "where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty" (2 Cor. 3:17). God and liberty are inseparable. And liberty presupposes and requires free activity: it has its striving, its rewards and punishments, its heaven and hell, its passing and its failure. These are the necessary conditions of freedom. The alternative is slavery. Slavery offers a very real form of security, but then so does death and a graveyard (Deut. 30:15–20). To respect rewards and punishment, competition, and discipline is to respect life itself, and to value character and self-discipline. It means, simply, choosing *life*: "therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live" (Deut. 30:19).

217

A CHICKEN IN EVERY POT

Chalcedon Report No. 373, August 1996

One of the most disastrous of election promises came in 1928, when Herbert Hoover expressed his confidence in the American future by foreseeing a time soon to come when Americans would be so prosperous that there would be, in Hoover's words, "a chicken in every pot." "Chicken every Sunday" seemed then an extravagant promise. Chicken was then an expensive meat, and turkey was even more expensive, so that Hoover's promise was one of great prosperity.

Hoover won the election but gained a mocking public contempt for his promise when, in late 1929, the stock market crash led to the Great Depression. Political action did not solve the crisis. At the start, about 1,500,000 were unemployed; by late 1931, this had gone up to 3,000,000. F. D. Roosevelt took office, and, with a variety of emergency measures, doubled that number, and, by 1936, had 16,000,000 unemployed people to contend with. Only by entering the conflict in Europe, World War II, did the figures of the unemployed decrease. But the end of World War II, a return to the Depression economy was forestalled by a continuing military buildup and production for global conflicts. With President John F. Kennedy, and Robert McNamara, another strategy was devised to keep the economy going, lending money to "third-world" countries to enable them to buy armaments from the United States (and other Western nations). By this means, depression was for a time suppressed artificially.

But what about Hoover's promise of a "chicken in every pot"? At the time, chicken was indeed expensive, and various recipes were devised to make a chicken stretch into several meals. One popular and tasty recipe was "chicken *à la* king," widely used to make one chicken last a while.

But, since Hoover's much-ridiculed promise, an economic revolution

has taken place, and chicken has become cheaper than beef. It is, in fact, both cheap and plentiful.

Agricultural experts, and university agricultural departments, devised means of producing four-pound chickens in fifty days. At Cornell University, Robert Baker invented fifty-two processed-chicken products in the years since 1960. These included chicken steak, chicken chili, chicken baloney, and the popular chicken hot dog, which soon won almost 20 percent of the hot dog market. Then in 1950 Colonel Harland Sanders of Louisville, Kentucky "created" the Kentucky Fried Chicken, which, in less than twenty years, was grossing more than one billion dollars a year in thirty-nine countries. That income then doubled.

Instead of a "chicken in every pot" becoming a symbol of unrealistic hope, it had become cheap food, and many children were complaining to their mothers, "Not chicken again!" All this happened, not because of politics, but because of economic initiative in the private sector. Today large installations grow chickens and turkeys by the thousands, package and freeze them, and make them available to housewives all year long.

But this is only one of a number of economic developments that have vastly improved the diet of Americans, and of other peoples as well. The economic sector, when free, has again and again shown that it can accomplish remarkable things.

I can recall living a half century ago in high mountain country a hundred miles from any bus or train line. The winter weather was, at 5,400 feet, often subzero. Only two vegetables could be trucked in without freezing, cabbages and carrots. Our table one day would have cooked cabbage and raw carrots, and, the next, raw cabbage salad and cooked carrots! Then came frozen foods, not by any act of Congress but as a result of the free market and its initiative. In an election year, too many people look to politics for an answer, and they thereby limit economic freedom and their own future. Neither Hoover and the Republicans, nor F. D. Roosevelt and the Democrats, could give us "a chicken in every pot," but economic freedom did. Now too many people want to shut the windows of economic opportunity by political action. Politics cannot give us "a chicken in every pot," but politics and controls can take away the chicken and our freedom. By the way, should not Robert Baker of Cornell get more credit for our economic growth than our Washington, D.C. experts?

218

ECONOMIC CONFISCATION

Chalcedon Report No. 28, December 1, 1967

In our April 1966 newsletter 7, the *progressive confiscation* of private property and of constitutional safeguards was discussed briefly. This newsletter will deal with *economic confiscation*.

As we survey the economic crisis, it is easy for us, from a Christian perspective, to see the present course of action as stupidity. For the federal government to attempt to control the price of silver is foolishness, and it has been costly foolishness, and the unrealistic price of gold is equally costly to us. The question is very often raised, "Don't they see what they are doing?" and the answer is, clearly, yes. What we are experiencing is planned stupidity, and its goal is confiscation.

Marxist economics clearly aims at confiscation: its goal is a communist economics and the destruction of free, private capital. But this is *equally* the goal of Keynesian, neo-Keynesian, and welfare-state economics. (John Maynard Keynes, incidentally was described as a homosexual by Walter Scott in "Personality Parade," in *Parade*, November 12, 1967, p. 2, citing as reference for this fact Michael Holroyd's *Lytton Strachey: The Unknown Years*, published by Holt, Rinehart, Winston.) Keynes's very influential book, *General Theory of Employment, Interest, and Money* (1936), had as one of its central points the hostility to savings as a "vice." (Attention has been called to this aspect of Keynes by Henry Hazlitt, *The Failure of the "New Economics,"* [Princeton: Van Nostrand, 1959]; and Theodore Macklin, *Gold: Key to Confidence*, published in September 1967 by the Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy, 79 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016.) Keynsian economics works to destroy savings *and* to make savings impossible; it does this, not with an open policy of confiscation, but with a humanitarian concern for the general welfare, but, under any name, it is a policy of confiscation.

Now, it is important to define the savings which are attacked by Keynsian economics: this involves more than savings accounts in banks and savings-and-loan associations. It involves pension and insurance funds, private property, inheritances, and every other evidence of thrift and providence.

This confiscation is done by means of "doctored" money, counterfeit money. Lenin plainly said that a central banking system and paper money are nine-tenths of socialism; our welfare state knows this and operates on the same premise.

Gold and silver are real money, and an economy geared to real money always has a healthy check on unsound economic practices. In such an economy, because both money and banking rest on a gold basis, credit cannot expand indefinitely. As bank loans increase to the limit of gold reserves, interest rates rise, credit is cut off, and a short, quick depression results. Before World War I, U.S. depressions were short, a matter of weeks and months only and not as total in their effects. Unsound business practices are a condition of man: there is no fool-proof protection against them. But a free economy limits credit because it has a hard-money basis, and a credit expansion which is foolish and unsound is curtailed by hard-money requirements. If a bank is too free with credit, depositors can withdraw their money in gold and break the bank. If a civil government becomes unsound in policy, the people can vote against it also simply by withdrawing and hoarding gold, or demanding gold for their paper notes.

But socialism wants to penalize the hard-working, the wise, and the thrifty, to protect the fools and to subsidize them. Its answer to depression is to manage money and credit. Increase the credit: this is the socialist answer, a social credit scheme. As Alan Greenspan wrote, in "Gold and Economic Freedom" (in Ayn Rand, editor, *Capitalism: The Unknown Ideal* [1967], p. 99), "if shortage of bank reserves was causing a business decline — argued economic interventionists — why not find a way of supplying increased reserves to the banks so they never need be short! If banks can continue to loan indefinitely — it was claimed — there need never be any slumps in business." As a result, a federal agency was created, the Federal Reserve System, to maintain a flow of credit and money.

Now, if an economy works to insure fools against failure, it will be progressively advantageous to be a fool or a parasite. The successful businessman is no longer the man who follows sound practices and holds to the Christian virtues; such a man is increasingly penalized in order to subsidize the fools, knaves, and parasites. Debt is made into a business asset, and a private asset, by means of tax write-offs for interest

and other advantages. Living on credit becomes a way of life, and also a steady confiscation of real wealth to provide for the rascals.

Today, most big business and labor are socialistic simply because their profit comes from the inflationary, confiscatory policies of federally created credit. In newsletter no. 27, Gary North pointed out that "IBM needs $600 million a year in credit." IBM is not unusual in this respect by any means. What does this mean? It means that, because the federal government, big and small business, and private citizens everywhere are deeply in debt and living on credit, they will demand more easy money, more inflation. They will want to pay off good debts with bad money. As a result, all the pressure will be for more easy money, more counterfeit money, to be exact, for more inflation. To stop now is to court disaster. As a result, the total disaster of runaway inflation is invited.

In order to avert the disaster of *runaway* inflation, *controlled* inflation will be the policy. This means progressive controls and "credit crunches" to keep the inflation from getting out of hand. The attempt is ultimately doomed to fail, but it will still be pursued.

In the free banking system of pre-Civil War days in particular, the failures of judgment affected individuals, banks, and business firms. The affect was essentially local, not national. Under a nationally controlled economy, every mistake is a national disaster.

Credit under free banking was dependent on available gold; without it, a bank too easy on credit failed: depositors lost confidence in a speculative bank policy. Under socialistic banking, such as the Federal Reserve System, continued easy credit requires continued confiscation of someone's wealth. The credit has to come from available wealth. The welfare state makes this fresh credit available through heavy taxation, bond issues, and other means of confiscation, direct or indirect. The wealth of the thrifty, productive, and conservative people is steadily confiscated in order to provide for the fools, knaves, and parasites. Don Bell has pointed out (see newsletter no. 26) that the number of people who receive federal pay or benefits numbers 102,900,000, over half the population of the United States. Of this number, about forty million receive regular monthly payments, the rest seasonal checks. It becomes profitable to be a rascal, and the result is a population explosion among welfare recipients, easy-money business firms, and scoundrels in every field. These people now can outvote the rest of the people. And these people know only one way to prosperity: rob the thrifty, hardworking people. The new rich of America have gained their wealth by soaking the old rich, i.e., those rich in character, hard work, thrift, and ability.

They will continue to do this until everything is confiscated and

destroyed. The end result of socialism is total poverty. Some kind of disaster is inescapable.

In this situation, the disaster devoutly to be wished for is God's judgment on these knaves and parasites as well as fools. The present order will not change unless it is shattered, and it is God's shattering we need. God, who governs all things, is never absent from history. He created and ordained it. He demonstrated His intervening power and concern in the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ. "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace here shall be no end" (Isa. 9:6–7). Christ shall confiscate the power of the confiscators. All laws, including economic law, are a part of His creation and ordination: defeat is written into the nature of the universe for all who transgress His laws. Both naturally and supernaturally, Christ's government works to punish evil. They who live by easy credit will die by easy credit. They who steal shall be robbed of all they have. "But they that wait upon the LORD shall renew their strength" (Isa. 40:31).

We face perilous times. But we do not face them alone.

Make no mistake about it: the issues are religious. All socialists oppose gold because they believe in neither God nor in freedom. Gold and silver represent independent wealth, wealth which is natural, God-created wealth. Paper money is state-created "wealth," and it can be destroyed by the state. A government decree can and often has changed the value of paper money, or abolished one paper currency to replace it with another. As Lenin clearly saw, there can be no total control of society without total paper money, i.e., fiat money. Wealth in gold represents independent and uncontrolled wealth, and therefore socialism tries to abolish it. Man's only "freedom" must be what the state permits, and this is like the freedom of a prisoner to move around in his cell.

Recently, U.S. Treasury officials denied that gold has any real value apart from the price the United States gives it. They threatened to "bankrupt" hoarders by lowering the price of U.S. gold from $35 to $6 an ounce —an act which would only raise the price of gold all the more rapidly, because it would only mean the bankruptcy of the U.S. dollar! The U.S. Treasury officials do not believe in gold because they do not believe in freedom. Such men believe themselves to be wiser than God: they do not believe that freedom can work. Only that which they themselves create and totally control, a paper "gold," can work, because only humanistic controls are for them man's hope.

The issues are thus religious: man's order or God's order. The outcome

in such a struggle is certain. We have therefore this assurance in the days ahead: the battle is the Lord's.

219

INFLATION

Chalcedon Report No. 37, September 2, 1968

After World War II, an American in Shanghai, the Reverend D. R. Lindberg (one of our newsletter family) walked downtown one morning and witnessed an amazing sight. Wealthy Chinese sat on the sidewalks and even in the streets, weeping and sobbing uncontrollably. Scattered around them were large piles of paper money, in denominations up to $5,000. A government order, in view of rapidly growing inflation, had declared all bills of $5,000 and under to be invalid, and their wealth and life savings had just been abolished. They had gone from store to store, bank to bank, hoping to realize something, and they had failed. However, the money, if accepted, would have done them little good. A little later, this American paid $25 million for a new suit; exactly a week to the day later, a small dime-store mouth organ for his son cost $50 million, and such was the distrust of all paper money that it took two American paper dollars to buy one Chinese silver dollar. This is inflation, the breakdown of paper money. Millionaires find themselves unable to buy a slice of bread with their millions, and, in some instances, have starved to death.

Inflation is one of the results of managed money, and managed money is the cornerstone of socialism. In fact, socialism is impossible without managed money. Managed money is the deliberate, state-controlled debasing or counterfeiting of money as the basic form of social planning. Paper money, and coins of baser metals passing in the place of silver or gold, is managed money, whereas gold and silver coinage, which constitutes real wealth, is valid money. For money is not merely a medium of exchange: it is a form of wealth, and if the medium of exchange is a controlled and counterfeit one, wealth is progressively confiscated and destroyed. As a result, the first and basic step in any socialism, in any statist

confiscation of private wealth, is to require people to accept a counterfeit or debased money, a mere representation of wealth, in exchange for their very real wealth, their labor, goods, and properties. Managed money is the basic form of socialist planning. The state produces the managed money and begins to spend it for social planning. With this managed money, the state can further its welfare programs, its progressive controls and expropriations, and its total programs of planning and socialization, because, as the producer of managed money, it is the biggest buyer on the market. The state buys real wealth in the form of labor, goods, and properties and gives managed money, counterfeit wealth, in exchange. The paper value of the people's wealth increases for a time, and prosperity seems to prevail, until the process reaches the point of increasing confiscation as the money rapidly inflates and becomes worthless.

But a runaway inflation not only destroys the creditors, the middle classes, and all with savings, it also destroys the state which permits it. It leads to a collapse of the civil government which promoted it. Previously, runaway inflation has repeatedly occurred. Will it again be the route to disaster?

Managed money, or socialism, is a parasitic economy. The state feeds on the people's wealth, and the people eat up their own future, and their country's future, with a debt economy and growing areas of socialization. Socialization produces temporary benefits to some, but socialization, as a parasite economy, must rob and confiscate in order to give. Instead of creating new wealth, it destroys existing wealth.

As a result of this progressive confiscation and destruction of wealth, the country begins to falter and to move towards economic collapse and catastrophe. A savage struggle for survival then begins. The socialist, interventionist, or welfare economy then faces a grim choice: who shall survive, the people or the state? Increasingly, in the modern world, the socialist answer is that the people must be sacrificed to preserve the state. To stop deficit spending and return to hard money would create a depression, which would hurt but would save both the state and the people, although at a cost, but this would involve abandoning socialism. This the state will not do, because to sacrifice socialism now means to sacrifice the state, which now sees itself as identical with socialism.

As a result, the state turns to what Wilhelm Ropke and Hans Sennholz have described as repressed inflation. Repressed inflation, according to Ropke in *Economics of the Free Society*, "consists, fundamentally, in the fact that a government first promotes inflation but then seeks to interdict its influence on prices and rates of exchange by imposing the now familiar wartime devices of rationing and fixed prices, together with the

requisite enforcement measures." In other words, the cure for the disaster bred by the growing controls of money, men, and property is total controls! This is like saying that the cure for tuberculosis in one lung is its presence everywhere in both lungs.

Ropke noted that repressed inflation is more deadly than open inflation and "ends inevitably in chaos and paralysis." And it is repressed inflation which we are steadily getting, as the federal government moves to control steel, copper, and aluminum prices, and to limit private spending by taxation, while continuing and increasing its own deficit spending. On May 9, 1959, Arthur Upgren, in the Minneapolis *Star,* stated that the United States would "go bust" by 1970 because of the breakdown of money. In a paper on the subject, "Why the United States is Most Likely to Have a Financial Collapse in 1970," Upgren offered as his answer to the pending crisis more money management. But more money management means simply more socialism. Briefly, such answers in effect declare that the only way to escape economic law is by means of the totalitarian law of the state.

This is, then, the course being progressively taken, more money management, which means more socialism, and thus progressive confiscation. This means chaos and disaster. It means the breakdown of money also. But, most of all, it means the end of socialism. The socialist states of the world are all parasites. As parasites, they have lived off their people first, and then off the United States. Now, as repressed inflation begins to work to gut the American social order, the socialisms of the world will collapse with this breakdown of American free enterprise. When the host body dies, the parasite also dies. The desperate attempt of socialism to survive by sacrificing its people fails to work; without outside help, socialism dies. A socialist world cannot exist.

Thoughtful men will naturally seek to protect themselves by investing in land, gold, silver, and other historic hedges against inflation, but the counterhedges of socialism against self-protection are greater than ever before. And, while survival is important, it is not enough. Socialism is finished: it is destroying itself, and, although the worst lies ahead, the certainty of socialism's collapse is nonetheless inescapable, and it must be a basic premise of all thinking concerning the future. The central concern even now must be reconstruction, the creation of new institutions dedicated to liberty, education to that end, and the assurance that the fresh air of liberty is ahead, past the days of chaos. The wise, therefore, will recognize that the breakdown of money, socialist money, is overtaking us, and that there is no security in counterfeit currency. Before they sit weeping, like the Chinese of Shanghai, surrounded with their worthless

money, they had better dedicate themselves and their wealth to the cause of liberty before it is too late. As Sennholz has pointed out, our managed money today is the poorest form of investment for the future. In the long run, an investment in liberty offers better returns.

The above was written two and a half years ago and filed away. Today, there is no reason to change a word of it.

The news accentuates our crisis. For some years now, people have profited by inflation. They are now geared to what Gary North calls "the economics of addiction."

A news report of Saturday, August 24, 1968, is headed, "Brink of Credit Disaster" (Oakland, CA, *Oakland Tribune,* p. 1) states that "[o]ver one-third of all American families are on the brink of serious financial trouble" because of heavy indebtedness. And most other Americans are also very much in debt and cannot take a real crisis. The reason is that "a consumption ethic has replaced the work ethic."

The demand by all these people in debt will be for more easy money, more paper, in order to pay off good debts with bad money. The people have a vested interest in more inflation; their prosperity depends on it. The federal government also has a vested interest in more inflation; its power depends on it.

When *over* one-third of all American families face financial disaster or very serious trouble, according to the American Association of Credit Counselors, can anyone imagine an administration doing anything but inflating? Virtually all the politicians of these days seem primarily interested in power, not the future, and the road to political power is now inflation. After them, the flood.

The foundations are being destroyed. It is high time to rebuild, to rebuild on a solidly Christian foundation.

220

DEBT

Chalcedon Report No. 181, September 1980

Men can disobey or disregard God's laws, but they cannot set them aside nor eliminate them. God's law forbids debts by believers for more than six years. The seventh year must be a sabbath (Deut. 15:1–6). As a general rule, debt must be avoided. Paul says, "Owe no man any thing, but to love one another" (Rom. 13:8). Solomon says, "the borrower is servant [or, slave] to the lender" (Prov. 22:7). Thus, debt is permitted for necessary purposes on a short-term basis but is to be seen as something to be avoided. Debts to the unbeliever have not the same meaning. Since they are already slaves (John 8:31–36), long-term debt is no problem to them. The believer, however, having been bought with a price, is not to be the slave of men (1 Cor. 7:23).

We live, however, in an age when men believe that it is no longer necessary to obey the law of God, *which is another and implicit way of saying that God is dead*. Whereas earlier in the century, Christians, in the United States at least, restricted debt to one thing only, the purchase of a house or a farm with at least one-fourth down payment, and a short-term debt, now long-term debt, and debt living for furnishings, clothing, vacations, and so on, is commonplace.

One result is inflation. Inflation is the expansion by statist fiat of money and credit. We have today the worldwide and massive debt living of civil governments and their peoples. Basic to debt living is theft. In 1935, Freeman Tilden, in *A World in Debt*, observed, "Inflation, whether of bank credit or of paper currency, cannot be effective until *the larcenous purpose is generally comprehended*." In an inflationary economy, there is behind the inflationary economics, a "new" morality which demands that envy and theft become legal and profitable. Everyone becomes a thief. In a world of big and little thieves, the biggest thief, the state, finally

destroys the little thieves before God's law finally brings destruction to the state also.

The prelude to such a "new" morality is the decay of humanism. The earlier phases of humanism are marked by idealism, and belief in a set of humanistic principles. From 1660 to the early 1900s, humanism struggled to apply its principles, belief in the goodness (or, at least, moral neutrality) of man, in some kind of "natural" law, in the messianic nature of the state (except among anarchists) and its humanistic schools, and so on. However, as humanism eroded into cynicism, its one prevailing belief came to be in the overriding reality of evil: it's a dog-eat-dog world; anything goes; get it while you can; and other like comments. When the late medieval humanism eroded into the "Renaissance" mind, men made a show of their vices, even to claiming vices they did not possess. Machiavelli boasted, "In hypocrisy, I have long since received baptism, confirmation, and communion. In lying I even possess a doctor's degree. Life has taught me to temper falsehood with truth and truth with falsehood" (Valeriu Marcu, *Accent on Power: The Life and Times of Machiavelli* [1939], pp. 281–282). Today, a like temper prevails. At the beginning of the 1970s I heard a university campus comment of like character, which included the counsel, "If you're still a virgin, keep it a secret."

All over the world today, nations have not only debauched their money but even claim that there are virtues in devaluation, which is like treating cancer as a sign of health. In the United States, the dollar remained constant (with minor fluctuations) from the early 1800s to the time of World War I. Now, with inflation, the dollar has eroded. Because inflation is a form of taxation, industry is suffering. Detroit's automobile manufacturers have not advanced the assembly line much over the days of Henry Ford and have grown weaker and fewer. American steel companies have facilities not even equal to Mexico's. The economy is near bankruptcy, in the United States and all the world. On June 27, 1980, R. E. McMaster, Jr. (a friend of Chalcedon), devoted his economic weekly letter, *The Reaper*, to a study of "The Fifty-Year Debt Cycle." One could say, by way of summary, that men either take God's sabbaths from debt or face disaster, either the jubilee or judgment: take your choice. McMaster noted, "In April, one-third of the U.S. taxpayers were so illiquid that they couldn't pay their taxes. They couldn't even borrow to pay them. They filed returns, but enclosed no money" (*The Reaper* [Phoenix, AZ]).

As Tilden noted in 1935, evil develops delicate sensitivities to justify itself. Behind all its sinning is a supposedly good purpose and a noble cause. Judgment is treated as an insult. "'If you had let me alone, I would probably have paid,' says the defaulter, with an injured air, 'But now that

you are trying to badger me, you won't get it.' There is no sensibility so delicate and easily wounded as that of a person or a nation that knows it is in the wrong" (Tilden, p. 250).

Meanwhile, the state's power increases, and so does its greed. The degenerate Stuart rulers of England, before their fall, had so overtaxed and overspent England, that under William and Mary it reached the stage of confiscation. Tax collectors entered forcibly into the dwellings of cottagers to seize anything, including bread boards and pillows to satisfy their exactions. Having chosen the monarchy over the Puritan commonwealth, the English were now paying the price of their choice.

We are now beginning, only beginning, to pay the price of our choices. No amount of bewailing will alter the matter, nor another set of lying politicians. A root-and-branch faith is required. We must say with Joshua, "choose you this day whom ye will serve . . . but as for me and my house, we will serve the LORD" (Josh. 24:15).

221

DEVALUATION

Chalcedon Report No. 21, June 19, 1967

A subject of growing importance and urgency today is *devaluation*. According to the dictionary, "devaluate" means "to fix the value of the currency to a low level to which an emergency has driven it." In its simplest form, devaluation occurs when the value of the gold backing of a paper currency is raised, and the paper money is accordingly lowered in value. Thus, if the gold is worth $35 an ounce, or is held at $35 an ounce, and is then raised in price to $70 an ounce, the paper money goes down in value and is now worth proportionately less. Previously, paper money was redeemable (as U.S. paper money is today by foreign countries) at thirty-five paper dollars for an ounce of gold; if gold goes to $70, then it takes seventy paper dollars to buy an ounce. The purchasing power of the paper has decreased in the same ratio that the gold has increased.

Devaluation is not the same as *debasement*, although the two often go together. In debasement, the weight or standard of the gold or silver in coins is reduced without reducing the face value of the coin. Thus, the silver quarter had $0.23 in silver in it, at $1.29 an ounce, the old price; the new quarter has only two or three cents of materials in it but passes for $0.25; the mint makes a sizable profit on it. Debasement affects coinage, and this is a limited part of our money today. Devaluation affects most of our money.

Devaluation is a product of controls and of socialism; it follows the expansion of paper money and credit. The vast increase in money supply with paper money does not change the fact that the basic money is gold. Those who say there is not enough gold in the world to be our monetary unit forget that gold is already our monetary unit all over the world. Our trouble comes from the fact that we are trying to substitute a counterfeit, paper money, for it. The paper inflates because it is counterfeit; gold

is going up in price, not because gold is changing in value, but simply because the inflated paper is worth less. Before 1913, gold had changed very little in price for eighty-five years. It has changed since then because gold is now traded, not for real wealth, but for inflated paper money. The more inflation increases, the more gold will demand a higher price. Only gold-backed currencies flow in international trade; no foreign country is interested in irredeemable paper money.

Devaluation thus is a product of irresponsibility. The more paper money a state prints, the more a civil government goes into debt, the more the demand mounts for gold as a protection against increasingly worthless paper. The printing-press treasury wants to say that its money is still "as good as gold," but people begin to show their fears and prefer gold. To devalue is to confess that the paper money is failing, and this treasuries hesitate to do. On the other hand, once they devalue, the treasuries double the value of the gold they possess, if they double the price of gold, and this gives visions of instant wealth and frees them for more inflation. Devaluation is like a partial bankruptcy; it frees a country from some of its debts and gives it power to incur far greater debts. It prepares the way for total bankruptcy.

We have scarcely touched the economics of devaluation, but our concern is with its morality, its ethics. Devaluation of money is simply one of the consequences of moral devaluation. Moral devaluation is the erosion of moral standards and of godly law and order. It comes when people pay lip service to God but reinterpret God's law to suit their tastes. Moral devaluation is present when people are against immorality generally, but feel that there is no point in being a "bluenose" about it. They are against perversions, but they do not favor the severity of God's law concerning it. They disapprove of stealing, but hotel "souvenirs" are another matter. Moral devaluation produces a world in which people want the law and order of morality but not its responsibility. We are thus against abortion, but with increasing qualifications. We are against murder, but we enforce capital punishment less and less, although it is required by God. We want other people to be responsible so that we will have less troubles and problems ourselves.

Moral devaluation always precedes monetary devaluation. The first and foremost step in monetary devaluation is *inflation*, and, in 1936, Freeman Tilden, in *A World in Debt* (p. 279), observed that there were two facts which preceded inflation. *First*, there "is the intent to falsify the true economic position of a nation, or to relieve the debtor at the expense of the creditor." *Second*, "Inflation, whether of bank credit or of paper currency, cannot be effective until the larcenous purpose is generally

comprehended." Both these facts represent moral devaluation, moral collapse. It is absurd to try to tell socialistic legislators and voters that their course of action is immoral from a Christian perspective: this is why they chose it! Larceny in the heart precedes inflation and is necessary before inflation can work. Moral devaluation is thus the source and cause of monetary devaluation.

A minor but vivid sidelight on our moral devaluation has been cited by Charles H. Brower. The word "square" was once a symbol of perfection in Bible times. More recently, it has been a term indicating integrity, honesty, dependability, and character. Now the word "square" is used by our youth and by radicals as a term of contempt; it means that people who are honest and moral are ridiculous and foolish.

Monetary devaluation is the progressive destruction of money, often ending in economic collapse and anarchy. But before that stage sets in, moral anarchy begins to prevail. Moral anarchy precedes economic anarchy and is furthered by it. The world of monetary devaluation is a world which prefers and encourages more moral devaluation.

What to do about it? A man does not become moral merely by being against sin. No one hates stealing more than the gambling-house operators of Las Vegas, and they take stern measures against it. Morality believes that the universe is governed by God's absolute law, and that the wages of sin are death, but the gift of God, eternal life. Morality moves positively to bring the world under God's law, and to establish the dominion of God's law over man and his society. As Moses said long ago, "Who is on the Lord's side? let him come unto me" (Exod. 32:26). The test, Moses declared, was an open stand and warfare in God's name to establish God's order. Nothing less than faith and the obedient works of faith are acceptable.

222

SOCIALISM AND INFLATION BOTH DECAPITALIZE AN ECONOMY

Originally a brochure produced for Coast Federal Savings in the late 1960s, this article was published with Rushdoony's other brochures as part of a two-sided paper titled "Comments in Brief" with Chalcedon Report No. 225, April 1984.

Decapitalization means the progressive destruction of capital, so that a society has progressively less productive ability. Decapitalization is the dissipation of accumulated wealth (Prov. 14:23).

Some of the potentially wealthiest agricultural countries are importers of agricultural produce, such as Venezuela and Chile. The fishing grounds off the Pacific coast of South America are some of the richest known to the world, rich enough to feed the countries of that area.

Chilean fishermen cannot market fish properly and dump marvelous catches of fish into the sea, because they have neither storage nor transport to take their fish to the markets. Thus, there is neither a lack of labor nor a lack of markets for the fish, but necessary capitalization to provide the facilities for bringing labor, produce and market together is lacking.

Much of the world is in the same predicament: it has the labor, the natural resources, and the hungry markets for its produce, but it lacks the necessary capital to make the flow of goods possible. Socialism tries to solve this problem but only aggravates it because it furthers the poverty of all concerned. Socialism and inflation both accomplish the same purpose: they decapitalize an economy.

Inflation succeeds when people have larceny in their hearts, and the same is true of socialism. Socialism is organized larceny; like inflation, it takes from the haves to give to the have-nots. By destroying capital, it destroys progress and pushes society into disaster.

As the products of capitalization begin to wear out, new capital is

lacking to replace them, and the state has no capital of its own; it only impoverishes the people further and therefore itself by trying to create capital by taxation.

223

GOD, THE DEVIL, AND LEGAL TENDER

Chalcedon Report No. 193, September 1981

To view the idea of legal tender theologically seems strange to the modern (and humanistic) mind, but it was once an important issue in the United States. The legal tender doctrine holds that the power to define legal money belongs to the state, and the state can therefore declare what constitutes legal money for the payment of all debts, public and private.

The Reverend John Witherspoon attacked the idea very early. It was unnecessary for any state to require people to accept good money. Gold and silver were always acceptable. A legal tender law simply requires people to accept bad money, and it does take civil coercion to make bad money acceptable.

The U.S. Constitution, Article 1, Section 10, states that no state can make "anything but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts." The *Federalist,* no. 44, gives us Madison's opposition to paper money. Patrick Henry opposed paper money, and Daniel Webster argued that a legal tender law is unconstitutional.

It was the lexicographer and Calvinist Noah Webster who spoke most bluntly. In 1790, Webster called a tender law "the devil." He warned, "My countrymen, the devil is among you." Of legislators who favored legal tender laws, he said that honest men should exclaim, "You are rogues, and the devil is in you!" Legal tender laws, he pointed out, were the preliminary to adulterated money, and all those who favored them were counterfeiters, deserving of the gallows, or at least the whipping post!

Legal tender laws allow good debts to be paid with bad money, so that a debt is paid with only a fraction of the value it was contracted for. The result is a form of legalized theft, Webster held. He declared in part,

"Remember that past contracts are sacred things; that legislatures have no right to interfere with them; they have no right to say that a debt

shall be paid at a discount, or in any manner which the parties never intended. It is the business of justice to fulfill the intentions of parties in contracts, not to defeat them. To pay bona fide contracts for cash, in paper of little value, or in old horses, would be a dishonest attempt in an individual; but for legislatures to frame laws to support and encourage such detestable villainy is like a judge who should inscribe the arms of a rogue over the seat of justice."

Why did Webster see legal tender laws as the devil manifested in law? We cannot understand the legal revolution wrought by humanism unless we understand that fact.

For Webster and others, gold and silver represented natural and hence a God-given order of things, whereas legal tender creates an arbitrary value which can only stand with coercion. Values are God-created, not man or state created. The temptation of Satan in the beginning was to doubt God's order: "Yea, hath God said . . . ?" (Gen. 3:1). Rather, the tempter suggested a new order in which man creates his own laws, values, and morality: every man shall be his own god, determining or knowing good and evil for himself (Gen. 3:5). In such a society, the state as man incarnate can set aside God's laws and make its own laws. It can issue a legal tender law and require obedience to it. (In God's natural order, there is no need to require the use of gold and silver; they commend themselves and are in demand.)

The essence of the theocracy as Scripture's law presents it is that the state is at best minimal. A. J. Nock saw the Old Testament design as one for government, not a state. Repeatedly, God declares, This do, and live (Deut. 5:33, etc.). God's law is the way of faith and life, whereas "he that sinneth against me wrongeth his own soul: all they that hate me love death" (Prov. 8:36).

Legal tender laws are thus the tip of an iceberg. They represent a man-made world, one in which the state, by total coercion, seeks to overthrow God's order and to replace it with a humanistic one. In this new order of things, the state is the new god walking on earth, and demanding totalitarian powers and command. There is a symbolic significance that, not too many years after taking a deliberately statist course with respect to money and banking, the United States, on its dollar bills, featured a new symbol and the Latin words proclaiming the new order of the ages. That order is statist tyranny.

Legal tender laws thus cannot be viewed in isolation. Churchmen show no interest in them, although they are a clear manifestation of humanism in economics. On the other hand, economists see legal tender laws in isolation from theology, although they are a clear expression of

the new established religion, humanism. Both are manifesting tunnel vision and are failing to recognize the roots of the problem.

Noah Webster saw the issue; it is a moral and theological issue. Webster saw, and again and again called, legal tender laws "the devil." He saw what these laws represented, "a deliberate act of villainy," a contempt for God's justice, the legislation of theft into law, and the deliberate conversion of the state into an instrument for theft and evil. He was right.

224

GOD AND MAMMON

Chalcedon Report No. 372, July 1996

The New Testament uses the name *mammon* in two different ways. In Matthew 6:24, our Lord says, "No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon." Again, in Luke 16:9, our Lord says, "And I say unto you, Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness; that, when ye fail, they may receive you into everlasting habitations."

The word *mammon* is a Hebrew word meaning money or wealth; it is not in itself evil. It is man's use or abuse of it that is evil, and this is the key to understanding our Lord's use of this word. In Luke 16:9, our Lord speaks of the wise use of money, very much in terms of God's law. The dishonest steward of the parable of Luke 16:1–8 buys friends, knowing he will soon be discharged from his position. Should not Christians so use their money to be charitable to needy believers so that they will be welcomed by them in heaven? The implication is that money demonstrates the works of faith. Money thus can and must be used here to further Kingdom work, in particular, in this context, charities.

In Matthew 6:24, the meaning is that a man cannot make a god of money or property. The opening clause is echoed in many Near Eastern proverbs, such as, "No man can carry two melons in one hand." Man's service to God must be exclusive: he cannot serve both God and mammon, i.e., money or property. Men, however, are prone to serving very immediate and profitable masters or goals.

But why would a man dedicate himself to anything less than God? California State Senator W. L. "Bill" Richardson, about twenty-five years ago, told me that voters have short memories; most of the time a scandal of more than ninety days past was forgotten, and men voted, not

in terms of a politician's character but their own advantage. Faith did not govern their voting, we can say, but mammon did.

In other words, our Lord's comments tell us much about ourselves, what we worship and serve. Our Lord in Luke 16:9 says, if you love God, help your needy fellow believer. Put your money where your faith is.

God defines Himself in terms of His revelation to the patriarchs. In Himself, He is I AM THAT I AM, or He Who Is (Exod. 3:14ff.), as beyond definition or limitation. I was told recently of a growing tendency on the part of some to say, "Money is." This is an amazing parallel to what God says about Himself!

It is remarkable that our present worship of money should come when money is so untrustworthy. Our money is no longer gold nor silver, but increasingly inflated paper. In the early 1900s, a workingman in California was paid in gold; to buy a house cost $300 in the cities. Now money is worth less and less from year to year, and the worst inflation is perhaps just ahead of us.

Too many people define "the good life" in terms of material things, not in terms of God and His grace and care. I recall, when I was young, how a young couple would work, save money, and buy a farm with 25 percent down. The house would be mostly bare, a bed, a kitchen table and three chairs (the third chair was for the mother-in-law when she visited), and a stove. Many a later-rich farmer started this way (wooden boxes were used to seat friends when they visited).

I remembered this in the 1960s on visiting a newlywed couple, in a home better than that owned by either set of parents, and furnished expensively at a great debt.

Now the time of reckoning has begun. I was startled to learn how very many checks are returned daily marked "insufficient funds." "Money is" gives way to "Money is not."

"The good life" should be our goal, not as our age defines it, but as God declares it. The delusion of our time equates "the good life" with things and money, which, however important, cannot be equated with life in Christ.

Money is not in itself evil. Rather, as St. Paul tells us, it is *the love* of money which is the root of all evil and which leads to disaster (1 Tim. 6:10). This misplaced love leads to a falsified calling, one not from God but from the appeal of monetary wealth.

Our Lord, in Luke 16:9, and in the law, tells us that our money should be used in terms of God's Kingdom, not our own little domain. We are stewards under God, with a duty towards one another and towards Him.

The Bible condemns neither money nor property, and it sees wealth as

one form of blessing God gives us. What it does see as evil is the love of money, and the quest for money as an end in itself. In the modern era, the view is that man is an economic animal. (Others follow Aristotle to see man as a political animal. Both views are false.) Man is a religious creature, made in the image of God, called to serve God in righteousness or justice, holiness, knowledge, and with dominion. Man demeans himself when he sees himself as anything less than God ordains he should be. We live in an era of too many diminished men.

225

COVENANT WEALTH

Chalcedon Report No. 424, November 2000

The usual economic classifications are wealthy, middle class, and poor. The definitions of each are vague, but the meanings are clear. In each case, the definitions vary with time. Early in the 1929 Depression, in a film, showgirls described the hero as "very rich" because his income was $5,000 a year. In those days, a good house sold for $2,500.

Intellectuals have problems with all three classes. They treat the rich as malefactors, the middle class as hopelessly stupid, and the poor are idealized as victims, but they are avoided.

From a covenantal and Biblical perspective, all three classes can be good or evil, depending on their relationship to the triune God and His law-word.

In the beginning, man was told to subdue the garden and develop it by caring for it. The Garden of Eden was, in a limited space, the place where man was to develop his kingdom work and gain in the wealth thereof. Now we define wealth in terms of money and possessions. God's purpose is that we define it in terms of His Kingdom, not in terms of human social status.

Covenant wealth is, first and last, Kingdom gain. Thus, I am, in my estimation, a rich man, although, for example, I have never owned a new car and my present one dates from 1980. (In the year 2000, it still does well because it is well cared for.)

Covenant wealth will prosper us usually; but it always prospers God's Kingdom.

But some churchmen share the world's views. I have seen well-to-do congregations build monumentally poor and ugly churches as though it was a virtue to do so!

The purpose of covenant wealth is to make this world into God's Kingdom. It means developing also the arts and sciences to further His

Kingdom. This means we apply the faith to every area of life and thought.

What are we building? What is around us, the Kingdom of God, or the kingdom of man?

All of history, and all our lives, can be termed the key form of wealth building, but for whom?

We believe that our work in developing Chalcedon's work is a form of covenant wealth building, but so, too, is any labor that serves to enhance man's progress under God. Christians need to be encouraged in covenant wealth building which serves not only themselves but all God's Kingdom.

Sad to say, who speaks now of covenant wealth? Have we forgotten that God's Kingdom requires it of His people?

It is time for us to recognize *the need* for godly wealth. It will bless both us and His Kingdom.

226

IS WEALTH MORAL?

Chalcedon Report No. 225, April 1984

MUCH current writing infers that Jesus and the Bible speak against wealth as immoral. It is true that the parable of the rich man (Luke 16:19–31) shows us the rich man in hell and poor Lazarus in heaven, *but* the condemnation of the unjust rich man comes from rich Abraham in heaven. Again, while Jesus said, "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. 19:24; Mark 10:25), the same chapter makes it clear that Jesus meant that no man, rich or poor, can save himself: "With men this is impossible; but with God all things are possible" (Matt. 19:26). In other words, salvation is not a do-it-yourself job for anyone, rich or poor; it is God's work and gift. Many rich men and women were among the saved ones close to Jesus (Luke 8:2–3; 19:1–9; 23:50–53).

The Bible condemns fraudulently gained wealth but declares honest wealth a blessing. *First*, therefore, honest wealth is to be desired or *a blessing from God*. "The blessing of the LORD, it maketh rich (i.e., materially wealthy), and he addeth no sorrow with it" (Prov. 10:22). The possession of wealth is *lawful* and is *protected* in the Ten Commandments by two commandments: "Thou shalt not steal" and "Thou shalt not covet" (Exod. 20:15, 17; Deut. 5:19, 21). Jesus confirmed this, and assumed the lawfulness of wealth as a godly principle (Matt. 25:14–30; Luke 16:1–8; 19:12–27). Jesus made it clear that morally acquired wealth is a blessing from and under God. "*Seek ye first the kingdom of God and all these things shall be added unto you*" (Matt. 6:32–33, Luke 12:30–31), and there is no wrong in desiring it, if we move in terms of the priority of faith in, and obedience to, God.

Second, wealth is morally good, but it is a subordinate good, a means to a better life and not an end. It is too uncertain to be the goal of life

(Matt. 6:19–20), and wealth can coexist with poverty of soul (Luke 12:16–21; 14:18–19; Matt. 22:6–7). Thus wealth has moral perils when it becomes primary rather than secondary in a man's life. It is not money which is the root of all evil, but "the love of money," and the coveting after money with this perverted love is cited as a sin by Paul (1 Tim. 6:10). Socialists can be as guilty of this "love of money" as anyone else. Thus, riches, wealth, can be dangerous *if* men make them the goal of life, if they idolize wealth.

The evil, then, is not in wealth as such, but in the hearts of men, and to speak of wealth as immoral is a false *logic*, an insistence that things are immoral rather than man. But, as Paul wrote Titus: "Unto the pure all things are pure: but unto them that are defiled and unbelieving is nothing pure; but even their mind and conscience is defiled" (Titus 1:15). Thus, although immoral men can acquire and misuse wealth, it is their hearts and actions which are immoral, not wealth in itself. In its proper place, therefore, wealth is not only moral but also blessed, and it can be honestly desired, gained, and held, and is a benefit to all of society.

227

THE BUDGETARY PROCESS

Chalcedon Report No. 301, March 1991

NOTE: The following statement was written by R. J. Rushdoony for the Chalcedon trustees' meeting, January 4–5, 1991. By a unanimous vote, the trustees ordered that it be published in the *Chalcedon Report*.

BUDGET making has such an odor of sanctity to it that it seems to many to be a course of irresponsibility to challenge it. I have not, in my years in the ministry and as president of Chalcedon, ever operated in terms of a budget because of religious and conscientious objections.

It is important to begin by defining a budget. Webster's first edition of his *Dictionary* (1828) defines it simply thus: "The papers respecting the finances of the British nation." *Webster's New International Dictionary*, second edition, has, as its two basic definitions, the following:

> *Budget*: a financial statement of the estimated revenues and expenditures of a country (orig. of Great Britain) for a definite period of time.
>
> Loosely, the cost of operation, living, etc., as determined by income, essential needs, or the like; as a minimum weekly *budget* for a family of five.

Christians normally have the second and minor meaning in mind. It has reference to a family's fixed income and the allocation of that income to basic needs. In this sense, budget making means financial responsibility and accountability. However, even with fixed incomes, there are problems in budget making if debt is a part of the budget, because the expectation then is of a continued income without disasters and contingencies.

Historically and economically, budget making and deficit financing have gone hand in hand. In fact, the budgetary process was created in Great Britain in order to justify a national debt as a necessity. The process began in 1780 with a parliamentary commission justifying such a

step in the name of *efficiency* and *rationality*. Each agency of state was to submit its needs for the year ahead in order to enable Parliament to tax and appropriate intelligently. Then these budgetary estimates would be submitted to the treasury, which in turn submitted to Parliament the "necessary" costs for the next year. A debate on the floor ensued, followed by tax measures. When the taxes were being collected, or in anticipation thereof, the state borrowed in order to make agency functions possible. Where there was a difference between income and expenditures, a debt was incurred, and servicing the debt became a part of the continuing budgetary process. National debts were born with budgets.

Before long, off-budget spending for special purposes was added to this process; this was an evasion of normal constraints. In time, off-budget debts began to surpass the regular indebtedness.

National debts were born out of the budgetary process. Budgets tend to be governed by "needs" rather than income, and the definition of "needs" is constantly expanded by bureaucracies and legislative bodies.

Carolyn Webber, a specialist in this area, and Professor Aaron Wildavsky, in *A History of Taxation and Expenditure in the Western World* (1986), observed: "Afraid that their funds would be taken away, departments kept up legislative pressure all year long, instead of just at the beginning. The budget thus became a starting point for negotiations instead of a commitment. Not only were there more claimants for government funds, they made claims more often and with greater tenacity than before. With no distinction between the 'off' and 'on' budget season, the central budget unit led a chaotic existence . . . To make their petitions impregnable, departments sought funding through the panoply of modern devises — entitlements, loans and guarantees, and off-budget corporations" (p. 492).

While a missionary on an Indian reservation, I saw a Christian, head of a newly created department, rebuked by local, regional, and national officials for operating economically, doing more work than planned, and leaving a surplus of funds. When he persisted in this, he was demoted, and, finally, had to leave the Indian Service.

The budgetary process is *theologically unsound* because it assumes the natural goodness of man rather than the fact of the fall and man's depravity. To operate in any sphere of life without an awareness of our own propensity to sin, and the sin of others, is folly.

Today's mail brought me two appeals for money. One was from a group ready to start on a debt venture; they had prayed about it and were sure it was the Lord's will! Another was from a group which, having reduced a $350,000 debt to $33,000, was appealing for funds to retire that

debt. However, over ten years ago they had approximately $700,000 in debts and learned nothing from that experience; they will again embark on debt as "the Lord's will," I am sure.

The budgetary process gives priority to needs over godly providence. Whether in the hands of nations, churches, or any other group, it is evil.

The alternative is to spend *only* the income one has *in hand*. This is why, over the years, Chalcedon's monthly "thank you" letter has always carried the following statement at the bottom of the page:

> Chalcedon is a tax-exempt public foundation, and gifts to Chalcedon are tax deductible. We believe that God's Word must be obeyed. God requires *tithing* and an avoidance of long-term debt. We therefore do not believe in deficit financing, have never contracted debt, and do not believe in long-term debt. Your giving establishes the limits of our work, humanly speaking. These are our principles, and we abide by them. However great our needs, our principles must outweigh our needs. Our needs are ours; our standard is the Word of God, and there is no question in our minds which must govern. The way of obedience is the way of blessing, and we expect, by the grace of God, to be blessed.

228

TAXATION AS REVOLUTION

Chalcedon Report No. 192, August 1981

With the wrong kind of instruction, a university education can be a deadly thing, if it links us to the dead rather than the living past. The student movements of the 1960s witness to this fact. A variety of factors in the present aroused student indignation, some justifiably so, and others definitely not so. Our concern is with the element of revolutionary fervor in some quarters of the movement.

The religious faith in revolution is an important aspect of the modern age. Revolution is seen as the way to change the world; it functions in many modern circles to replace the Biblical doctrine of regeneration. Conversion is to occur, not by the grace of God through Christ, but by revolution.

This faith has been subjected to searching and telling analysis. Jacques Ellul, for example, has shown that the results of revolution are consistently reactionary rather than progressive. The faith, all the same, remains.

This is ironic, because the modern world is increasingly making armed revolution obsolete and unnecessary. Such revolutions now occur in the more backward areas, whereas in theory the more advanced capitalistic areas should be the revolutionary centers.

In the centers of advanced humanistic culture, it is increasingly only the minority of a minority of radicalized youth who are revolutionary. Even here, the revolutionary activity has become a militant terrorism rather than a program of revolution. Instead of commending them to the workers, it disaffects them. Not many workers appreciate losing a few days wages because their plant was bombed! Bomb the revenue service, the city hall, maybe, but not my job! Revolutionary movements alienate themselves from the workers whom they profess to champion. They are out of touch with reality.

Even more, they are out of touch with the realities of revolution today. The *first* and foremost fact today is that revolution is a state monopoly. Even the terrorists are a part of this monopoly, being subsidized and controlled by one or another Marxist regime. (The U.S. State Department, and other foreign agencies of states abroad, also subsidize various groups for their own purposes.) An independent and popular revolutionary group does not exist in our day; they are instruments and puppets of state. The modern state has a monopoly on revolution.

Second, the major form of revolution in the modern world is taxation. Such taxes as the income tax, the property tax, especially the inheritance tax, and many more serve to effect a state-controlled and state-directed revolution. Armed revolutions are inefficient and alarming: they create a strong resistance, and they alarm the people. Taxation effects a more thorough revolution, and it can be sold to the people as a humanitarian measure. The purpose of taxation is said to be the relief of the poor, jobs, relief of the sick, the aged, and more. To oppose this revolution leaves one open to charges of inhumanity and unconcern. Few dare oppose such a revolution by taxation; it is a means of being marked as evil.

Third, the main purpose of taxation thus becomes, not the support of civil government in its necessary functions, but the creation of a power state in the name of social justice. Modern totalitarianism comes in the guise of social welfare and humanitarianism. Today, if the funds allocated for welfare went to each recipient without intermediaries, the amount per receiving person of family would be $40,000 a year; what they receive is dramatically less. The difference creates a bureaucracy dedicated to its own welfare and growth. The end of civil government is more government; its use of power is to gain more power. Dedicated to its omnicompetence, the modern state sees it as a social necessity that it gain more power.

Fourth, a major function of modern taxation is destruction. Since World War II, some civil governments have raised the income tax to over 100 percent in order to force the wealthy into liquidating their assets. Others, whose taxes are a "modest" 50 percent, are less open in their revolutionary and destructive goals, but are still dedicated to the same ends. In the United States, for example, over 75 percent of all families face the loss of their business or farm at the death of one of the owners. Few may recognize the inheritance tax as a radical form of revolution, but it is, all the same.

Fifth, taxation thus works to dissolve the past more drastically than have armed revolutions. Few more corrosive social forces exist than taxation. Holdings, both small and great, which have been in the same

families for generations, and even centuries, are dissolved. The stability of town and countryside is broken. Taxation is revolution at work.

Modern taxation is a humanistic and anti-Christian form of revolution. It must be fought by a renewed and dedicated faith, and by tithing. The Lord's goals are furthered by the Lord's tax. It is futile and immoral to rage against taxation and then refuse to manifest the faith and the tithing which can alone establish God's order.

It is equally wrong to demand a cheap faith, one that asks no price of us in commitment nor in tithing. One of the greatest indictments of the church members of our day is their unwillingness to support financially their church and all Christian agencies except on the most meager terms. They want Christ's all, but their response to the needs of Christ's Kingdom is miserly and niggardly. They want every guarantee from the Lord of a blessed life, and then give the Lord a lesser percent than to a waitress! Should the Lord be grateful for this, or angry?

Taxation is a form, the major form, of revolution. The faithful can, with God's tax, turn the world upside down. They can reconstruct one area of life after another. If they wait for the state to stop taxing them before they begin to obey the Lord, they will wait their way into judgment. Taxation is revolution; use God's tax to establish God's reign and Kingdom.

One of the goals of taxation is economic redistribution. Statist redistribution does not work to eliminate great wealth but rather to create a new wealthy class made up of bureaucrats, party bosses, and those whom they subsidize. The new wealthy class of the Soviet Union, for example, is more arrogant and deadly than any czarist lords ever dared to be. The "haves" in economic redistribution in the modern world are the friends of the state and the state's ruling hierarchy; all of the rest become "have-nots." Socialism does not equalize wealth: it concentrates it rigidly. The most powerful instrument in this redistribution of wealth is taxation.

Taxation serves another purpose, namely, to provide funds for the state's self-justification. The modern state is history's most powerful advertising and propaganda agency. *First*, as state-paid projects increase, so too does the state's control over the economy, capital, and labor. The freedom of every sector is diminished.

Second, the state controls education and uses the school to teach statism at the taxpayer's expense. Neither the cause of Christianity nor of freedom from statist controls gain much place in state schools. Rather, the state school teaches that freedom means deliverance from Christianity, and from the independence of the church, man, and the marketplace.

Third, taxation enables the state to revolutionize other areas, most

notably law, to justify its radical departures from morality and justice. The law, divorced from God, becomes an instrument to further statist coercion.

Fourth, the press is subsidized. Probably no news agency can equal the power and funds of the federal "news" dispensing agencies. When I testified at the Internal Revenue Service hearings in December 1978 (against the proposed regulation to control Christian schools), I was interested to see, after the initial testimonies (mainly by the IRS) on the first of the four days of hearings, how reporters simply walked in to pick up the IRS "news" releases from the "press table." No nonfederal news agency can afford to give the thorough coverage which the modern scene requires. Thus, a large amount of our "news" is the product of statist handouts to the press, or press conferences designed to create news in terms of statist goals.

This revolution by taxation will not be defeated merely by votes. There is often little relationship between campaign pledges and performance in office, as recent presidential elections have shown.

The key is the reconquest of government by Christians through God's tax, the tithe. It means the creation of schools, hospitals, welfare agencies, and more which are Biblical in character, not statist. The early church, weak in numbers by comparison, defeated Rome in this way. We must do no less with statism now. This revolution by taxation must be countered by a Christian revolution financed by tithing, the creation of new institutions and agencies which are governmental in character and faithful to the Lord.

SOCIETY & CLASSES

229

THE MYSTERY OF THE SOCIAL ORDER

Chalcedon Report No. 374, September 1996

One of the curiously interesting men of history was Napoleon. A deist, an opportunist, a man whose core ideas are sometimes hard to discern, Napoleon was often brilliant and sharply discerning as well. Unlike others of his day and since, he saw, as Robert C. Solomon noted, that religion was "the mystery of the social order." He therefore held, "The people must have a religion and that religion must be in the hands of the government." Napoleon moved to control the church, and the result was a failure.

Since then, men have tried both the control of religion as well as its obliteration, and such efforts have not been limited to fascists and Marxists. There is "good" reason for these efforts. The modern state sees itself as the maker of civilization and culture. As a result, it replaces religious law with state-created laws. It has moved into the sphere of education, often with total control, in order to replace the religion of the churches with the religion of the state. It has worked to redefine the family on the assumption that, by separating the family from the church and from its Biblical definition, it can remake society in non-Biblical terms. Because sexuality is in theological terms, God-determined and future-oriented thereby, sexuality has been divorced by law from God and morality and is subject to state law.

Religion historically has been the foundation of our social order because it has defined life, law, morality, and salvation. Now, logically, with the state's claim after Hegel to be god walking on earth, all things are being redefined by the state. This redefinition begins with the abandonment of the idea of duty. According to our Lord, the greater the responsibility, the greater the *duty*: "For unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall be much required: and to whom men have committed much, of him they

will ask the more" (Luke 12:48). Our duty thus increases as our responsibilities do. Anti-Christian man, however, gives license to men in power to do as they please. In Roman faith and practice, men of power were above the law that bound "lesser men." This theory of irresponsibility has come to undergird the ideas of rights and entitlements. Wherever rights are separated from duties, the result is an anarchistic freedom, the supposition that the individual can do as he or she pleases without any sense of obligation to God and to man. Such anarchistic "rights" is in effect a denial of the rights of others to their persons and properties, because the "sovereign" individual has a unilateral claim against all others.

What Napoleon called "the mystery of social order," religion, was a mystery to him because he rejected Christianity and thus had no cohesive force to bring people together without coercion. A state cannot bind people by force, by fiat laws, nor by an enforced education. Both Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany, among others, have tried to unite peoples through statist actions. They used also hate for capitalists, and for Jews as a supposed unifying force, with ugly results.

No religion has been more a cohesive bond than Biblical faith. Its power resides in every man's faith, not in an imposed ecclesiastical or civil order. It does not focus the unifying power in a human order but a divine one. It is a "mystery" only to those who do not believe that a divine order exists, governs us all, and will judge us all.

The crisis of the modern state has developed because its own actions and its educational policies have created a cynical people. Cynicism has never bound a people. The first-century A.D. Roman writer, Gaius Petronius Arbiter, was proconsul in Bithynia, and director of entertainment for Nero. His *Satyricon* began as a criticism of Roman degeneracy and ended as an example of it. High-minded sentiments gave way to homosexual caterwauling. Degenerate humor proved more important to Petronius than reform. Cynicism is now commonplace. At election time, men try to generate some excitement over their sorry candidates, but in too many cases the candidates are cause for more cynicism.

Napoleon held, "religion must be in the hands of government," and, in most countries now, this is the premise of most political parties, although not so openly stated. It is, however, *acted on* whenever the state controls education. Education is the control of the next generation; it is the control of the future. By eliminating or downgrading religion in education, the state seeks to replace religion with itself, to replace God with man and man's fulfillment without God. Napoleon said, "The people must have a religion," and he was right, but too many since Napoleon, and in part beginning with him, have been determined that this religion must not

be Christianity. They work accordingly for a separation of Christianity from education, law, and the state. This is, of course, a recipe for suicide, but, for too many, a universal ruin is better than a surrender to Jesus Christ.

Clearly, the problem of Christianity and the state is an important and currently unsettled matter. This is a very different question than the separation of church and state, an institutional matter and a necessity where the churches are plural in form. Every state has a religion, acknowledged or not. The English *Spectator* has referred to Britain as the least religious country in the world, but a state church exists there which is nominally Christian.

"The mystery of the social order" is no mystery at all. Contrary to a long line of thinkers from Aristotle on, man is *not* a political animal: he is a religious creature, made in God's image, in knowledge, holiness, righteousness (or justice), and with dominion. In his fallen estate, man perverts the application of his image and attributes, but he cannot escape them, nor their religious meaning, nor the accounting God requires.

230

RELIGION AND CULTURE

Chalcedon Report No. 220, November 1983

In 1959, in *The Calvinistic Concept of Culture*, Henry R. Van Til pointed out that culture is religion externalized. In recent years, this fact, once a commonplace recognition of the nature of reality, has given way to a variety of newer doctrines. Marxists have held that economics determines culture; others have located its source in the unconscious, and so on. The Nazis saw the source of culture as race, and, in recent years, liberals have tended to agree. Ethnocentric studies, emphasis on "black" consciousness and black culture, and so on have been forms of genteel racism.

At the same time, a racist denigration of supposedly "white" culture has occurred, as witness the common term WASP, i.e., White Anglo-Saxon Protestant. To begin with, this term shows ignorance of the fact that, the world over, most Protestants are not Anglo-Saxon; they include a few million blacks in the United States, for example, a growing number of Latins, Orientals, and others, and the world figures are even more impressive.

We can grant that what is called a WASP culture does exist: many who reflect it are Catholics, blacks, and others, and some reflect it better than the old-line so-called WASPS! (Recently, one "WASP" who went to one of the city's best restaurants commented that most of the well-dressed and mannerly people present were blacks!)

Culture is not a product of race, the unconscious, economics, or any such thing. Culture is religion externalized. A vast number of peoples today, black and white, reflect the culture of humanism. Judith Moore, in the September 4, 1983, *Review*, in discussing Rosemary Radford Ruether's *Sexism and God-talk: Toward a Feminist Theology*, gives us an excellent statement of the humanistic faith: "Except in seminaries of Fundamentalist

denominations, sin has become synonymous with racism, sexism, elitism, colonialism, ethnocentrism, pollution, violence — every dualism and division. Salvation has become just another way to say 'Freedom Now!' And what is meant by freedom is a cutting loose in the real world, not some transcendent 'up-there' headtrip spiraling out of the here-and-now." This is humanism, a religious faith, and it is one of the two cultural forces at work in the United States and the Western world of our time.

The other is Christianity. If Christianity is not the determiner of culture, then its churches are dead; they are as salt that has lost its savor: "it is thenceforth good for nothing, but to be cast out, and to be trodden under foot of men" (Matt. 5:13). It is horrifying to see great segments of the church insisting that there is no relationship between Christianity and culture. They hold that we must go to the humanists for our culture (and then sit back and criticize it as it pollutes our homes), and to the humanists for our laws. This is worse than surrender: it is suicide.

Henry Van Til said of God that because, "For of Him and through Him and unto Him are all things," God is sovereign in His being and in all His works. It follows thus, "Religion based on divine sovereignty is religion for God's sake. Such a religion is direct, putting man into immediate fellowship with God. It is all-embracing, extending to every phase of human life, not merely to external worship and personal piety" (p. 52). As a result, "a people's religion comes to expression in its culture, and Christians can be satisfied with nothing less than a Christian organization of society" (p. 245).

Beware of those who are satisfied with less!

231

NO PART-TIME CHRISTIANITY

Chalcedon Report No. 335, June 1993

THERE is an old Armenian proverb of amused skepticism that asks, "Your mother was an onion, your father a garlic, so how did you become sweet sugar?" Politics today is the art of masquerading as sugar when you are garlic, of acting as a saint when you are a scoundrel.

Our faith tells us that man is a fallen creature. The Bible is emphatic that man is depraved, that "there is none righteous, no, not one" (Rom. 3:10, 12; Ps. 14:1–3; 53:1–3). This means that efforts to build a good society with evil men are doomed. As the old proverb has it, "You cannot make a good omelet with bad eggs." But it is basic to politics in the modern age that *the* good society is best built without Christ and apart from Biblical law. Christians are regarded as a roadblock to the good society. The issues are clear to our humanists. The church is less aware of them. Too many churchmen believe that the good society can be built on the foundation of humanistic man and without the Lord.

St. Paul is emphatic on the impossibility of any good order apart from the Lord, "For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ" (1 Cor. 3:11). Our Lord concludes His Sermon on the Mount by describing the two foundations. One house is built upon a foundation of sand. The storms and floods of life wash away the foundation and destroy that house. The other is built upon a rock (literally, in the Greek, upon *the* rock), and therefore it does not fall (Matt. 7:24–27). In every area of life and thought, our lives must be built upon the Rock.

A few years ago, when we devoted an issue of the *Journal of Christian Reconstruction* to Christianity and business, Dan Maxwell spoke to several wealthy evangelicals in business, inviting them to submit articles. Their reaction was, "What does Christianity have to do with business?" They could not relate God's law-word to their work.

But the fact is that there is only one kind of Christian, the full-time one. In every area of our lives, work, and thinking, we must be governed by the Lord and His Word. We cannot reduce our faith to fire and life insurance: we must be the Lord's faithful people in all that we do.

Our faith must have a vital and active relationship to our everyday life. As Calvin wrote, "The gospel in its very nature, breathes the odour of life: but if we are stubborn and rebellious, this grace will become a ground of terror, and Christ will convert the very doctrine of his salvation into a sword and arrows against us."

Part-time Christianity is a contradiction in terms. The mystery religions so common in New Testament times satisfied people of the Roman Empire by providing reassuring doctrines about the future life. They were part-time religions: they only provided limited services and knowledge to people; they did not command them nor govern a person's total life. The radical character of Christianity was that it demanded that *all things* in every sphere of life and thought be commanded by the triune God. This is why Christianity had martyrs, and the mystery religions had none. Our faith requires, not a retreat into a particular corner, but a capture of every sphere of life and thought for Christ the King.

232

THE CITY

Chalcedon Report No. 40, December 1, 1968

In order to understand the direction of history, it is necessary to understand the meaning of *the city*. The city has a long and strange history and has at various times been regarded as a man's ideal society, and, at other times, as a thing to flee from. The countryside similarly has been viewed sometimes as a wilderness and at other times a refuge, an idyllic haven from the city. The reasons for this are important for us to know.

Too many people in modern times have seen the origin of the city in Cain, who built a city and called it Enoch (Gen. 4:17). The Hebrew word for city probably means in origin "to rouse," or "to raise an alarm," according to H. C. Leupold, and Enoch means "Beginner"; the city of Cain was thus both a new beginning, and a place of refuge when an alarm was raised. But Cain's "beginning" had reference to an earlier beginning, Eden. We are accustomed to thinking of the Garden of Eden exclusively as a "garden"; but Revelation 21 and 22 make it clear that Eden is both garden and city, "The New Jerusalem," the Kingdom or City of God. The common characteristic of ancient cities was a wall; Eden was walled *after* the fall to keep sinful man out, the wall being "Cherubims, and a flaming sword" (Gen. 3:24).

In terms of this, we must say that the city is intended to represent *community* and *a common life and refuge*. The two basic aspects thus of the city are (1) a common faith, and (2) a common defense. But today the city has no common faith, and it is a place of increasing lawlessness and terror. Somehow, the city has failed; the city has failed to be a city. Instead of walling out the enemy, it has walled in the enemy. It is important for us to know why.

Let us analyze briefly the two basic aspects of the city in its origin, *first*, a common faith. Originally, a city represented a common faith, and

citizenship rested on atonement. In ancient Rome, for example, a man lost his citizenship, except for soldiers on duty, if he were absent from the annual lustrations, the annual rites of atonement. Citizenship meant adherence to a common religious faith and a common doctrine of law. To be a citizen once meant something more than a vote, it meant a covenant of faith. Citizenship was a religious fact.

Second, the common-defense aspect of a city meant the defense of the citizenry from enemy attack. That enemy was not only a foreign invader, but also lawbreakers and unbelievers within. The law order of the city could be overthrown by unbelief, because every law order represents a religious faith. The criminal and the unbeliever are thus equally subverters of a law order, although for different reasons. The city therefore walled itself with stone walls against foreign invaders, and, by temple, ritual, and law, against the enemy within.

In ancient Israel, the true concept of the city was clearly maintained, not only in that a common faith, the covenant God, and a common defense, the covenant law and national defense, were maintained, but that a *common justice* was accorded to noncitizens: "Ye shall have one manner of law, as well for the stranger, as for one of your own country: for I am the LORD your God" (Lev. 24:22). The stranger or alien could not become a citizen unless he became a member of the covenant, citizenship being religious, not racial, but in any case he was under law, under a common justice.

But certain changes began to occur in the life of the city. The New Testament era, like our own, was the urban age, the era of great cities. But the concept of citizenship was changing. The Christians were persecuted in terms of an older standard: because they denied the religion of the state, they were enemies of the state, and war was waged against them. This war was logical and inevitable, because two mutually contradictory religions and standards of citizenship were involved.

But, meanwhile, Rome was destroying its own standard of citizenship. Citizenship came to have a negative meaning: a citizen was not a Christian, or should not be a Christian, because a Christian by definition was an enemy of the state. But citizenship at first could be bought, at a great price, then a cheap one, and, finally, it was being granted to everyone and had no meaning, dignity, or responsibility.

Meanwhile, welfarism, combined with the ruin of the farmers, created a welfare mob in Rome which increasingly dominated the city and made for lawlessness. Instead of the city being a refuge from the world, it was increasingly the hellhole of the world. Instead of the emperor ruling Rome, increasingly the emperor was ruled by fear of the mob. In A.D. 274,

the concessions to the welfare mobs reached the point under Aurelian that bread was substituted for wheat in the welfare grants (to make baking unnecessary for welfare families), with free pork, olive oil, and salt added, *and*, more important, the right to relief was made hereditary. Welfare children no longer had to undergo the trauma of applying for relief, when they came of age; it was their birthright! The increase in taxes, and in inflation, virtually wiped out the middle classes. Aurelian, a brilliant general, tried to restore Rome to order; he tried to replace bad coinage with good. A new coin proclaimed him "*Deus et Dominus Natus*," God and lord from birth. The coin showed Aurelian as the sun-god arising to bless the whole earth. But in A.D. 275 Aurelian was assassinated by the very corrupt officials he planned to expose. An able general, he had done brilliantly against the outside enemies; the enemies within, he tried to overcome, but his efforts were futile: he removed a few officials, but he created a greater welfare mob.

By the time Rome fell, the city was radically sick. Emperors no longer ruled from Rome; they had moved from city to city, but cities were increasingly unsafe, and, when Rome fell, the actual capitol was a minor city, Ravenna. Moreover, plague, flight from the city, lawlessness, and welfarism had progressively made the city a poor place to live and had depopulated the cities.

Earlier, the city had represented civilization, religion, and safety as against the countryside, which was seen as a wilderness, pagan, dangerous, and lawless. But men now fled to the wilderness for safety. The all-inclusive city had walled in anarchy and lawlessness, so that men of law and religion sought shelter in the wilderness.

There are, as St. Augustine said, two cities, the City of God versus the City of Man. The more openly and clearly Rome became the City of Man, the more clearly its inherent ruin and collapse began to govern its history.

The concern of the succeeding centuries was the city, to establish the rule of the City of God. Space does not permit an analysis of its history. It was an important and central part of the Christian message. St. Patrick, for example, in the *Book of the Three Habitations*, taught concerning the City of God that it is the goal of history. Much later, Otto, Bishop of Freising, in *The Two Cities*, grieved because the two cities had become one in the church. The various reform movements, and the Reformation, were aimed at separating the two cities.

An important stage in the development of the city was the Enlightenment, which concerned itself with the City of Man. The City of Man was to be an open city, open to all men, *and* open to the rulers. City planning began in the eighteenth century, and it called for straight streets, so that

the state could send its cavalry charging down the streets and dominate the city. With straight streets, guns could be mounted at strategic intersections to command every approach. All men were to be citizens, because all men were to be ruled by the philosopher-kings.

For Jeremy Bentham, political power was necessarily unlimited and undefined. His concept of the state, the City of Man, was perhaps the best description of a total prison we have had.

This *open* city of the humanists was supposedly an ideal concept of brotherhood; in practice, it meant the opportunity for total control of all men. It led to totalitarianism and tyranny.

But another important step in the history of the city was the colonization of North America. The Puritans in particular were concerned with the City of God. They settled, not as lone individuals, but as cities and towns. When they migrated westward, they migrated in companies, not as lone individuals, and they established towns every few miles. The farmer out in the country saw himself in relationship to his township.

The town was the City of God; the countryside was the wilderness, outside of God but to be brought under the sway of the City of God. Laws, including the so-called "Blue Laws," had as their purpose the conquest of the wilderness outside of the city and inside man. The purpose of law is to bring God's order to the world within and the world without. The city had, i.e., every state in the union had originally, religious and moral tests of citizenship.

But humanism has gradually extended the boundaries of citizenship. Attempts are under way to restore citizenship automatically to all criminals. Citizenship is increasingly defined, in the twentieth century, in a physical sense, by race, or by membership in humanity as such, or by birth. It no longer has reference to faith, law, and defense. The more inclusive the city becomes, the more demonic it becomes, because it denies that faith and law are governing principles, and it makes the fact of being a man, a human being, the governing principle. Citizenship is then beyond law, beyond good and evil: it is amoral and demonic.

The City of Man is beginning to rule the earth. In Marxism, it has perpetrated greater evils and more mass murders than history has ever seen, tortures and cruelties beyond all past conceptions.

In the democracies, lawlessness is increasingly the rule in the cities. Signs of this were apparent early in the last century in America. New York City, under Tammany, began to propagate democracy, rule in the name of the people, and the result was tyranny, massive fraud, the enforced prostitution of helpless women, and, a steady perversion of justice (see Alfred Connable and Edward Silberfarb, *Tigers of Tammany* [New

York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967]). As the city decayed, what men had once regarded as the wilderness, the rural areas, came to be a paradise by contrast.

Today, all over the world, the philosophies of the Enlightenment govern, especially in the cities, and the result is what a November 1968, newspaper article described as the "Exodus from the Cities." The cities now lack community. Many live in distrust of providing protection for the citizens; the city is increasingly unable to protect even its police and firemen, and the death toll of the police increases annually. The city is dying, and the vultures are gathering to feast on its corpse. The city has become the ideal arena for guerrilla warfare, and again civilization is witnessing a turning to the wilderness as a stage in the rebuilding of civilization.

The purpose of the City of God is that covenant man subdue the earth and exercise dominion over it. Both town and country must be brought under the sway of God's law.

Humanism cannot contain the flames of anarchy: it feeds them. It replaces God's law by man's law, an absolute order by a relative order, and it gives ultimate authority, not to God, but to elite, planning, scientific man. Men are reduced from creatures created in the image of God to laboratory animals who are used in social experiments. Humanism cannot be fought on humanistic premises. The humanist believes, not in an absolute God and an absolute law, but in a pragmatic, relative standard. In politics, he grounds sovereignty in man and the state, not in God. In economics, he denies the validity of any economic law and an objective monetary standard, gold, and grounds his economics and money on "character" and "integrity," forgetting that man is a sinner. In education today, the humanist denies that the student must conform to an ultimate moral, intellectual, and scientific standard of scholarship but progressively asserts man and his existential need as his only law. In religion, man is the new god of the humanists, and the new commandments are read out of man's biology, not from Scripture. It is no wonder, then, that humanism cannot contain the flames of anarchy, since its very nature feeds the flames. The flames will devour the existing humanistic order, because all the remedies of state only pour gasoline on the flames, and the mobs in the street shout, "Burn, baby, burn!"

That which is for burning shall be burned, and those who are destined for the fire shall go into the fire, but we who are the Lord's people look "for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God" (Heb. 11:10). In terms of this expectation, we begin now the work of reconstruction.

233

THE CITY AND ORDER

Chalcedon Report No. 154, June 1978

The historian, Sylvia L. Thrupp, in *Society and History* (1977), wrote on "The City as the Idea of Social Order." For her, the idea of order was an invention of man early in history, and the city became the expression of *cosmological order*. The city represented the fact of order, authority, and purpose which was inherent in the universe. Order was thus seen as basic to the nature of the universe, and, for man to live in terms of reality, meant that man had to be in line with ultimate order. The city was thus a religious entity.

Then cities developed another concept of their being: they were expressions of *social order*, of the proper relationship between man and man, between ruler and ruled. Some forms of urban planning, as with Plato's *Republic*, combined the ideas of cosmological with social order to set forth an opinion concerning *perfect order*, the just or moral order in terms not of God, but an idea. The doctrine of progress and/or evolution was added to this by some thinkers to set forth the doctrine of the city as basic to the future and its perfection.

With the Enlightenment, another concept began to appear, and, in Montesquieu, became vocal, the city as a product of *economic order*. Some added to this their belief in the city as the home of Deism and enlightenment. Voltaire saw the city as *the home of pleasure*, a concept very powerful since his day.

The nineteenth century saw still further concepts set forth, the city as the center of a racial culture, or of a bureaucracy, or of culture conceived as the arts (the city then becoming an aesthetic experience). Romanticism arose about the same time and, very powerful in the twentieth century, has been in revolt against the idea of the city. Romanticism has influenced many sociologists to view the city as *pathological*.

With this brief survey in mind, let us examine the implications of our present situation. What has happened? At the beginning, the city represented religious order. Later, it came to represent various ideas of social order, political, economic, cultural, experiential, and so on. Modern man, however, tends to be, even when he is agreeable to the city, *anti-order*. The intellectuals have become hostile to law and order; both words together or singly are anathema to them. The existentialist impulse is against a prescribed law or order, and, as a result, is an enemy to the city even when most a part of it.

The result is a basic conflict. Some doctrine of order is essential to the life of a city, but the intellectual, the urban man par excellence, is hostile to the very foundation of urban existence, a doctrine of order.

The modern city is totally indifferent to any concept of religious order as basic to its life. It regards industry as a necessary evil to be controlled and taxed as much as possible. Social order is gone, because, without a common faith and goal, next door neighbors are usually strangers. Such order as the city may have is political power and police authority. The politician is increasingly distrusted, and the police are outmanned by the lawless and criminal element. The police power can give good and clear order when the majority of people subscribe to a doctrine of order, but, when most are at heart orderless and lawless, the police power begins to lose efficacy.

In brief, modern man complains bitterly about the growing disorder and lawlessness of urban life but fails to recognize that his own life and faith are in essence antinomian and lawless. Modern man is getting the kind of society and city he believes in.

No idea of order can long survive unless it is grounded in a doctrine of theological order. If God and His decree, His order, are not basic to all reality, then all doctrines of order are empty and rootless. If chaos and disorder are ultimate in the universe, or if man believes that they are, they will be basic to his life and action.

Some years ago, I visited in prison a brilliant young thief, head of a criminal gang of thieves; all were college men. His rationale was simple; everything in his education made it clear that no God exists, and that all religion and morality were myths. Hence, he held, the sensible man will establish his own lifestyle and try to get all he can for himself. Next time, he added, he would be wiser in the conduct of his faith. His logic was sound, but his premise was false. His logic had been the logic of countless persons in this existentialist generation. It has turned the city into a place of disorder. Once the city walls kept out disorder. Now men hope that the walls of their house will keep out disorder.

As the psalmist said, "Except the LORD build the house, they labour in vain that built it; except the LORD keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain" (Ps. 127:1). The restoration of the city requires more than urban renewal and money. It requires a faith in the triune God as the source of order, and in the New Jerusalem as the goal of society. It requires theological foundations for urban life and for the doctrine of society. Law must become Biblical; humanistic law hastens decay and collapse. Education is a religious fact; it must become Biblical in nature. The family is not simply a cultural and biological entity; it is a religious order, established by God. Unless in *every* area of life and thought we see the Biblical foundations and the prescribed order, we will soon see them in none. If we view all order simply as a human invention, then we have made disorder ultimate, and it will prevail in our lives. Theology is still queen of the sciences; it is not dethroned by men's rebellion. Rather, by their rebellion, men sentence themselves to death. Wisdom is God and His order, and declares from of old: "He that sinneth against me wrongeth his own soul: all they that hate me love death" (Prov. 8:36).

234

THE DARK AGES DEFINED

Chalcedon Report No. 428. March 2001

The term "Dark Ages" or "Dark Age" is of recent usage. Not long after the French Revolution, it was used by historians to define the period after the fall of the Roman Empire to the Renaissance. They soon realized that the centuries that produced the cathedrals, the universities, scholasticism, and more could hardly be called "dark," and so the terms "Middle Ages" or "medieval era" were invented. "Middle" meant between the fall of Rome and the Renaissance. For these men, any kind of Christian era was a lapse between Roman and modern humanistic statism. "Dark Ages" was used for a time to refer to the time immediately after the fall of Rome. Those times were "dark" because Christianity had succeeded.

For Christians, the term "Dark Ages" is wrong, and "medieval" not too much better. A *dark age* is an age without Christ, and we must say that we are drifting into such an era all over the world. Most revelatory of that have been public schools, films, television, *and* the impeachment trial of President Clinton in early 1999. In the trial, only one senator referred to the Biblical law against adultery, and that citation was brief and cautious. Any examination of current events shows that we are drifting from a Christian culture to a humanistic, statist one.

Imposing structures are no evidence of faith or freedom. The pyramids of Egypt, the imposing buildings of Rome, and the same emphasis on power in other cultures gave more evidence of tyranny than light. The world of our day gives more evidence of the vainglory of the taxing state than anything else.

This means that the church cannot be the chaplain to an anti-Christian order. The United States has a chaplain for Congress, but its Supreme Court has virtually outlawed the influence and application of Christianity

in national life. England has a state church, but the least percentage of Christians, and is the world's lowest in the percentage of practicing believers of any religion. Sweden, Germany, and other countries have state churches and no prevailing Christianity. And so it goes everywhere.

We are now moving into a dark age the world over, and few seem concerned. All too many churches that claim to believe the Bible reject its law, which constitutes much of the Bible. Sinning public officials have cited the belief that the law is dead as justification for adultery.

The heart of any culture is its law. The law defines what is right and wrong, and where ultimate authority rests. The modern state sees itself as the definer, not God. The church, in the process of its modernism and its antinomianism, has in effect conceded to the state the power to make law. In the United States, the Ten Commandments have been barred from state schools, and moral and social authority have been reserved to the state. The church is too often better at teaching good citizenship than Biblical faith. The marks of a dark age are appearing all around us.

Basic to any society is *faith and obedience*. The two are inseparable; we cannot speak of a consistently lawless man as a man of faith. His contempt for law is a mark of his contempt for the Lawgiver, God. Present-day culture is marked by a contempt for law, and in the churches this contempt is called faith. Churches, as a result, increasingly see their youth imitating the world. The practical cathedrals of the modern era are not only its public schools and state buildings, but also its huge prisons.

Christians must live under God's law, and they must apply it to every area of life and thought. Some churches reject God's law until the millennium, which is to say that they reject Christ as King. In fact, in some "Bible-believing" churches it is held to be wrong to see Christ as King. Is it any wonder that we are losing? To say that Jesus Christ is our Savior but not our King is to say that He and His law do not command us, which means that the state's plan of salvation does.

Perhaps you want to live in a dark age; you find God's law distasteful, and want Jesus Christ as your Savior, not your Lord. If so, be content with the world around you. But, if not, believe in and apply God's law. For to see the Lord as our Savior and Lawgiver is truly to believe in Him. It means that we are not a part of the realm of darkness, but the people of light.

235

PLAGUE

Chalcedon Report No. 17, February 1, 1967

"The Plague — An Ultimate Arm of War?" So reads the title of a front-page news story by William Hines, *Washington Star Service*, in the Thursday, January 19, 1967, *Oakland Tribune*. The article reviews a two-part report in the magazine, *Science*.

Chemical and biological warfare (CBW) is today extensively studied and planned. Hines writes:

> It is already possible to make some dreadful conjectures on the basis of things presently on the record. The possibility of a militarily instigated outbreak of plague is one.
>
> We know that plague ("the Black Death") is one of the munitions of war being worked on in the CBW program. We know this because a soldier named Ralph Powell fell ill of pneumonic plague in 1959 working at Fort Detrick, Md., where CBW research is centered.
>
> Pneumonic plague is one of two forms of the worst scourge ever visited on mankind. From a military point of view the pneumonic variety is preferable to the bubonic because bubonic plague requires the cooperation of a rat and a flea in the cycle of epidemic infection. Pneumonic plague can be distributed more effectively by aerosol sprays from airplanes or fog from smoke-type artillery shells.

Because of quick diagnosis, Hines reports, Powell was cured, but the intensive care with quick diagnosis and strict isolation are essentials which would not be available should an epidemic strike a large city." Although estimates vary, Hines states that "[t]wenty-five million of the 75 million people then living in Europe died in the first great Black Death between 1347 and 1350. More than one-seventh of London's population of nearly 500,000 perished in the Great Plague of 1655, and other areas were subsequently hit when Charles II and his court fled, taking the scourge along with them" (p. 4).

Other aspects of CBW include "war against food. A woman scientist was awarded the Army's highest civilian service medal for her work on a fungus particularly effective on rice." Hines concludes, "For 20 years man has been juggling the nuclear tools of his own destruction. Now he may be on the verge of acquiring a new and equally 'unthinkable' tool. Carried to its logical conclusion, CBW could provide a solution to the population problem — the 'final solution,' as Adolf Hitler so felicitously put it" (p. 4).

Man proposes, but God disposes. The nations of the world are busily engaging in chemical and biological warfare studies as the next step beyond atomic warfare. It is regarded as a superior method because it offers opportunities to capture an area with the people unharmed, or with the resources unharmed and the people eliminated.

But, meanwhile, an unplanned, nonsocialistic plague is getting under way in Asia. In Santa Ana, California, the *Register* for Monday morning, November 21, 1966, reported on page one, "20th Century Man Menaced by Revival of 'Black Death.'" The article stated that, for the first time in forty-two years a case was brought into the United States by a soldier returning to Dallas, Texas, from Vietnam. "In one year 11 nations in the Southeast Asia-Pacific region reported the number of plague cases had almost tripled." But these statistics do not tell the story, because few deaths in that area pass through medical and statistical hands." The report concludes (p. A2):

> Recent checks showed that fleas in the port areas of Vietnam are now immune to DDT and every ship or plane leaving the war zone could carry plague-ridden fleas.
>
> "The world today faces a growing menace of the outbreak of human plague." World Health Organization scientists said.
>
> The main reasons are rapid urbanization and lack of appreciation of the danger.

The most important developments, however, are in Communist China. Within that nation, three diseases are spreading: Asian Flu, pneumatic plague, and cholera. According to Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott, in their "Washington Report" (Oakland, California, *Tribune*, January 27, 1967, p. 30):

> With these deadly diseases appearing in epidemic proportions in several northern and western provinces, United States and Russian officials are gravely concerned that the spreading civil disorder in China may turn that country into a massive incubator of epidemics.

As a result, the United States, through Secretary Dean Rusk, and the Soviet Union, through Ambassador Dobrynin, are discussing common

action against the threat of plague. It is one thing for nations to plan to unleash plague against mankind; it is another for God's judgment to unleash it against man. Then all good nations are called to work together through the United Nations to stop the plague. Man's biological and chemical warfare is good socialist planning: God's judgment simply cannot be permitted by the United Nations and the World Health Organization! This is good humanism but not good sense.

Allen and Scott report that the epidemics in Red China are potentially a far graver threat to our troops than the Vietcong and North Vietnamese. They are an even greater threat to the Soviet Union. A Red Guard defector has reported that the flu epidemic has already entered Soviet areas. The fear is that the other epidemics, the plagues, will follow.

Plagues are a common occurrence at the end of an age, whether of the Roman Empire, the medieval era, or any other culture. The end of an age is marked by a general breakdown of morality, law and order, money, soil, morale, the will to live, and of all things, because the basic faith which has undergirded the culture is either gone or abandoned. When man lays waste his spiritual resources, he also lays waste all other resources, natural, economic, political, agricultural, and all things else. When men are without faith and cannot say why they are alive, their will to live is weakened. Men with strong faith and a sense of calling have the strongest resistance to death. The forces of life are in them stronger than the forces for death around them. In an age when men cannot say why they are alive, or what life's purpose is, the survival ability is on the whole poor. Men live, not because of a zest for life, but in fear of death. Men with a zest for life under God and a joy in their work tend to have a long and vigorous life.

Today, men are spiritually sick, more than that, spiritually dead, because of their apostasy from God. As a result, they have a poor survival ability. It is significant that it is in Communist China that the plague is beginning, for life has become most meaningless there. But life is basically meaningless everywhere if man's chief end is not to glorify God and to enjoy Him forever.

Jesus Christ speaking as Wisdom ages ago through Solomon, declared, "But he that sinneth against me wrongeth his own soul: *all they that hate me love death*" (Prov. 8:36). Men may hate the thought of plague, but if they hate God more, it is the plague they will inherit and unconsciously choose. And this is their judgment.

In our world today, we are seeing the spread of socialism, which is a man-made sociological plague. We shall soon see the plague of socialism itself plagued with all kinds of plagues, in every area of its existence.

Significantly, Revelation speaks of God's judgments on Babylon the Great, the one-world humanistic order, as a series of "plagues" which destroy its planning in every area. Against all man's planning, God's plan stands secure.

236

GRIM FAIRY TALES

Chalcedon Report No. 26, November 1, 1967

Most people today believe in fairy tales. Jesus said, "Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?" (Matt. 7:16). As St. Paul stated it, "whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap" (Gal. 6:7). People who believe in fairy tales deny this. A student can neglect his studies and somehow get a good grade. A man or nation can spend more than they take in and somehow remain solvent. The believer in fairy tales expects reality to match his dreams without any effort or work on his part.

As a nation, we have been subsidizing evil, improvidence, criminality, and anti-Christian and anti-American thinking and activity for a generation. We have been sowing a storm: can we reap anything but a storm? We have been subsidizing evil and penalizing good: can we expect anything but evil to result?

In his study, *Grover Cleveland* (1948), Allan Nevins observed, "Character is not made overnight. When it appears in transcendent degree it is usually the product of generations of disciplined ancestry, or a stem environment, or both." The old Puritan discipline left a long and powerful influence on the American character. The humanistic discipline of state-supported education is now making itself felt in American life. Our politics, the hippies, the erosion of character and morality, all these things and more we are reaping because we sowed for it. In brief, we have been sowing for revolution and for economic disaster, and we are on the verge of reaping both.

In the economic sphere, we are asking for disaster. A hard-money policy has been abandoned, and inflation is increasing. There is no likelihood that the paper-money policy will be altered by anything save disaster. The socialist answer to every problem is appropriations and controls. The appropriations buy votes and increasingly make more and more of the

people parasites living off the rest. Don Bell, in his excellent newsletter (October 20, 1967) calls attention to the fact that "the number of persons drawing pay or benefits of some kind from the federal government (state, local and private assistance not included)... is... 102,900,000," but, "Granted that in many cases the benefits may be small, and millions of people are actually earning what they get (as the military on active duty) but the figures remain: over half the people in the United States are drawing pay or benefits from the Federal Government... About 40 million persons receive *regular* monthly payments from federal funds. This figure does not include businesses, farmers and others receiving checks on an irregular or occasional basis." Most of these people will not vote an end to their paychecks. They will only vote more socialism. Economically, our future offers us basically two choices. *First*, we can have a depression, but only accidentally, because, while a depression is the easier way out, it is politically suicidal, in that it loses votes. If we fall into a depression, the political answer to it will be more controls. *Second*, we can have a runaway inflation, which means runaway controls also, culminating in social chaos and anarchy.

Religiously, we see the churches today serving the cause of revolution. The gospel they preach is anti-Christian, and their morality is deliberate immorality. Christ came to free men from guilt, but the "now" gospel is designed to make us feel guilty for the sins of others, and for the backwardness of other peoples and races. Thus, Harvey G. Cox of the Harvard Divinity School wrote in the June 1967 *Renewal* magazine on "Penance, From Piety to Politics. Reparations as a Religious and Political Issue." According to Cox, we must pay reparations to the Negro people, among others: "This debt is not a charitable contribution, but an honest debt, and the majority group in America remain the debtor group. Only when the relationships between the two groups are put on this basis of legal right and wrong, and of just reparation do we escape the unconscious condescension which so often distorts even the most well-intentioned individual in this delicate area." In other words, white America must pay a heavy tax penalty for some time to come because of its initiative and superiority. Earlier this year, the Stanford Presbyterian theologian, Dr. Robert McFee Brown declared: "Not only is Christendom gone, but in its place is revolution. The question is not whether the revolution will succeed, but how much bloodshed there will have to be before a more equitable balance has been reached between rich and poor..." (*The Presbyterian Journal*, June 7, 1967). Brown is for revolution, and his gospel is revolution. The Jesuit president of the University of Santa Clara, the Very Reverend Patrick A. Donahue, has expressed his hatred of the John Birch

Society, which has killed no one and works to restore constitutionalism, and his preference for Marxism, which has killed millions of Christians: "For myself, Birchism and its multiple variants are more destructive to human freedom than the crudest form of Marxism" ("A Jesuit's Barrage at Alumni," Oakland, California, *Tribune*, October 25, 1967, p. 2). If these men are clearly wrong, then how much more wrong are those who stay in these churches and help subsidize and support anti-Christianity by their presence and their gifts?

In education, the situation is no better. When an anti-war teach-in at UCLA was poorly attended, with only twenty students turning out to hear four black speakers, Professor Donald Kalish, chairman of the sponsoring University Committee on Vietnam at UCLA declared: "When the intellectual and middle class community refuse to even listen to spokesmen from our ghettos, I think that is sufficient grounds to burn our city down and I might even join them" ("Anti-Vietnam War Teaching Called Failure," *Los Angeles Times*, October 12, 1967, pt. 3, p. 18). Both here and abroad, student groups call for guerrilla warfare (John Chamberlain, "SDS Impulses Span the Sea," *Los Angeles Herald-Examiner*, September 22, 1967, p. B2). At Berkeley High School, a patriotic program, "Up With People," was banned because "it deals with images rather than realities and . . . sets standards of morality, of right and wrong, good and bad," according to a faculty-student committee (Noel Lieberman, "High School at Berkeley Bars Singers," *Oakland Tribune*, September 27, 1967, p. 1). Nothing indicates more clearly what our statist education has become than this: "Standards of morality of right and wrong, good and bad," are subversive to it! Meanwhile, sex education is becoming increasingly important to schools whose pupils are less and less able to read well. A popular teaching aid "is a series of 35 slides dealing with the reproduction of flowers, chickens, dogs and human beings. The anatomy and physiology of reproductive organs are shown in brightly colored representation designed to capture children's attention. A simply written text labels everything with its proper name as chickens and dogs are shown copulating. An 'optional' slide shows a man and woman in bed covered, to illustrate human intercourse" (Neil Ulman, "The Facts of Life," *Wall Street Journal*, September 19, 1967, p. 1). We are told that "very shortly," special private classes will be established to relieve parents of the responsibility of instructing their own children. "Initially, there will be the usual outraged hue and cry when movies are used to demonstrate positions," but the courts will vindicate "academic freedom" and "enlarge" our freedom (H. S. Kahm, "Had Any Lately?" in *Cavalcade*, November 1967, p. 17). This is, of course, part and parcel of the attack on privacy.

A psychologist has said, "The closed door, in most households, is not so much a guardian of privacy, as a symptom of prudery; a barrier between the generations, an obstacle to fluent sex education, a reinforcement of guilt and repression . . ." (Chester C. Bennett, Boston University, "What Price Privacy?" *American Psychologist*, 22, no. 5 [May 1967]). Is it any wonder that the very halls of many schools today must be patrolled not only by teachers but sometimes by the police as well?

Meanwhile, the police are under attack. A testing program has been set up to cull out undesired persons. "Typical questions" include statements like this: "I believe in the second coming of Christ" (Guy Halverson, "Culling All Police," *Wall Street Journal*, October 18, 1967, p. 16). In many cities, police are forbidden to fire on looters or rioters ("My Cops Forbidden to Fire at Looters," Santa Ana, CA *Register*, August 21, 1967, p. C5; see also George Lardner, Jr., "Winced at Riot Order, Guard Chief Recalls," *Los Angeles Times*, August 26, 1967, pt. 1, p. 12). A bill proposed in California would limit the right of the police to use their weapons even further ("Solons disagree on When Cop can use Gun," Santa Ana, CA, *Register*, October 20, 1967, p. A8). Similar legislation is proposed elsewhere.

When we turn to the political sphere, the picture is no less grim. *Barron's Weekly,* on August 28, 1967, wrote on "Guerilla Politics," an apt title, in that contemporary politics, like guerrilla warfare, is action aimed at the destruction of the existing social order. On July 31, 1967, the leading article in *Barron's* told its story in the title: "Poverty Warriors. The Riots are Subsidized as Well As Organized." Story after story reports on the subsidies to criminal and hoodlums (Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott, "Negro Gang Leaders to Get Federal Jobs," cited in the *Oakland Tribune*, August 11, 1967, p. 22), as well as subsidies to revolutionists ("Violence Pays, 'Liberation' School Told," *Santa Ana Register*, August 24, 1967, p. B7). The federal government today is actively and deliberately subsidizing revolutionists in the name of alleviating social distress. Some of this is clearly due to liberal soft-headedness, to the belief that money will save men. But not all the bureaucrats involved are fuzzy-minded liberals; many are dedicated socialists and social revolutionaries. We *cannot* understand what is happening around us unless we see the black revolutionists, the hippies, the student radicals, and others who receive federal aid in one form or another as the Red Guards of the establishment, called upon to break down the freedom of the people. Mao Tse-tung called on the Red Guard to break down all opposition in supposedly spontaneous demonstrations. It is easy to understand the Chinese Red Guards from a distance, but we cannot understand our American subsidized revolutionists as another Red

Guard until we see them as an instrument being used to destroy the old free America. The American Red Guard will be used to destroy the cities, cripple the police, infringe on our liberties, and then, in the name of controlling the Red Guard, the establishment will pass legislation to control its subsidized rioters and agitators, and to control us. An angry populace will demand "riot control," and, although existing laws provide more than enough means for the police to control riots, the riots will be permitted to continue until "emergency" legislation can be rushed through on demand and all our liberties be confiscated in order to "control" the American Red Guard. The Red Guard will be ruthlessly killed off, if need be, to please the people, but their liberties will also be killed off.

In all of this, the major enemy is Christianity, and Christian law and order, Christian faith and Christian morality. As Dr. Lars Ullerstam, M.D., has written in *The Erotic Minorities*, "To be chaste is no longer praiseworthy; rather, it is something *unnatural*, and therefore almost intolerable" (p. 24). For Dr. Ullerstam, we need "a sexual bill of rights" which will not only permit liberty to homosexuality, incest, exhibitionism, pedophilia, saliromania, algolagnia, scopophilia, and every other kind of perversion and pervert, but will also provide state subsidies for these people to compensate for their "persecution" by Christians. Here again, the issue is the same: *a subsidy for evil*. Having subsidized evil so long, how can we help but reap a harvest of evil?

It would be possible to write several volumes on the evidences of subsidies to evil, to revolution, to anti-American activities, to laziness, to a variety of persons and activities which need legal control rather than legal subsidization. The important question is this: *why is evil subsidized*? The answer to this question is the great dividing line. The Greek and pagan view, the anti-Christian view, is that man's problem is a failure of knowledge. If man does wrong, it is because of inadequate, insufficient, or incorrect *knowledge*. The answer therefore is *reeducation*. This is, of course, the answer of Marxism and Fabian Socialism. Reeducation of people out of Christianity, or, if they are too old for re-education, "purge" them or kill them off. The anti-Christian puts his hope, therefore, in knowledge, in education, and, whether he be of the radical or of the conservative variety, he plans to save mankind by education.

The Christian view is that man's problem is not a lack of facts but a hatred of godly knowledge. Man's problem is *sin*, a corrupt and depraved will and mind, a total unwillingness to do other than suppress the truth. Knowledge cannot save man; only Christ can. The redeemed man will then grow in grace and therefore seek knowledge in order to serve and glorify God more ably.

In terms of this, let us examine the question, *why is evil subsidized*? It is not subsidized out of ignorance, out of any lack of knowledge as to its meaning. President Johnson and Vice-President Humphrey have both sounded the call to world revolution in full knowledge of what revolution means. *Evil is subsidized to destroy the good, to destroy Christianity and its law order.* The kind of planning for destruction varies from group to group. Some revolutionists plan in terms of mass burning, looting, raping, killing, and total destruction. Some plan in terms of totalitarian controls and ruthlessness only towards troublemakers. In either case, the goal is, whether directly or slowly, *total destruction of Christian civilization*. Some have called for, as I pointed out in *This Independent Republic* (chap. 9), a long period of chaos and revolution, of anarchy, racial amalgamation, and the total destruction of civilization.

In times like these, it is well to remember the words of an ancient Hebrew, Jesus (or Joshua) ben Sirach, who wrote:

> They that fear the Lord will not disobey his word; and they that love him will keep his ways. They that fear the Lord will seek that which is well-pleasing unto him; and they that love him shall be filled with the law. They that fear the Lord will prepare their hearts and humble their souls in his sight, Saying, *We will fall into the hands of the Lord, and not into the hands of men: for as his majesty is, so is his mercy.*

Don Bell Reports, for October 27, 1967, stated briefly what this writer has said repeatedly at great length: "As a nation we have become too filthy to recover; we must reconstruct."

Our tax dollars are subsidizing evil. While there is still time, our free dollars had better subsidize Christian Reconstruction. Rebuild or perish. Lot's wife turned back longingly to the old familiar places and perished with Sodom. Those who try to save the old forms, the old churches, the public schools, the old and captured citadels, will go down with them. The days ahead are days of death, and of reconstruction. Our tax dollars are already subsidizing revolution and an American Red Guard, and we are getting our money's worth there. As Clark H. Pinnock observed, in *Set Forth Your Case* (1967), "One of the best kept secrets from the public at large in the twentieth century has been the death of hope and the loss of the human." We are all involved, by compulsory taxation, in the subsidy of evil and the death of hope, as well as the loss of the human. But the question remains: to what extent are we using our remaining freedom for the Lord?

237

THE HUMANISTIC MYTH

Chalcedon Report No. 88, December 1972

A persistent myth cherished by humanistic man is to locate sin and the responsibility for it not in himself but in his environment, and in the ruling class. In every era, men have blamed their griefs and sins on the existing establishment or power structure. To cite a few examples, during the "medieval" era, men found it easy to see evil as the monopoly of rapacious churchmen, and the myth of the greedy, lustful priest was fostered. True, some priests were evil, but, to this day, we hear much about the sins of the priests and too little about the sins of the people. No class has a monopoly on sin or virtue. There were many sensual priests, but only rarely are we told of the many women whose delight and game was to seduce sexually innocent and dedicated priests. At a later date, we hear of the debauched royalty and nobility, who bled a people of their meager means and dishonored their wives and daughters. Again, it must be pointed out that the royalty and nobility were freely robbed by those under them, and women thrust themselves at them as a means to personal advancement. In the last century, when a young king went to a spa, the place was crowded by mothers and daughters anxious to advance themselves as royal mistresses. The bourgeoisie also, on attaining power, became the targets of the same mythical thinking. The brutal factory owners seduced working girls and cast them aside, according to the myth. Certainly, this happened, but as often as not every attempt was made to gain advancement by seducing the factory owner, or his sons. The same was true of slavery; slaves as often seduced and exploited their owners, as the owners their slaves. Vice and virtue have never been the monopoly of a class, and it is only mythological thinking that makes it so. In fact, a sure road to disintegration and decline is for a ruling class to become sufficiently immoral to feed the myth with a semblance of confirmation and thereby inflame reaction.

The myth of the monopoly of evil by the power structure is best promoted when the intellectuals and artists of a society become hostile to the rulers and then promote hostility in their culture. Intellectuals and artists have been essentially a subsidized group in most societies. At first, the clergy supported them, and there are Biblical grounds for a close tie between the church and the arts. However, as both intellectuals and artists saw themselves as the true elite of a society, they then became of necessity the enemy of their rival, the current ruling class. Today, it is increasingly the state that subsidizes them, so that every "Establishment" is becoming the enemy of its intellectuals.

In the modern era, the monarchy and nobility were both excellent patrons and easy targets. The evil of monarchy was not that its taxation was so great but that its rule was so selectively restrictive. The monarchs taxed far less than modern democracies do, and they generally ruled much less restrictively; their failing was that their governments were restrictive of production and trade, and economic progress was stifled thereby. The decline of monarchy was essentially an internal decline. Courts became no longer a place of justice, i.e., the nation's supreme court, but a place of social events. Louis XIV created the first "pentagon" and bureaucracy of power, while turning his palace into a pleasure area to seduce the nobility away from power. Middle-class men were used to rule, while Louis XIV gave the forms of power to the nobility. The old upper class was turned into a showpiece, irrelevant progressively to the nation and to its power.

Even more serious, royalty had begun to commit suicide by both unwise unions for political purposes and excessive inbreeding. To cite examples from England, there was a "taint of madness" in the Tudors, which showed up in Henry VII and Henry VIII (Paul Murray Kendall, *Richard the Third* [New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company, 1955], p. 186). Even the respectful biographer of Mary, Queen of Scots, admits to the weaknesses inherited by that queen (Antonia Fraser, *Mary, Queen of Scots* [New York, NY: Delacorte Press 1970], p. 12). Catherine of Aragon brought a questionable heredity to her union with Henry VIII, and their child was Mary. Some of these, and others, were rulers of faith and dedication, but at critical points their judgment was faulty. George III and George IV suffered the consequences of excessive inbreeding, and porphyria as well as leukemia became "royal" diseases. Of Princess Alexandra of Bavaria (in the nineteenth century) it was unhappily true that her "whole life was clouded and confused by an unshakable conviction that she had once swallowed a grand piano made of glass." King Ludwig II of Bavaria had impaired judgment, which led to disaster, and his brother Otto was

pronounced "incurably insane" (Wilfrid Blunt, *The Dream King: Ludwig II of Bavaria* [New York, NY: Viking Press, 1970], pp. 16, 159).

The monarchs and nobility made themselves irrelevant to their times by their pursuit of pleasure. Being themselves empty, they came to see life as empty. Voltaire himself, both a critic and very much a part of this culture, said, "Trifle with life; that is all it is good for" (Pierre Schneider, *The World of Watteau, 1684–1721* [New York, NY: Time, 1967], p. 60).

Long before the monarchs and the nobility either disappeared or were relegated to ceremonial functions, in Western Europe effective power had been assumed by the middle class. Commerce and industry came to the forefront, and the new power structure began to remake Western civilization, rapidly and efficiently.

Unfortunately, however, the new ruling class began to imitate the old ruling class. It became fashionable for artists, intellectuals, and businessmen to imitate the vices of monarchs of an earlier era, or the surviving ones. Had women like Madame de Pompadour ruled kings once? The new elite made courtesans into rulers, and their salons into palaces and places of judgment. By the 1860s, Theophile Gautier wrote, "the religion of money is today the only one which has no unbelievers." The courtesans of Europe rose to great power and wealth. According to Richardson, "Sexual license had always been a privilege of the aristocracy, an element in their education; but now it was claimed by the middle classes who had risen to wealth and power." Rather, the middle class equated the degeneracy of royalty as the mark of its power, and it imitated those same vices with relish. The courtesans were made rich and famous, because they "symbolized frivolity and irresponsibility" (Joanna Richardson, *The Courtesans* [London, England: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1967], pp. 2, 221, 230).

Meanwhile, the same bitterness men had once felt for the royalty they felt now for the middle class and for the intellectuals and artists. Marie Antoinette had earlier been blamed even for bad weather; the new power structure was now the target of like unreasoning hatred. It first became vocal, after the French Revolution, when it was only partially expressed, in the revolutionary movements of 1848. The moral scandals of industrialists and the poverty of the working class were widely discussed. Moreover, the intellectuals and artists were also debauching the wives and daughters of the citizenry! As Tom Prideaux observed, "An outbreak of personal scandals — among them a jealous husband's discovery of his spouse in a hideaway with Victor Hugo — convinced the man in the street that the morals of the dominant bourgeoisie were no better than those of the decadent aristocrats they had supplanted" (T. Prideaux, *The World of Delacroix, 1798–1863* [New York, NY: Time, 1966], p. 166).

The poor, downtrodden people, and the torchbearers, the intellectuals favoring socialist revolutions, became now the new bearers of innocence, and all other classes were seen as evil exploiters. Everything was done to develop and perpetuate this myth, and to suppress evidence to the contrary. Thus, on June 23, 1851, Helene Demuth, the Karl Marx family servant, gave birth to a son. Marx had either seduced or raped her, and Payne feels the slim evidence suggests that "it was rape rather than seduction" (Robert Payne, *Marx* [New York, NY: Simon and Schuster, 1968], p. 260). The Communists, having made much of the bloated capitalists ravishing working girls, worked to suppress the fact that their great theoretician is the best example of this kind of exploitation, as have been most other Communists. Peter Stafford, in *Sexual Behavior in the Communist World*, has made clear that Communists are as ready to exploit people as any other class, and, because of their totalitarian powers and goals, more able to do so than any class heretofore. Moreover, the lives of intellectuals and artists have been no more reassuring that they represent any power to reform society, let alone themselves.

In recent years, therefore, the position of the self-styled intellectual and artist has been to favor perpetual opposition and perpetual revolution. Having been burned by favoring various alternatives to the church from monarchy, through the bourgeoisie, the working class, the Communist movement, and the New Left (which turned on its teachers), the intellectuals favor now the "adversary role." Their own political action has revealed their failings too well. If anyone adopts a position defensive of a faith or tradition, he is called a "counterintellectual," and some who are described this way include Edmund Burke, Alexis De Tocqueville, August Comte, Harold Lasswell, George Orwell, Raymond Aron, Eric Hoffer, Daniel Bell, Nathan Glazer, Daniel Moynihan, Irving Kristol, and others (Peter Steinfels, "The Counterintellectuals," in *New American Review*, no. 14 [New York, NY: Simon and Schuster, 1972], pp. 115–138). The intellectual stance now is a radical cynicism and relativism, "the adversary role," but every critique is in terms of a criterion, and the criterion of the intellectuals is a deep faith in the reason of autonomous intellectual man. The absence of a social program is, however, a major retreat from responsibility; whatever is offered is done in the spirit of relativism and cynicism. Not surprisingly, the word to intellectuals in Washington politics from their universities has been a demand to "come home" and be again the critic on the sidelines.

The humanistic myth is playing out. Sin has become a chronic factor on the political scene as elsewhere, and no power structure has been immune to it. No class or power structure has had a monopoly on virtue

or on sin, and sin has become a dark cloud on the humanist horizon, a forerunner of a destroying storm. Reinhold Niebuhr, to whom sin was a sociological reality and grace a religious myth, taught the intellectuals well. The lesson has come home to them in varying degrees: man's efforts to reconstruct society are always limited, frustrated, and defeated by the fact of sin. Men like Robert Ardrey have since been documenting man's rapacious and quarrelsome nature. The modern world was fashioned by thinkers whose faith came into focus in Rousseau; now it is kicking against the pricks of a self-knowledge which smacks more of Calvin's doctrine of man. In fact, whether it be Orwell, Golding, or any other contemporary writer, the emphasis on man's depravity in some respects goes beyond Calvin's imagination.

The emphasis on sin, evil, and depravity is all around us. Pornography, once a vice of a degenerate and declining royalty and nobility, is now mass produced for mass consumption. The world of humanism is everywhere in decay, and the humanists themselves acknowledge that this age is in serious trouble. Leslie Fiedler has described this mood as "waiting for the end" (see Chalcedon Report No. 87).

The alternative to waiting for the end to come is to wait on God's grace, and this too many refuse to do. Milton's Satan held that it was better to reign in hell than serve in heaven, and this is the mood of many. The end, however, does not come, only progressive slavery.

The alternative is the freedom of grace. It means a distrust of man, and of man's agencies. It means a strict limitation of power for man, and for church, state, school, and all other institutions. It means that, instead of submitting to man-made controls, man submits to divine controls, the sovereign sway of God's law in every area of life. Trust in God requires a distrust of man, man as monarch, industrialist, worker, intellectual, and clergyman. To be truly dependent on God, we must be independent of man except and insofar as God, within very narrow limits, requires it in His Word.

Sin is not abolished by the abolition of monarchy, democracy, or oligarchy, nor by abolishing the state, the church, or anything else. The problem is in man, and the answer is in God. The age of the state has seen the answer in a reformed state, a state purged of an evil, oppressing class, but humanism is running out of classes to abolish! Isaiah, in speaking to the humanists of his day, who had debauched the country, and its money (Isa. 1:22), said, "Cease depending on man, whose breath is in his nostrils; for at what should he be valued?" (Isa. 2:22, Berkeley Version). This means us, first of all. The world is too full of people like us, "good people," who trust in our own righteousness too often more than we

trust in God. No state can supply to its people that character which the people lack. The need for grace begins with every one of us.

238

GET A HORSE?

Chalcedon Report No. 94, June 1973

One of the by-products of the ecology movement is a slogan which often appears as a bumper sticker: "Fight smog. Get a horse." Supposedly horses provided a cleaner atmosphere than automobiles do. Behind that assumption lie some very interesting philosophical and religious beliefs. However, before commenting on them, let us look first at the day of the horse.

Joel A. Tarr, in "Urban Pollution — Many Long Years Ago" (*American Heritage* 22, no. 6 [October 1971]), gives a vivid picture of how much pollution horses created. Milwaukee, in 1907, had a population of 350,000 people, and a horse population of 12,500. It had a daily problem of 133 tons of manure. It should be noted that every city, apart from its own horses, had a daily influx of wagons and teams from farms, with produce, and from small towns nearby, so that at all times, and especially in the early 1800s, the horses which daily entered a city were very numerous. In 1908, when New York's population was 4,777,000, it had 120,000 horses. Chicago in 1900 had 83,330 horses. Remember, too, that by this time the streetcar and some automobiles had alleviated the need for horses to a great degree; there were, however, still three and a half million horses in American cities and seventeen million in the countryside.

Consider the implications of this. In the winter or spring, the manure turned to slush, and it meant walking (and slipping and falling) into liquefied manure in bad weather. Americans then were not as calm and sedate as romantics would believe. The weather then led to more bad tempers than we can imagine today. What the well-dressed man and woman said on being splattered by liquefied manure by a passing carriage, or on slipping and failing into the foul slush, is best left to the imagination. It was not a pretty picture.

Summer weather did not improve matters. The summer sun dried the manure, and the carriage and wagon wheels soon turned it into a floating dust to be breathed by all, and to coat clothing and furniture with a foul covering. People complained about breathing "pulverized horse dung," and a summer breeze was a disaster. Summer rains only brought back a manure mush.

The windblown particles were a reservoir for disease spores, such as tetanus. Because of a variety of other forms of pollution, in those days, epidemics of cholera, dysentery, infant diarrhea, small pox, yellow fever, and typhoid were common.

The manure, of course, bred flies by the billions, and they were everywhere. It was impossible to keep swarms of flies out of the houses, and a common gesture at the dinner table was to keep waving your free hand to keep the flies off the food. The sparrows were also a major problem. They fed on the grain particles in the manure and they multiplied astronomically. A very common complaint in those days was the sparrow problem. Sparrows could make it difficult to sit under the shade of that old apple tree, and housewives found that their clothes on the clothesline often bore evidences of sparrow droppings.

But this is not all. Freighters, junk men, delivery men, and cabbies were commonly brutal in their treatment of horses. This led to the founding in 1866 of the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. In spite of their efforts, men still killed an animal which dropped in its tracks or broke a leg, and left him dead on the city street. In 1880, there were 15,000 dead horses left on New York streets; as late as 1912, Chicago had 10,000 dead horses left on its streets, although by then streetcars and automobiles were lessening the horse population. One of the first things that happened to a dead horse, before any disposal agency could get to it, was that dogs, by nature scavengers, were quickly busy tearing it to shreds and carting hunks of meat into nooks and alleys.

Much more can be said. For example, the noise pollution was very great. Iron horseshoes on cobblestone pavements, four shoes to a horse, and sometimes two and four horses to a wagon, made a tremendous racket, night and day. Automobiles and trucks are silent by comparison. The noise also involved the shouts and profanity of teamsters trying to get the maximum effort out of their overworked animals.

But we have barely touched the surface of urban pollution. Cooking and heating by wood and coal stoves meant that, winter and summer, coal soot was a part of urban life. In heating with coal, faulty flues often led to carbon monoxide poisoning. (In 1902, Emile Zola lost his life in France through charcoal fumes.) Faulty flues often led to serious fires. On

winter days, the balls of greasy soot would form and drift in the wind and on the streets. With smog at its worst, cities are today far cleaner. With coal as fuel, housewives could not allow curtains to go unwashed more than six weeks: they would disintegrate if not washed very regularly. This meant, too, that painted walls were regularly washed down by tidy housewives as a routine in housecleaning. Housewives aged more rapidly in those days, not because they did not know how to take care of themselves, but because severe pollution, and constant heavy work in combating it, aged them rapidly.

Remember too that, without the automobile, urban sprawl was not nearly as possible then as now, and cities were more compact and concentrated. This meant that every form of pollution was also more concentrated and had a corresponding effect on city dwellers.

Other forms of pollution then common can be cited, but the picture is by now clear. The coming of the twentieth-century technology and the automobile did not increase pollution. Rather, it helped limit it severely. Bad as smog is, a very strong case exists for the very important fact that the air over cities is now definitely cleaner.

Moreover, more power to the agencies of civil government is not the answer. The worst pollution today is probably in the Soviet Union (see Marshall I. Goldman, *The Spoils of Progress: Environmental Pollution in the Soviet Union* [Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1972]). Most pollution today is created by statist agencies, or, as Dr. Hans Sennholz has shown in a recent study in *The Freeman* (Irvington, NY: The Foundation for Economic Education), by those sectors of industry which have some form of statist subsidy.

People, however, are very ready to believe that technology and progress are responsible for pollution. In fact, with very many it is a truism that progress means pollution, and the only way to restore the earth is to return to a more primitive way of life.

So-called primitive man was and is a great polluter. One reason why such "primitive" tribes have not done more damage to the earth is that their way of life leads to so much pollution and disease that it limits their population, and their ability to damage is thereby restricted. Many such tribes would set grass and forest fires in order to drive game to them. (This was common among some American Indian tribes.) Others would spread nets across a river to trap all spawning fish. A tribe would stay in one place until all the fish and game were too scarce, or until it was too filthy from human pollution to be tolerable, and then move on. This myth of "primitive" man as a conserver is a part of the broader myth which is so deeply rooted in the very unhealthy and twisted aspects of the ecology movement.

The roots are in Rousseau and Rousseau's idealization of "primitive," natural man as against civilized and Christian man. Rousseau's thesis was essentially this, as he himself described it: "man is by nature good, and . . . only our institutions made him bad." The way to the future was for Rousseau a return to man's barbaric and primitive past.

Last month, a woman interviewed on television described in glowing terms her visit to a backward tribe. One of the most "wonderful" things about them was their total disregard for time. She found it "beautiful" that someone who promises to do something tomorrow morning might decide to do it only days later. The woman conducting the interview also rhapsodized over this and declared that we are all too much ruled by the clock, and how wonderful it would be if we could all get rid of living by the clock.

This, of course, is pure Rousseau. Rousseau gave away his watch and declared that time-watching was an evil manifestation of civilization and a mark of decadence. Civilization, the church, private property, technology (as much as then existed), and much more were all damned by Rousseau as aspects of degeneracy. Man's hope was in a return to primitivism, to a golden age of unspoiled, non-Christian man.

The philosophy of Rousseau meant, thus, a negation of Christian civilization. It meant, to use Methvin's apt phrase, the development of "the technology of social demolition" (Eugene H. Methvin, *The Rise of Radicalism* [New Rochelle, NY: Arlington House, 1973], p. 99). It meant also the birth of revolution as man's hope of salvation, of salvation by mass destruction. The philosophy of Rousseau is basic to modern education, politics, and religion. It means that the modern world pins its hopes on destruction, and it has a hatred of progress and civilization, of technology, of religious and philosophical principle. The more deeply all these agencies succeed, the more deeply suicidal destruction becomes a way of life. Increasingly, militant sons of Rousseau work to bring technology to a halt out of a radical hatred of technology and progress. A gasoline shortage is developing in the United States, because no new refineries can be built due to opposition on the grounds of a Rousseau-inspired ecology movement. New oil fields cannot be developed for the same reason, and so on and on. Add to this statist controls which are restricting industry, and the picture is one of a man-created crisis caused by a serious shortage of common sense.

In a very important book, *Out of Revolution*, Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy (New York, NY: William Morrow, 1938) pointed out that the basic movement of the modern world is from Christ to Adam, from redeemed and supernatural man to natural man, from Christian civilization to an anti-Christian world. Goethe's formulation of this new gospel was to the point: "Allah need create no longer. We instead create

his world." As Rosenstock-Huessy observed, the word "creation" was transferred from God to the man of genius. The new world imagined by the followers of Rousseau is the world of post-historical man because primitives know no history. "Books like James Henry Breasted, *Dawn of Conscience*, with its ardor for an age preceding the despicable age of revelation, or like Frazer's *Golden Bough*, pave the road for an age when Jerusalem, Athens and Rome can be eradicated from our children's textbooks, and where the life of Indians, negroes, Egyptians, Sumerians, Teutons, and Celts will seem much more attractive than the so-called classics of Greece and Rome" (p. 118). The hero of James Joyce's *Ulysses* says, "History is the nightmare from which I will awake."

To say that we are developing a post-Christian civilization is absurd. It misses the whole point of the revolution of our times. What humanistic men are trying to do is to *destroy* Christianity *and* civilization, not to create a new civilization. Seidenberg's *Post-Historic Man* is also post-civilization man, man beyond and without civilization.

This dream is both insane and impossible, because it reckons without God, but it is no less destructive. There can be no compromise with it, no catering to it, and no collaborating with it. If you are busy bemoaning or apologizing for technology and the machine, either wake up, or get over into the ranks of the barbarians. And leave all your clothes behind as you go: if you are logical and true to your faith, you will not need them. They interfere with your "natural" environment. Take your picket signs with you as you go: you may need them for firewood when your bare butt gets cold, if you believe in fire, that is.

Meanwhile, the rest of us had better realize that it is *Christian* civilization that we must reconstruct, one systematically and faithfully established on Biblical premises. We must have a healthy regard for the world God has given us, *and* for the things He has given us the power to develop and to use in the exercise of our dominion under God.

We do not despise the "primitive" or the past, and we recognize that what we have developed today is "primitive" compared to what is to come. We owe much to the men of the last century, and their horse-drawn carriages, but respect for their accomplishments requires that we build further in terms of them.

Remember at all times that God who made all things has also ordained all things in terms of His sovereign will. The future belongs, not to the sons of Rousseau and their "technology of social demolition," but to God, and to the people of God. We must remind ourselves, as courageous men of past ages have done, that the results are in the hands of God, but the duties are ours. It is time we met them.

239

IMITATION

Chalcedon Report No. 93, May 1973

Thomas À Kempis (ca. 1379–1471) wrote a devotional manual entitled *On the Following* (or *Imitation*) *of Christ,* said by some to be, after the Bible, the most widely read book in history. The title sums up the major cultural goal in the history of Western civilization, the attempt to create a social order in terms of Christ and Scripture. With the Renaissance, and then with the Enlightenment and the French Revolution, another cultural goal came into existence, the imitation of the nonworking rich, royalty, or nobility. The object of envy and imitation became the idle classes, men beyond work, men who could live in contempt of monetary considerations, morality, and law. The rake and the dandy became heroes; they seemed to live a life without reckoning, and without a day of economic or religious judgment.

The beginning of the era of revolutions did not lead to a proletarianization of culture. Instead, the new classes in power began to imitate the vices of the old aristocracy and to flaunt their contempt of economics and religion as a means of proving that they had arrived. In France, from Louis XIV on, the court was marked by gambling on a massive scale, and sexual immorality. Nineteenth-century France saw the new classes imitate royalty, and courtesans triumphed as never before. In Red China, the elite communist cadres put the old war lords to shame with their more systematic exploitation of women, their use of power to promote their idle fancies, and their childish and senseless pride.

Each new generation of leaders has imitated the older idle rich and have built houses, not in terms of convenience and utility, but as imitation palaces, and furnishings still are prized because they echo the ornate vulgarity of the Bourbon styles. The "proletarian art" of Marxist countries is officially required to imitate the older styles of royal Europe in

the name of socialist realism, whereas non-Marxist art despises the same tradition in art because the middle classes borrowed and used it for a time. Modern art strives instead for a new elitism which is non-utilitarian in a radical sense.

In education, the goal on the part of the traditional scholar is the training of gentlemen. Witonski thus deplores the instrumentalism of American universities, where, "Instead of studying, say, Latin poetry, a student can study urban race relations, an instrumental course that will be of little use to him in the real world" (Peter Witonski, *What Went Wrong with American Education* [New Rochelle, NY: Arlington House, 1973], p. 112). But of what "use" is Latin poetry "in the real world"? Witonski's idea of a liberal education is hopelessly obsolete. A liberal education is an education in the art of freedom, of being a free man (*liber* meaning free), and Witonski, as an Oxford and Harvard scholar, has a view of freedom which is irrelevant to our world, and, in its own way, almost as worthless as courses in hotel management. The scholar as a member of the idle clan, a man who *is* rather than *does*, is meaningless increasingly. The scholar who *does* asks to initiate the "social relevancy" of agitators. The academic scholar thus has been unable to define himself in our era because he lacks a faith which makes for valid definition. This underscores his increasing irrelevance to the future in any constructive sense.

The styles of men and women in the age of aristocracy stressed clothing which made people useless for work. Women emphasized this by their hairstyles, shoes, and fingernails: they were beyond work. The goal of most moderns is the same non-utilitarianism and the same lust for an aristocratic idleness. The hippies have also manifested the same contempt for the world of work: they drop out of study and work. They emphasize handcrafts and aristocratic arts as alone relevant to their cultural goals.

"The Puritan work ethic," as the antithesis of this imitation of the nonworking or idle rich, has been especially under attack. In the 1920s, as a boy in Detroit, one of the most remarkable facts was the pride of workers in automobile factories: they urged friends to take the guided tour through, for example, the Ford plant, to see the assembly line. Instead of boredom, there was a delight in the high volume of production and a boastfulness about what their work was doing to change the world. The reason for this attitude was the "Puritan work ethic." The increasing signs of boredom today mark not only the automobile workers but white-collar workers, executives, intellectuals, and men in every area of work. The reason is a change of faith, the growth of a delight in idleness rather than work. Increasingly, men no longer live to work, but work in order to

be able to play. The *Playboy* dream is to cultivate the appearance of being a member of the idle rich from college days on.

The idle rich were a reality, but always a sign of approaching death and collapse. The nobility of France, for example, became idle and useless when Louis XIV required their presence at court and stripped them of power to prevent revolts. As a growing bureaucracy took over, the monarchs themselves became idle and finally irrelevant. Today, because of the proletarianization of the dream of idleness, men of all classes are determined to make themselves irrelevant and to commit cultural suicide.

The hatred of capitalism is largely inspired by the old dream of imitating the nobility and royalty, not in their greatness, but in their decadence. The lifestyle of the future requires, we are told, living in terms of fun and games. We are asked to despise mass production in favor of handcrafts, and to love the new morality rather than to obey God.

The rich have always been with us, as have the poor. The lines, historically, have been very sharply drawn. To the horror of the nobility, the Industrial Revolution not only created a new rich class, the industrialists and merchants, but it made good living cheap enough for the middle and lower classes. Capitalism undermined the old aristocracy and dramatically benefitted the masses. As Hazlitt notes, "Before the Industrial Revolution the prevailing trades catered almost exclusively to the wants of the well-to-do. But mass production could succeed only by catering to the needs of the masses" (Henry Hazlitt, *The Conquest of Poverty* [New Rochelle, NY: Arlington House, 1973], p. 54). The result was the rapid rise in the standard of living among all peoples in Western Europe.

A savage counterattack came from the two major branches of the old aristocracy, the lords and the intellectuals. A series of "investigations" were launched in England to dredge up every case of capitalistic exploitation in order to build a case against the new class. Since no class is exempt from sin, such examples were found and publicized by both the lords and also by the intellectuals (see F. A. Hayek, ed., *Capitalism and the Historians* [n.p.: University of Chicago Press, 1954]). Socialists and aristocrats made common cause in their hatred of the levelling influence of the free market. Karl Marx, by virtue of being an intellectual, entered the ranks of the aristocracy and married into the nobility. In *The Communist Manifesto*, he echoed the aristocratic hatred of the Industrial Revolution while admitting its revolutionary impact on the world. Marx charged, "The bourgeoisie, wherever it has got the upper hand, has put an end to *all feudal, patriarchal, idyllic relations*. It has pitilessly torn asunder the motley feudal ties that bound man to his 'natural superiors,' and has left no other nexus between man and man than naked self-interest, than

callous 'cash payment.'" The bourgeoisie had replaced the old aristocracy, with its junior members, the intellectuals, with a new upper class, the producers, and Marx could not forgive them for that offense. While ready to admit the remarkable effects of industrialism, he took offense at its bypassing of the intellectual. He countered with an Hegelian dream in which the seduced masses, rejoicing in the new affluence, were offered even more affluence if only they followed the intellectuals as their philosopher-kings. One point Marx saw clearly. Power had belonged to the royalty and landed nobility, because, in the old order, they largely controlled property. This old aristocracy had made room for the intellectual; a Ph.D. had standing as a junior member of the aristocracy, and, if he were a Goethe or a Voltaire, with or without a degree he was an uncrowned king. That eminence had been shattered. Capitalistic production had created new and cheap property, good property, and even landed property was being taken over by the middle and lower classes with their new wealth. In *The Communist Manifesto*, Marx declared, "The distinguishing feature of Communism is not the abolition of property generally, but the abolition of bourgeois property . . . In this sense, the theory of Communism may be summed up in the single sentence: Abolition of private property . . . Capital is therefore not a personal, it is a social power." Once a feudal aristocracy had controlled this social power, property. Marx now proposed that a new feudal aristocracy, the dictatorship of the proletariat, the intellectual elite, control this social power. The Marxist "revolution" was the ultimate in counter-revolutionary thinking: it was aimed at undoing the effects of the Industrial Revolution.

In a variety of ways, the New Left continues in this reactionary, counter-revolutionary tradition. "Detroit" is a symbol of the hated mass producer. Production has polluted the world, the ecology, people hold, ignorant of the greater pollution which preceded the Industrial Revolution, or of the times when the rivers of Europe were dead streams in a way beyond our present knowledge. The goal of the New Left is to sabotage the great seducer of the common man, production. Instead of realistic attempts at dealing with pollution, the "eco-freaks," the New Leftist exploiters of ecology and conservation, concentrate instead on *destroying production*. Through legislation and sabotage, production is hampered. Oil shortages are one result. The oil reserves in America alone are enormous, despite the statements to the contrary, but drilling is restricted, and new refineries are not built because of restrictions. Off-shore drilling has a remarkable record of safety: the Santa Barbara incident had overtones of sabotage. Today, guards are necessary on off-shore installations to prevent sabotage by groups who want to create destruction in

order to make production anathema. It is the mark of the New Leftist aristocracy to despise mass production in the name of the masses, to hate an abundance which enables "the common man" to have as much as an intellectual. One well-paid university professor climaxed and concluded a long tirade against capitalism by declaring, "Do you realize that my plumber makes more money than I do?" This was the ultimate insult: the free-market economy had given a plumber more money than a professor! The professor's contempt of capitalistic materialism had a materialistic ring. In every age, disproportions have existed such as the professor cited, and in every society. They are not corrected by envy and mass suicide.

We see also a horror of abundance in the New Left and a desire to *destroy abundance*. The delight of the New Left in handcrafts is revealing. What they produce is sometimes good, sometimes crude and childish, but, in either case, it has for them the virtue of being a scarce product. Scarcity is prized and abundance is despised. There is a contempt in every area of the common and the abundant. For example, to have a lovely flower or shrub in one's garden which grows and blooms readily is somehow despised and frowned upon. The idea is to coax growth out of something which does *not* do well in that locale. Achievement is not seen as beauty but as scarcity and exclusiveness. For many, a flower is not beautiful if it is common. In my university days, I heard professors on a few occasions ridicule the Californian's affection for his state flower, the poppy. In those days, tens of thousands of acres were covered with poppies every spring. Since then, cultivation and the extension of farming into new areas has caused the poppy to recede. A student has told me that he has heard professors denounce the destruction of the California poppy by the extension of farming. This is typical: abundance is despised, and scarcity is prized, because only the elite can afford the scarce item.

To cite one more example among many, *styles* reflect the same hatred of that which all men can enjoy and the same lust for the aristocratic. The aristocratic in this definition is not the superior but rather the exclusive and the scarce. Whether the style is in dress or in a fad, as long as it is the mark of the avant-garde, everybody is ready to imitate and adopt it. The imitation of the idle rich, the jet set or any other group, is a major passion. Is it chic to see a certain pornographic film, to favor homosexuals, or to adopt a style? Then all climb aboard the bandwagon of liberal or radical chic, hippie chic, or what have you. However, when it becomes popular, it perishes. Is everybody doing it? Then forget it.

The imitation or the following of Christ had as its goal life. The imitation of the ideal of the idle rich, or aristocracy as imagined in the modern era, has as its goal *irrelevance*.

The *privileged* groups of the monarchist era in France had as their social goals and principles four things. *First*, they believed in inequality, however much they idolized Rousseau and his gospel of equality. It was an article of faith with them that some men are more equal than others. *Second*, they believed in the autonomy of the aristocracy; they were exempt, or should be, from the laws which bind common men. *Third*, they were "different" and hence could not be included in the body politic in the same way as other men. *Fourth*, even though they had little power, they regarded the exercise of state power as their natural right. It is this heritage which the intellectuals and the New Left (as well as the Old Left) have largely adopted. It is a policy of studied irrelevance, and its only real power is, not to produce, but to destroy.

Another factor which has since been added is *madness*. The extent to which madness is a theme of importance in modern culture is rarely appreciated. Before Freud, the cultivation of new and aristocratic mental illnesses was already prominent. Psychoanalysis became an "in-thing" for a time for the self-styled elite. In fiction, television, and motion pictures, the subject of madness is a common one, and an appealing one to many. Mental illness is in fact systematically courted as a liberating process by sensitivity and encounter groups, and industry for a time recently worked to cultivate mental illness as though it offered a way to a higher status and health. This cultivation of mental illness is still a "growth industry," typical of the new, nonproductive growth "industries" of our time. Gene Church and Conrad D. Carnes, in *The Pit: A Group Encounter Defiled* (New York: Outerbridge & Laynard, Inc., 1972), gives us an account of the kinds of depravity cultivated in the attempts to gain leadership and aristocracy through induced madness.

An age which despises production and abundance and pursues scarcity, idleness, and irrelevance will certainly gain all these things, and will destroy itself in the process. Scarcity is ahead, and irrelevance, and death as well. The age of the state, the world of humanistic man, is committing suicide. We will be hurt in that process, but it is also a forerunner of our deliverance. More than ever, we must work to reestablish our roots in the Biblical faith and order, to establish new schools and institutions to rebuild society.

In 1961, in the concluding paragraph of my book, *Intellectual Schizophrenia: Culture, Crisis, and Education,* I wrote: "The end of an age is always a time of turmoil, war, economic catastrophe, cynicism, lawlessness, and distress. But it is also an era of heightened challenge, and creativity, and of intense vitality. And because of the intensification of issues, and their worldwide scope, never has an era faced a more demanding and

exciting crisis. This then above all else is the great and glorious era to live in, a time of opportunity, one requiring fresh and vigorous thinking, indeed a glorious time to be alive." More than ever, this is true today.

240

THE WORSHIP OF FEELING

Chalcedon Report No. 356, March 1995

Mark Gabor in *The Pin-Up* (1972) commented on the diverse nature of man. In all of us are the potentialities for vast ranges of good and evil, he held, and now various movements seek to explore and heighten the varieties of human experience. The goal of many people is to expand "the range of personal experience to encompass the many feelings and predilections that depersonalized society has not previously encouraged" (p. 191). Those feelings were discouraged previously because they were immoral and antisocial, i.e., they were against God's law and hostile to community.

In the 1920s G. V. Hamilton found that women were committing adultery not because they were unhappy in their marriage, nor because it was more satisfying, but because of a belief in "spousal freedom" and expanded experience. In the 1950s and 1960s, I learned of men experimenting with homosexuality, women with lesbianism, and both with other forms of aberrations, in the name of expanding experience and feeling more alive. Christian moral standards were held to be dull and confining, and immoralism for them represented freedom and "being alive." In the process, of course, such people harmed both themselves and those around them. All the same, their worship of feeling, of lawless feelings, only intensified. For more than a few, this meant a steady exploration of ever "kinkier" sexuality and experiences.

At the same time, television and films began to exploit this urge for novel experiences. It is important to remember the change that has taken place. One of the earlier and certainly very successful TV programs was *Dragnet*, with Jack Webb. It ran for years, with a strong following, but it had no violence, no car chases, and only a rare display of guns; the stress on good behavior by the police reflected the times. The exploitation of feeling was absent from this and other television programs.

Today, the exploitation of feeling grows more and more blatant, and too often films and television are like exposure to a cesspool. Those who crave experience and worship a diversity of exploited feelings tend to require more and more intensified and aggravated feelings.

All this is nothing new. Classical Greek drama exalted victimhood into tragedy. The tragedians saw men as victims of the gods, who totally stacked the deck against men. Sophocles, in Oedipus plays, insisted on seeing man as the total victim and pawn of the gods. Had Sophocles lived in our time, no professor or critic would have accepted his works probably, because they represent coincidence upon coincidence to an appalling degree to document a total predestination to evil by the gods. The goal of the tragedians was to incite a strong feeling of self-pity in the viewers. They were to feel intensely that the gods were against men, and that, the greater the man, the greater the hostility. Self-pity is the greatest cancer that can afflict anyone's being, and it is a very prevalent evil today.

When men base their lives on the priority of feelings, they devalue themselves and life. They are then no longer creatures made in God's image but are instead playthings of the gods, fate, or life. They revel in their self-pity.

In the process, such people devalue man and man's place in the scheme of things. One article in 1994 had as its subtitle, "Happiness is chemical" (*XO*, July–August 1994, p. 41). The idea in this thesis was that such "knowledge" placed man's control over himself into his own hands. The logic in the article was a bungled one.

The Romantic movement idealized and idolized the power of feelings. Moreover, as a result of the rise of Romanticism, feelings came to be seen as pure and true while the mind remained fallen and sinful. More than a few now identify feelings and emotions with the work of the Holy Spirit, thereby warping their theology. By contrast, many see Scripture as cold and rational whereas feelings are revelational. The result is theological confusion.

In one sphere after another, *feelings* have been exalted. In poetry, very early William Wordsworth made feelings revelational. In this century, Edna St. Vincent Millay, beginning with "Renascence," supplanted religion, reason, and revelation with the priority of feelings. In *A Few Figs from Thistles*, she defiantly took on both Christ and science, using our Lord's statement (Matt. 7:16), and plant biology to defy reality with the resolve of her feelings. She paid a grim price for her feelings.

But the exaltation of feelings has a long history. In the normal view of things, men have seen feelings as lower than ideas and thought, and

speech as the mature and articulate expression of ideas and feelings. However, Christopher Pearse Cranch (1813–1892) wrote:

> Thought is deeper than all speech
> Feeling deeper than all thought.

As a result of such perspectives, we see in our time a priority given to impulsive response. One teenage girl, invited to join in on a dubious activity, hesitated. She was immediately told that if she stopped to think, she would "mess herself up." Unreflective, nonmoral responses are prized, thereby contracting the territories of moral concern while expanding the range of feeling. There are too many people who can express high emotions over the "environment" (trees, animals, etc.), who at the same time regard moral standards either of no social consequence, or of a negative one.

This tendency has pagan origins, was revived with Romanticism, and is now the essence of the new paganism and too often of the heart of Evangelicalism which condemns "head" religion in favor of "heart" religion. The result is "Bible believers" who do not know the Bible and who condemn those who do!

But, basic to the American development of Christianity has been the premise, "Truth is in order to goodness." Our moral advance is a result of our knowledge of God's Word. Unless our lives are grounded firmly on the truth, Jesus Christ, and His enscriptured Word, we are, however good we feel, no more than deluded souls.

241

REVEALING OURSELVES

Chalcedon Report No. 364, November 1995

When I started kindergarten, my English was very limited: I could understand it, but I spoke a mixture of English and Armenian. But I loved language. Many of our people spoke three and four languages, my father, five. (English was hardest for him, although his reading ability was without flaw.) As a child, I sensed the cultural differences language represents: they were religious expressions, manifesting a faith and a character. I once, as a student, heard a professor of Hebrew say that English was heavily influenced by the Hebrew of the Bible, especially the translation of Isaiah in the Authorized Version. My father often used prayers from the classical Armenian at the table, sonorous and awe-inspiring prayers. Speech reveals a people, and the current speech does not say much for us.

Not only verbal but written language is revelatory of a people. Everyday speech, novels, and more indicate what we are. Our speech betrays us, and it marks us, but so, too, does our literature and our film fare.

I would listen, as a child, to the conversations in various languages, and the nuances in meaning. Some languages have a harshness and are not as amenable to Christian use as others.

In second grade, I learned there was still another "language," the comic strip. I was both entranced and baffled by it. I saved comic strips and had quite a stack of them that I read and reread, trying to fathom their meaning. A baffling one, popular with other boys, was "The Katzenjammer Kids," by Rudolph Dirks. Later, it had another similar life as "The Captain and the Kids." Perhaps there is a book about it, but the only good, but brief, analysis I have seen was in Arthur Asa Berger's *The Comic-Stripped American* (1953, 1974), which I read in 1976.

The characters are Mama, Hans, and Fritz. One boy was blond, the other brunette, as I recall it. Then there was the Captain, the adoptive

father, and the (school) inspector. Dirks's "lesson," according to Berger, is that "you can't get away with anything," but I think the message that came through, and made Hans and Fritz heroes, was that they were "destruction incarnate," and their philosophy, according to the inspector, was "society is nix."

Mama is forever indulgent, and the Captain always applied punishment too late. Mama always loved her destructive offspring and could not see their evil.

I wonder to what extent Dirks was consciously reflecting the new indulgence that "advanced" women were advocating for children, with uncritical love replacing a religious discipline. After World War II, the babies born to army men became the youth of destructive revolution: they were given to *mindless* revolt. Their Katzenjammer perspective has created many of the problems of our time.

The language of the streets and of the state schools is now a Katzenjammer language, and the Captain seems to have died and left Mama in charge.

According to Berger, the Katzenjammer Kids had no control over their destructive impulses. Others have called attention to the evils of a child-oriented family and society. We have had a breakdown of the family, of authority, and of power relationships. Protest and vandalism are seen as rights, and youth is now the new Pharisee class in society.

The church is mainly silent on the matter. I regularly hear of incidents where some adult gets into trouble with parents and the church for trying to stop misbehavior or vandalism in church by children or youth. Our speech betrays what we are, and also our control, or lack of it, over our children.

Our language and our behavior have been coarsened, and we are the losers for it.

But there is a change. Christian schools and home schools are training up a generation of godly youth. A businesswoman commented to me on the difference in the behavior she saw daily between state school and Christian school children. The future belongs to us — if we really want it. We are constantly confessing our faith, in our speech, our reading, our tastes and associations, *and in our children.*

242

THE ARTIST AS THE PROPHET OF REBELLION

Chalcedon Report No. 321, April 1992

ALTHOUGH the origins of the artist as prophet are in Rousseau, Paul Johnson sees the first great example of it in Ludwig van Beethoven (1770–1827). He was "one of the central pillars of the modern," i.e., a secular, humanistic worldview in which all aspects of life are detached from Christianity and in which autonomous man's ideas and will are ultimate.[1] He despised all "superiors," publicly manifested his rudeness towards them, and he was contemptuous of authority. Beethoven "popularized the notion of the artist as universal genius, as a moral figure in his own right... indeed, as a kind of intermediary between God and man. His friend Bettina von Arnim said he 'treated God as an equal.'"[2] Of course, Beethoven's god was not the Biblical God but a creature of his own imagination. In fact, Beethoven said, "art *always* represents the divine, and *the relationship of men toward art is religion*: What we obtain from art comes from God, is *divine inspiration*."[3] Beethoven had created a new god, with himself as its prophet; other artists soon followed suit.

The implications of all this become understandable when we turn to Albert Camus (1913–1960), who, in *The Rebel*, declared: "Since God claims all that is good in man, it is necessary to deride what is good and choose what is evil."[4] Beethoven was a devout practitioner of this faith, although an amateur compared with some who followed him. He was a

1. Paul Johnson, *The Birth of the Modern World Society, 1815–1830* (New York, NY: HarperCollins, 1991), p. 107.
2. ibid., p. 117.
3. ibid., p. 120; italics added.
4. Albert Camus, *The Rebel* (New York, NY: Vintage Books, 1956), p. 47.

liar and a cheat, and self-righteous about it.[5] At the same time, he saw himself as "the archetype martyr to art, the new kind of secular saint who was taking over from the old Christian calendars as a focus of public veneration."[6]

Concert halls, once noisy places, now replaced churches as the scene of reverential quietness. Art began to replace the church as the new established religion of society, and the modern state gives very generous subsidies to the arts.

Anna Sokolow, in writing about the dance, lashed out against any fixed ideas or rules. She declared plainly that she *hated* them. No rules should be imposed on dancers. The dancer should simply express "what he feels is right." But what is right? Anna Sokolow is very blunt about that:

> The trouble with the modern dance now is that it is trying to be respectable. The founders of the modern dance were rebels; their followers are bourgeois. The younger generation is too anxious to please, too eager to be accepted. For art this is death. To young dancers, I want to say, "Do what you feel you are, not what you think you ought to be. Go ahead and be a bastard. Then you can be an artist."[7]

This tells us why modern art is implicitly or explicitly *anti-Christian*. Note Sokolow's statements: "...to be accepted. For art this is death." "Go ahead and be a bastard. Then you can be an artist." Sokolow expressed interest in the Bible, but it was for what she could find and use from it, not in terms of submission to the God of Scripture.

According to Pauline Kroner, the modern dance must be "intrinsic dance" "as opposed to extrinsic, the kind of dance that is composed from the outside, not motivated by the inner necessity of the creator's being."[8] This tells us why, as a painter once said when asked "the meaning" of an abstract composition, that the questioner could not understand the meaning of art, and hence no answer was due. Given the logic of this autonomous and anti-Christian doctrine of art, all members of an orchestra should play whatever is intrinsic to their being. As far as I know, not even John Gage has tried that!

Alvin Nikolais declared, "Freedom from the domination of the concrete is a logical manifestation of our times."[9]

5. Johnson, *Birth of the Modern World Society*, p. 123.
6. ibid., p. 125.
7. Anna Sokolow, "The Rebel and the Bourgeois," in Selma Jeanne Cohen, ed., *The Modern Dance: Seven Statements of Belief* (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1966), p. 29.
8. Pauline Kroner, "Intrinsic Dance," in ibid., p. 77.
9. Alvin Nikolais, "No Man from Mars," in ibid., p. 63.

"The concrete" means a God-made world. Autonomous man prefers his own creation; because it is "without form, and void" (Gen. 1:2), it is supposedly a world which is both man-created and without God. Beethoven and Wagner, as they expressed their anti-Christianity, still did so with the forms and tools of traditional and Christian art; the more recent modernists have increasingly dispensed with and waged war against the real world, as well as against Biblical morality.

Donald McKayle denied the right to categorize:

> The need to categorize I consider a point of contention. To me, one's alliance is determined by the manner of one's work. Is it the act of creation, or preservation? Is its aim realization or anticipation? If one must make niches, let them be based on artistic value.[10]

Now, up to a point, McKayle was speaking against being classified as a *black* artist in the dance. He did recognize that one's cultural heritage "flavors one's work," but he failed to recognize that what we *all* do is a reflection of our faith, heritage, character, and growth.

But the artist as rebel is at war with God, and with God's reality. Thus, even where an ostensible realism occurs, it is a mockery. For Leonard B. Meyer's "Radical Empiricism," causality is denied, and "no event follows another, but simply comes after." There is no relationship, and "the isolated object freshly experienced is the chief source of value." The radical empiricists and the pop artists denied "the reality of relationships and the relevance of purpose." Only individual sensations, not the connections between them, are real. Anything is likely, and nothing is certain in the universe.[11]

David Hume (1711–1776) reduced all things to disconnected sense impressions; no reality can be known outside the mind of man, and man's stock of ideas is simply sense impressions; any causal connection between these sense experiences is an invention of man's mind.

David Hume is a name unknown to these artists, but they now formulate his ideas as their own! This is a very important fact. Peter Paul Rubens (1577–1640) was a Flemish painter, an envoy for Spain to Charles I of England in peace negotiations in 1629, a man of wide knowledge, erudition, and culture. He had a close familiarity with the world of action and ideas, and his paintings reflect that fact.

In understanding David Hume, we understand modern art, and also its illiteracy. Two centuries after Hume, the arts have finally caught up

10. Donald McKayle, "The Act of Theatre," in ibid., p. 54.
11. Mario Amaya, *Pop Art . . . and After* (New York, NY: Viking Press, 1965), p. 30.

with his thinking! Modern art is thus stupidly antique art, proudly presenting as fresh discoveries Hume's ideas of generations past.

The artist, by seeing himself as a prophet and the new source of revelation, has as surely cut himself off from reality as have the inmates of psychiatric asylums. They have lost touch with reality and have manufactured one of their own.

Beethoven, Shelley, and others began a pretentious charade as prophets. Shelley saw poets as the world's unacknowledged legislators, an insane bit of nonsense very much in tune with his whole discordant life. Modern art has chosen evil and insanity.

243

THE GRAND OPERA LIFE

Chalcedon Report No. 338, September 1993

PHILIPPIANS 4:5 tells us, "Let your moderation be known unto all men. The Lord is at hand." *Moderation* in the Greek is a word meaning *reasonableness*. "The Lord is at hand" means, "The Lord is near (*engus*)," meaning that He is near either in time or place; this is usually taken to mean the Second Coming, but there is no reason to deny that it means other than that we are under God's very present and watchful eyes. Read in this way, it means that we must live always before God, governed by His law-word and manifesting a reasonable, conscientious, and God-governed life.

Why is this important? The Puritans changed conduct wherever their influence went from a flamboyant and hyperemotional lifestyle to a reasonable and restrained one.

The modern era, like the Renaissance, sees life as theater. More than one scholar has shown that the shift to this view from life lived before God's eye meant that *acting* before men became a way of life. Castiglione's *Courtier* counseled putting on a performance for the benefit of important people. Not sincerity but performance became paramount.

This new lifestyle became embodied in opera, "heroic" plays, theater, and court life. Important people dressed and lived theatrically, and their reality was not God's truth but a world of appearances.

The results are history. All the arts were used to further the theatrical, and a sharp line separated the middle class with its sobriety from the aristocracy and their contempt for middle-class restraints.

With the development of the cinema, the overblown dramatic life was popularized for all. The limitation of silent films meant that over-dramatization was used to convey the message. This over-dramatization did not disappear with sound films. In fact, whether in films or on television,

this hyper-emotionalism and supercharged activity has become more commonplace.

The results for everyday life have been devastating. I am old enough to recall the prefilm era in rural America. The wild emotionalism and outbursts common to television and film plays were unknown in everyday life. Now, however, young children mimic the tantrums of film life, and youth and adults act in a way which once would have been regarded as crazy and intolerable. All too many now display emotional outbursts that are really pathological and reflect the craziness of film life. Normal living has been deluged with supercharged emotionalism in too many families. The grand opera life is hell for families; it means tantrums and outbursts have replaced reasonableness, and young and old storm their irrational ways through life.

"The Grand Opera Life" had a deep influence on royal court architecture, and it can still be seen in statist architecture. Life was turned into melodrama, and, in the nineteenth century, men raged and ranted sometimes, as witness Shelley, and women fainted to make a point. In differing forms, twentieth-century peoples are also given to melodrama. Present-day black and white youth act in ways their great-grandparents would find incomprehensible.

We must stress to this generation that we are God's creatures, and we live, move, and have our being in His presence, *before His eyes*. We can put on an act that will fool men, *but never God*. We must live with reasonableness in His presence and in terms of His law-word. This is what Philippians 4:5 is all about. It is time we paid attention.

244

INCARNATION, LIFE, AND ART

Chalcedon Report No. 365, December 1995

The incarnation is the central fact of Christianity. Our faith is not in an abstract, remote, or simply spiritual something, but in the living God. This God appeared as the Angel of the Lord to the saints of old, Abraham notably. He incarnated Himself in Jesus Christ, and He has at all times required a conformity to His purpose in every area of life and thought. Our Lord compared Himself to the Temple and was reviled for this (Matt. 27:40). It is important for us to think seriously about that comparison. The Temple was the house of God, and, as such, it was so important that God Himself gave the detailed instructions for its construction and commissioned through Moses artisans to do the "ornamentation" for it (Exod. 36:1–4). A religion centered on the incarnation is totally concerned with its physical expression. A faith that holds that faith without works is dead (James 2:14–26) will require that the material and the spiritual be in harmony.

What this means is that a Biblically governed Christianity must be radically concerned with art, beginning with architecture. Architecture provides the clothing for life and its activities. People who are unconcerned with architecture, or who believe that any shelter will do for housing or for worship, fail to understand their faith.

The first churches built by the early church were built of stone to resemble royal courts. The church was the house of Jesus Christ, King of kings and Lord of lords (1 Tim. 6:15). The behavior of the congregation was comparable to the conduct of petitioners and servants awaiting orders in a royal court and palace. The churches were built then, and for centuries to come, as Christ's palaces. This was in terms of both Old and New Testament practices. As soon as Christians could move out of their covert worship in homes, they built churches as royal palaces for the Lord

Jesus, Messiah-King over all nations. The church represented the Kingdom of God, out to reconquer all nations for Christ the King.

Their faith in the incarnate Lord had to be incarnated in every area of life and thought. There was artwork even in the catacombs. Even as the Word was made (John 1:14), so the Christian's faith had to be made flesh in word, thought, and deed, in art, farming, the sciences, and all other spheres of life.

Greek philosophy tended towards abstractionism. The *idea* was more important than the concrete reality, because it was held that the material dies and fades, whereas the spiritual, the idea, is eternal.

As against this, the Christians affirmed the goal as the new heavens and a new earth, the general resurrection, and the eternal Kingdom of God. No area of our lives is outside the governance of God's holy law, and therefore none can be neglected.

Old Testament faith had as its focus the Temple, the physical center of worship and of the three great festivals. The attention God requires His people to give to mundane laws about weights and measures, sanitation, diet, and more, and to the Temple and its construction, means clearly that our faith must be incarnated, made flesh, in everyday life. It is not a faith for withdrawal from life but for incarnation therein.

Architecture is the most practical of the arts as well as the basic art. Too much architecture today is concerned with exhibitionist goals; too many architects today are unconcerned with theology. If aesthetics is our goal in art, architecture, and life, we place *taste* above *meaning*, as too many have done. Too many choose a church in terms of aesthetics rather than theology.

Art must be concerned with meaning. Victorian art, and also Tolstoy, was concerned with morality rather than theology, and morality without theology soon becomes empty and sentimental. Men like Matthew Arnold substituted morality for religion and thereby contributed to moral decline.

Too many people either disregard the instructions in Exodus concerning the Temple, or else they turn it into spiritual symbols, as did Gregory of Nyssa. Beginning with this point of view, they end up spiritualizing the law (as Gregory did) and then reducing Jesus to a purely spiritual Savior, not the Redeemer of all creation. Such a perspective surrenders the world to the devil, and art also.

The reconquest of all things for Christ, and their reconstruction in Him, must include the arts.

245

ART AND CULTURE

Chalcedon Report No. 344, March 1994

About twenty years ago, I heard a very superior musician and conductor express his intense disagreement with composer Igor Stravinsky's views on art. Stravinsky disliked the "artiness" of many artists and musicians. He did not rely on inspiration; he kept faithful "office" hours, working on his music, studying, experimenting, or composing. At a dinner meeting, I once met a woman (in the 1960s) who worked for Stravinsky. The "maestro," she said, kept regular hours, like any worker or business man, and he was a dedicated worker.

We can begin to understand Stravinsky's perspective by reading his *Poetics of Music in the Form of Six Lessons*, his Harvard lectures, published in 1947. Our concern here is with a key observation by Stravinsky: "For art presupposes a culture, an upbringing, an integral stability of the intellect" (p. 124). As against the proud opinion of many that art *creates* culture, Stravinsky realistically held that art is the expression of a culture.

It was Henry R. Van Til, in *The Calvinistic Concept of Culture* (1959), who stated the matter most clearly. He held that culture is *religion externalized*.

But most people who talk about culture see it as a product of the arts, not of religion. Moreover, their view of art sees it as a substitute for religion. Earlier in this century, and in the last, it was a common goal "to spread culture among the masses." It was believed that culture would enlighten and ennoble people, or, "the masses." This motive was frequently a naïve and simplistic one. Modern dancers, beginning with Ruth St. Denis, and including Isadora Duncan, saw their dancing as a revival of ancient pagan civilizations and cultures, especially Greek. Ruth Emma Denis, the dancer's mother, passed on to her daughter the mission

of remaking the earth as a spiritual matriarchy. (The contemporary Gaia cult has roots in all this.) "Ritual motions of Eastern religions" were made part of the modern dance. The classical ideal was stressed. Settlements were planned in Greek-like groves. The modern dance aimed at awakening "all our latent and barbaric sensibilities," (Elizabeth Kendall, *Where She Danced*, 1979). Traditional disciplines were regarded with hostility. Only with "freedom" would the spirit and the body flower as in pagan days.

Some of this pagan zeal marked the National Socialist movement of Adolf Hitler. The art he required was classical art, with classical figures and "freedom." Again, this was an aspect of anti-Christianism.

Culture today is defined in terms of some cultural products, i.e., paintings, novels, buildings, music, and the like. These are cultural expressions, not culture itself. The life and faith of a people is the heart of the culture. A culture is neither the organization nor the artifacts of a society, but that which makes its outward and visible life tenable. It is the faith men live by, the ideas, doctrines, and beliefs that govern their total lives.

Charles Gray Shaw, in James Hasting's *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, called attention to the distinction between nature and culture. Our sex, nationality, and heredity are matters of nature. How we live is a reflection of our culture.

Where and when men have been truly Christian, every area of life and thought has reflected their faith. When, with the Enlightenment, men turned their backs on Christianity, while maintaining a formal adherence to the church, the result was a neoclassical culture. The ideal society was seen in Greek and Roman terms, and life and education began to reflect such a faith.

We have had various kinds of non-Christian cultures, Romanticism, modernism, Marxism, fascism, etc., all reflecting faiths seeking to supplant Christianity and reflecting the faith of men at war with Christ.

The life of a people is an expression of their faith. The two major expressions of a ruling faith are law and education. Only when we have God's law govern a nation, and Christian schools provide its education, can we speak of a Christian culture. It is a faith, a religion, which is behind every culture, and to confuse the expressions with their source is to forsake reality.

But today we see this confusion all around us. We have crime-ridden cities, where business is declining and meaninglessness is rampant, which discuss as the remedy an arts council, a series of concerts, music education, dancing classes for the young, and so on. The cultural expressions are seen as the regenerating forces rather than the faith behind them.

"To spread culture among the masses" is still a popular goal, except that the idea of culture is now democratized. It once meant the modern dance, modern art, and modern music. It now means for too many the brutal and mindless music of the drug culture. The modern barbarian sets these new goals.

The culture of our popular media goes beyond anything Marxism, in either its Soviet or National Socialist forms, would have tolerated. It is now the expression of hatred, anti-Christianity and anti-morality, and of drugs and crime. The faith which our popular culture externalizes is demonic.

We cannot again be a "cultural" people until we have a truly Christian faith. A strong faith will create its impact in church and state. It will revitalize the various arts and daily life. It will reshape everyday life because it is expressive of man's being. Without a strong, deep, and profoundly Christian faith, we cannot reestablish a living culture.

246

ART: CHRISTIAN AND NON-CHRISTIAN

Chalcedon Report No. 368, March 1996

Art does not become Christian because its subject becomes, for example, paintings of Biblical themes. Our faith, like our language, is the expression of our total lives; if English is our native tongue, we speak it naturally whether or not we are awake or talking in our sleep. It is our native tongue, and we best express ourselves in it.

To illustrate, Matisse, when working on the chapel, once said to a nun, "I am doing it for myself." She said, "But you told me you were doing it for God." Matisse answered, "Yes, but I *am* God" (Janet Hobhouse, *The Bride Stripped Bare* [New York, NY: Weidenfeld & Nicholson, 1988], p. 102). Matisse was honest about his art: as his own god, he was a creator more than a painter, and his importance is in part due to the self-conscious nature of his art.

Art develops in terms of it presuppositions. It becomes epistemologically self-conscious, more and more aware of the premises that underlie its conception. Art is a perspective on life. When John Milton wrote *Paradise Lost*, for example, or *Samson Agonistes*, he was intensely concerned with understanding the collapse of the Puritan commonwealth, and his own blindness, from a Biblical perspective. His was a theological attempt to understand the events of his lifetime. Whether or not his effort was theologically sound does not alter the Christian framework and motivation. Quite the opposite is Ezra Pound's *Cantos*. Pound, like Matisse, does not seek to understand history but rather to remake or create it. He writes largely in English, but not in the English that Christians can readily grasp.

Thus, art, Christian and non-Christian, begins and ends with differing views of the artist and his art. The artist in the non- or anti-Christian begins with and ends with differing views of the artist and his art. The

artist in the non- or anti-Christian perspective is not only a creator, but he is in the process of creating himself. He will not be someone made in the image of God, but "must" be someone who has undertaken the "agonizing" task of creating himself. In my student days, I found that more than a few professors correlated psychological pathologies with artistic achievement. I briefly knew a talented young artist who believed that he needed every kind of experimentation, beginning with sex and drugs, to attain artistic statue; he died as a result of his experimental living.

Such thinking is now commonplace. Joel Conarroe, editor of *Eight American Poets* (1994), sees "derangement of the senses" as necessary to the artist. The Romantics glorified madness; Conarroe's poets accept it as a price paid for creativity. He asks, "Was it inevitable that the Holocaust and Hiroshima, central horrors of the age, should become metaphors for a poet's inner torments and sense of guilt?" (Joel Conarroe, ed., *Eight American Poets* [New York, NY: Random House, 1994], p. xx).

Now this is a remarkable statement. *First*, the "poet's inner torments and sense of guilt" are compared to the Holocaust and Hiroshima. Guilt over what? From the Christian perspective, all men are sinners and carry a burden of sin and guilt until they find atonement in Christ. The alternative to Christ's atonement is sadomasochism. With masochism, the man of guilt endlessly punishes himself to make atonement. With sadism, he punishes others and makes them his sin-bearers. What Conarroe describes means that art now requires a pathological condition in the true artist. Conarroe cites the sculptor Augustus Saint-Gaudens, who said, "What garlic is to salad, insanity is to art" (ibid., p. xxi).

Some writers seem to revel in their chosen isolation. Robert Lowell (1917–1977) was called *Cal* in school, for Caliban, although he preferred Caligula (ibid., p. 68). John Berryman (1914–1972) said in one poem, "I'm cross with god who has wrecked this generation" (ibid., p. 150). For some, astrology is part of their rejection of God's reality.

For more than a few, it is homosexuality. Homosexuality means a shorter life expectancy and exposure to more diseases than is the case with heterosexuals. Since the onset of AIDS, and the penchant of many to wear it as a badge of honor as against an indifferent and hostile world, one at times gets the impression that, if AIDS did not exist, the homosexuals would work to invent it.

There is another aspect to non-Christian art. Turning from the avant-garde to the mainstream artists, we find some interesting trends in some prominent figures. Two examples of one facet can be seen in the very able twentieth-century artists, Edward Hopper and Andrew Wyeth. A startling aspect of their world is the strong sense of isolation. Wyeth strips a

scene of a variety of things to give us not only a concentrated view, but also a sense of the isolation of persons and things. The result is a very lonely world, and a bleak one. His paintings belong in galleries, or in extremely modern homes and offices where life is depersonalized.

Edward Hopper (1882–1967) was even more given to this bleakness. In urban scenes, the streets are deserted, restaurants virtually empty, and his figures of men and women show us people radically alone in a depopulated world. It is almost as if a giant vacuum cleaner has sucked up most people and things. What remains is a world without speech and communication, empty of meaning, and empty of human relationships. The viewer becomes a spectator to a nearly empty world, and he is an outsider to it. The world of Hopper is fully familiar in its images, but it is eerily empty of life and action. Hopper's world is full of models and settings, but barren of life. When Hopper visited New Mexico, its beauty dazzled him but left him ill at ease and unable to paint. After days of search he finally found what suited him, an abandoned locomotive (Donald Hall and Pat Corrington Wykes, *Anecdotes of Modern Art* [New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1990], p. 145).

To forsake God is to forsake meaning and standards, but the descent into the abyss does not occur at once except in a few individuals. Culturally, the Western world went from God and His law-word to nature and natural law; after Darwin, nature was replaced by the state or the anarchic individual, or by various causes. For example, feminism has become for many a paradigm, and a work such as Linda Nochlin's *The Politics of Vision* (1989) is at times perceptive but still severely limited. Limited causes, whether or not valid, cannot give meaning to a cosmic void.

And this is the problem. When man abandons faith in God, he abandons meaning. Dostoyevsky was right: if there is no God, then all things are possible. An overall binding meaning and law having been abandoned, and we are in a totally meaningless world — the world of the Marquis de Sade. Justice is then impossible because there is no God, and evil becomes man's expression, the manifestation of his freedom from God.

Robert Rauschenberg (b. 1925) saw this clearly: the only meaning without God is self-created and self-ordained. In a telegram to Iris Clert, an art dealer in Paris, he said simply: "This telegram is a work of art if I say it is" (Hall and Wykes, *Anecdotes*, p. 348). Precisely. And this is the problem of modern man, which artists face more clearly. This perhaps makes their mental problems and suicides more explicable. Rene Magritte (1989–1967) saw no reason for living or dying (ibid., p. 260). Stanley Spencer said, "In my painting I owe nothing to God and everything to the Devil" (ibid., pp. 240–241). Willem de Kooning (b. 1904) left quickly

after glancing at Michelangelo's *Last Judgment* in the Sistine Chapel, saying, "You know I'm no art lover" (ibid., p. 310). Alberto Giacometti's (1901–1966) waking dreams were happy dreams of rape (ibid., p. 275). Roberto Matta (b. 1911) saw fatherhood as a form of "half castration" (ibid., p. 310). And why not? Responsibility is a step back into God's world. Artists have in our time been much given to irresponsible acts, whether drunk or sober. There is the well-known incident when Jackson Pollock (1912–1956) walked naked into a party and urinated in the fireplace (ibid., p. 327). Quite rightly, John Cage has been described as "chance's apostle" (ibid., p. 345). Chance, meaninglessness, and emptiness are the heart of contemporary art's gospel. Art reformers like Leo Tolstoy have failed over the generations because their concern is moralistic and not theological.

Art is a theological exercise and a form of communication. The hostility of the modern artist to communication is intense. His attitude is, "Choose your own meaning." He rejects any overall meaning in art or in life, whereas, for the theologically astute Christian, we live in a universe of total meaning, so that man can never escape meaning in any way. Francis Thompson's poem, "The Hound of Heaven," very ably sets forth this cosmic and total scope of meaning, the personal meaning of the personal and triune God. If the Christian artist seeks to limit meaning to a moral content, he is reducing the implications of the faith to the human realm. A faithful theological expression will be inclusive of the ethical and aesthetic, among other things.

Without this Christian theological content, art drifts into a passion for the disconnected and the isolated. It drifts into a man-centered focus; it begins, for example, with romantic love, then it stresses dirty love, whether heterosexual or homosexual. (The homosexual plays a major part in contemporary art because his stress is so anti-Christian.) Random observations replace meaning in poetry.

When man is not governed by God and His realm of total meaning, he substitutes purely personal impulses and demands for God's law. The men of Sodom (Gen. 19:5), and the men of Gibeah (Judg. 19:22) demanded as a right the freedom to sodomize strangers.

The "death of God" in a culture leads steadily to the death of man because it destroys God's justice in denying His law. Man then is, as set forth by the Marquis de Sade, simply something to be used, abused, sodomized, raped, and killed by those who can do it. Anti-Christianity in due time is the death of art and man.

No one has answered Robert Rauschenberg's telegram: "This telegram is a work of art if I say it is." Meaning is gone, and art and life with it.

247

DATING

Chalcedon Report No. 106, June 1974

In 1923, the lawyer and writer, Henry Dwight Sedgwick, wrote *Pro Vita Monastica*, in defense of the contemplative virtues and to a degree a defense of monasticism. Sedgwick did not write as a Christian, but as a concerned modern man fearful of the collapse of our humanistic culture. Something like the ancient monastic groups was needed, without the old faith, to preserve civilization in isolated pockets. In his last sentence, however, his despair at the possibility of a humanistic holiness and reconstruction was openly stated: "The sun is set, the moon no longer shines, no stars twinkle in the sky; we must light our candles, or we shall be in utter darkness."

Fifty years later, in 1973, another book with a similar plan appeared, but one which made Sedgwick look optimistic by comparison. Roberto Vacca, in *The Coming Dark Age* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1973), devotes his last chapter to a proposal that a new kind of monastic order is necessary to conserve civilization from the collapse just ahead. "The new monks" would have to preserve and transmit scientific knowledge in order to make rebuilding possible some day. *Things* rather than *values* are to be conserved: tools, implements, motor generators, and things of a like character. For Vacca, hope is not great, but "in certain cases at least — making more information available can bring salvation" (p. 221).

The "monastic" refuges imagined by Sedgwick and Vacca are very much like the world they see near ruin. The humanistic sinner carries his sin with him into his retreat, and there is no reason to suppose that his retreat will be any the less disastrous than the culture he flees from.

The problem, of course, is that the disaster is within modern man, and he is determined to project it onto the world around him. Because humanistic man is sick, he is determined that the whole world must sicken

and die with him. As a result, he cries doom and disaster wherever he turns.

Two able books have recently exposed the irrationality of this modern mood: Melvin J. Grayson and Thomas R. Shepard, Jr., in *The Disaster Lobby: Prophets of Ecological Doom and Other Absurdities* (Chicago, IL: Follett Publishing Co., 1973), and John Maddox in *The Doomsday Syndrome* (New York, NY: McGraw Hill, 1973). Behind this urge to condemn man as the polluter and destroyer is a radical hatred of man, a self-hatred, and a will to death. Modern man finds it difficult to say almost anything too bad about himself.

Almost. He will not call himself a sinner against God. The pride of modern man is in his supposed wisdom in seeing all the evils in the world around him. The humanistic doctrine of holiness is one in which the more a man exposes the real or imagined sins of the state, the establishment, the left or the right, and of other men, the greater his status. Since the days of Theodore Roosevelt, "the muckraker" has been the virtuous man for humanists, and men as stupid as Lincoln Steffens became heroes because they acquired a skill in denunciation.

Just as in films and fiction, each new work must out-shock the old, so in scandals, charges, and in crime, the urge to surpass previous horrors is in evidence. Revolutionary groups change their strategies regularly, not to out-fox the police, but to increase their shock value. Part of this shock requires an intensifying of destruction. Thus, the predictions of the modern humanists are self-fulfilling prophecies: destruction is predicted, and everything is then done to heighten chaos, ruin, and anarchy.

As men once emulated one another in righteousness and holiness, in the new mood men emulate one another in anarchism and destruction. I recall vividly the admiration in the voice of a student I overheard in the 1960s: hearing of a radically immoral and anarchistic act, he glowingly declared, "Far out, man!"

Modern man is suicidal, and his goal is death. The world, however, is vastly bigger than modern man. A new culture is in process of formation, neither statist nor humanist, nor church-oriented. In many cases, Christians are leaving their impotent churches, sometimes to build new ones, often to find in associations, fellowships, and in their homes, the new foundations for a renewed Christendom.

An old expression speaks of "the country of the soul." Modern man's soul is homeless and has only death ahead of it. Those who have the assurance that in Christ they have a citizenship in heaven and a lordship over the world have a very different "country of the soul" than the lonely soul who denies all ties and asserts his existential isolation. The "country

of the soul" of modern man has become limited to the dimensions of his own inner being, and this he finds to be, not an empire, but a hell. He cannot look at the world and sing, as does the Christian, "This is my Father's world." It is for him a dead, cold, and alien world, and his constant theme is of alienation and isolation.

In the early church, we find a new system of dating appeared early: we have it today in A.D., in the year of our Lord. When the martyr Polycarp was burned at Smyrna on Caesar's festival, February 23, A.D. 155, the church recorded it "in the consulship of Statius Quadratus, but in the reign of the Eternal King." This phrase occurs often: "in the reign of the Eternal King." It expressed the confidence of the early Christians in victory over Caesar. Because the Eternal King ruled the country of their soul and the universe, they knew that in time they would triumph.

In whose reign are you living?

248

SPORTS AND CULTURE

Chalcedon Report No. 355, February 1995

Games and sports are probably as old as mankind. We are familiar with the Greek Olympics of antiquity, and the savage games in the Roman arena. In Homer, we meet with games at the funeral of Patroclus, and it is clear from this and other pagan examples of games that they were connected with religion. The religious meanings varied from one culture to another. In Greece, the athletes had to be free of civil or religious stains on their character to compete. The Roman games were connected with human sacrifice; the Christians very early opposed them and brought about their end. The Roman example left a long-lingering hostility among Christians.

Since the fall of Rome, this Christian hostility has lingered. It has not been helped by the brutal sports once commonplace, involving cruelty to animals. Some present-day sports are often managed by heartless men and also involve serious injuries; both Larry Kubin and Ford Schwartz have spoken to me of problems with respect to football.

We now have also a liberal, non-Christian hostility to sports. I recall vividly my shock in 1952 on hearing a prominent liberal, a woman, speak with horror of the "traumatic" effect of baseball on boys because of its highly competitive character and its "capitalistic" emphasis on success. My immediate reaction was this: she wants the games to allow four strikes to batters, not three; later, I realized that a hundred strikes would not satisfy her. Baseball was too individualistic and too results-oriented for her tastes.

The old Christian hostility has been replaced by a humanistic one. Meanwhile, an ironic fact is that nowhere outside of Christendom has a like interest and development of sports ever occurred. Spectator sports have an extensive history in Roman culture, but the very great popular

participation is a remarkable fact, and very much a part of our world. Remember that persons of note, such as John Calvin, have taken a delight in games and sports.

A key facet of games in our culture has been *a delight in life*. It is impossible to imagine the ancient Stoics, or the Neoplatonists, enjoying sports. The Stoics took no pleasure in life; the Neoplatonists regarded the material world as beneath the dignity of intelligent man's concern.

Christendom has become the center of games and sports, but Christians sometimes have problems explaining their interest. But *a delight in life* expresses itself in a variety of ways, in the joys of marital and family life, and in the exuberance of happy songs. Much Christian music is joyful and triumphant (and it is sad that some play and sing it in funeral tones!). Christians are a laughter-filled people, a happy people who know that they have a victory in time and in eternity.

I recall, when I was a boy, that some of us would at times run or race simply out of an exuberant joy. I have listened to girls talk and giggle, alive and happy. Ours is a theology of joy, and it is reflected in every area of life and culture.

The use of such words as *joy*, *joyful*, *glad*, *gladness*, and related terms abound in the Bible because ours is a faith with victory, and we are a people with an eternal security. Such a faith will manifest itself in every area of life.

249

ESTATE AND CALLING

Chalcedon Report No. 118, June 1975

The old Christian doctrines of *estate* and *calling* were often violated in earlier centuries, but their importance was nevertheless very great. Even in violating them, men knew that their office or position, and their calling, made certain duties mandatory, and that both God and man expected their fulfillment from them. The common acceptance of the doctrines of *estate* and *calling* compelled men to assess themselves and other men in terms of a God-centered standard.

With humanism, a steady decline and then a disappearance of the ideas of estate and calling began. How extensive the loss is will appear in the fact that the once-common saying, "Act your age," a relic of the idea of the dignity of *estate*, is now almost gone. Thus, I have a picture of a woman in her eighties sunbathing in a flimsy bikini at Nice, France, a fitting symbol of the disappearance of the old doctrine. People who try to act their age are now often ridiculed, because "you're only as old as you feel" (or pretend you feel). The *mind*, not objective reality such as age, God's law, and other people, now governs.

With the loss of all strong and theological ideas of estate and calling, men now live for themselves, and they make their own needs and whims their end or goal. The purpose of life is sought in man's own desires, not in God's sovereign purpose and order.

This raises a very significant fact: the criminal is the man who lives for himself, makes his wishes and needs his law, and disregards the law structure of God and man. He seeks his purpose and goal within himself, in his own fallen nature, not outside himself or in reference to anything higher than himself.

Thus, the man of today and the criminal are essentially in agreement on their philosophy of life. Each makes himself the measure of reality

and the source of his own law or standards. What then separates the law-abiding citizen from the criminal? Both alike seek their own fulfillment without regard for God's law and order. Both are alike man-centered to the core of their being.

Their only essential difference is that the man of today tries to realize himself within the law, whereas the criminal operates outside the law. Both, however, have abandoned the idea of objective law and the sovereignty of God over all things. The idea of law as a convenience or man's own desire has become a destructive one for all concerned.

As a result, the children and youth of today show that the distinction between the man of today and the criminal is being blurred. A U.S. Senate subcommittee has estimated, in April 1975, that vandalism in state schools now costs about half a billion dollars a year; the murder of a hundred students, and rape, robbery, and assault on school premises are a part of an accelerating rate of school crime. As more than one teacher has reported to me of late, the line between a hoodlum and a state school pupil is becoming more and more vague and blurred.

Of course, their elders are busy blurring the lines also. A UPI news item from Olympia, Washington, reads, "Proposed legislation before the Washington House of Representatives to legalize prostitution provides that licenses be given 'only upon satisfactory proof that the applicant is of good moral character'" (Santa Maria, CA, *Santa Maria Times*, February 20, 1975, p. 11).

Humanistic scientists who were earlier predicting a new paradise when man became "liberated" from Christianity, are now busy predicting the end of the world and man with pompous solemnity and no sense of their own guilt. Having "liberated" man from God's law, they are amazed at his supposed irrationalism, refusing to see it as the logic and reason of man-centered unbelief. Loren Eiseley, in the April 1975 *Science Digest*, writes of man, "His mounting numbers and ideological fanaticism may force his disappearance into ice and darkness just as he arose from those same natural forces he has threatened to outwit."

Men who have proclaimed the death of God have not realized that they thereby proclaim the death of man, of godless man. The judgment of the living God is clearly in evidence on them, and an age without God's law is an age of death, because the condition of life is law, God's law (Deut. 28).

The future is thus a very good one for those who are the redeemed in Christ and who, in terms of God's law, move in terms of recognition of their *estate* and *calling*. The rest will perish, because, with their every action, political, economic, educational, familial, and personal, they

invite death. As Wisdom declares from of old, "He that sinneth against me wrongeth his own soul: all they that hate me love death" (Prov. 8:36).

In terms of God's law, we have a plan of action for dominion over all things, a guide to knowing our estate and calling, and the means of the fulfilling thereof. In terms of God's law, we live, not unto ourselves or for our own wishes, but in terms of His calling and purpose, knowing that only in this way can we ourselves be fulfilled. As our Lord declared, "But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you" (Matt. 6:33). He having made us can alone be our fulfillment. The necessary condition of our life is the sovereign God: without Him, we have no estate and calling, and, finally, no life, society, or culture. In the graveyard, there is no estate and calling.

250

WOMEN AND CHILDREN FIRST?

Chalcedon Report No. 360, July 1995

Having been brought up on the belief that the law of the sea, in a shipwreck, is, "Women and children first," it was a shock to learn what happened when the Titanic went down early in the twentieth century. Most of the first-class passengers, including men as well as women and children, got away *in half-empty lifeboats*, but fifty-three children of third-class passengers, including their parents, went down with the ship (Edmond Taylor, *The Fall of the Dynasties, 1905–1922*, p. 23).

In mulling over this fact, many questions came to mind. Would feminists today object to the idea of "women and children first" as demeaning? Nowadays, would the first-class passengers be left behind, and the third-class taken? Or would the crew insist on their priority? Granted that the rules in the days of the Titanic were not good, are there really *any* rules now?

The student rebellion of the 1960s had many slogans. One that came in a bit later was a simple one: "Question Authority." Much advance in history has come because one or another false or bad authority was questioned, but the temper of this slogan was to question all authority; it was a recipe for anarchy, and we see that anarchy all around us.

Why women and children first? What was the rationale behind this slogan? As a young man, I had the opportunity to ask a sea captain about this once. His rambling answer was still very positive in his assertions. It is a man's duty at all times, he said, to protect women and children, and a shipwreck is simply an example of this duty. He added, women and children are our future, so why not? Besides, he said, while we sailors are sometimes a rough lot, a seaman can be no less a gentleman. For him, raising the question as to the priority of women and children was out of place.

Now, of course, with abortion, children can be regarded as unwanted and unnecessary by many. And feminism certainly has not commended women to many men who are offended at the gratuitous insults they receive from feminists for their gentlemanly courtesies. (As one young man complained, my mother brought me up that way, and I can't change overnight!)

The expression, "women and children first," was the motto, in a sense, of the old order, not always kept but at least a standard of sorts.

Now all the old standards are being challenged. One recent book saw "no scientific reason why you couldn't have a chimp-human hybrid" because genetic engineering may make it possible for scientists to play God. All the old rules must therefore be discarded, it was held. Freedom has come to mean deliverance from all the rules of Christian civilization, and the new realm of possibility is simply the assault on Biblical culture. But, since God is the Author of life, to depart from His law is to forsake life. Instead of salvaging something from the collapsing culture, it becomes instead a suicidal venture.

We are told, in Proverbs 8:36, "But he that sinneth against me wrongeth his own soul: all they that hate me love death." Separate yourself from the culture of death. We are the people of life.

251

RESPONSIBILITY AND CHANGE

Chalcedon Report No. 49, September 1969

On July 26, 1969, it was my privilege to attend Dr. Hans Sennholz's seminar on "The Dollar Crisis." As Dr. Sennholz concluded his very able and intensely interesting account of our monetary problem, he analyzed the decline of the paper dollar and the grim future and then concluded thus (to cite my summary notes): The people are to blame; the government is their tool. People make demands on the government for a growing list of services, demanding aids, services, grants, which create an inflationary economy. Peter has been taxed to pay Paul. The end of the road is in sight, but the pressures on the government by the people continue. Price controls and a dictator loom ahead on this road, and economic destruction. The people must change, before the trend can change.

These admirable words reflect a Christian perspective; they echo the faith in personal responsibility which is basic to Christian Western civilization.

Yet within a week, as I reported these words to a number of Christian and conservative ministers and laymen, I received a large number of objections. I was told: Not true, the people have been misled. Not true, it has been a conspiracy against the innocent public. Wrong, let me give you a book proving who has fooled the public . . . and so on. During the same time, I also saw a leftist analysis of the tight money situation: it was described as a capitalistic conspiracy against the people!

The leftist analysis alone was logical, although wrong. The Marxist perspective is that not individual responsibility but environment is the source of sin, wrong, and evil. Men are victims, not sinners. Change the environment, and you change man. Dr. Sennholz had echoed the Christian presupposition: change the man, and you change the environment. These "Christians" and "conservatives" who criticized Dr. Sennholz

were revealing the extent to which they had absorbed Marxist premises; they were carrying the old banners but marching in an alien army.

Let us analyze the matter more carefully, *first*, the matter of *conspiracy*. Most simply defined by the dictionary, a conspiracy is a "[c]ombination of men for a single end"; in law, it is a combination for either unlawful ends or to use unlawful means towards an end in view. The Christian must take the conspiracy view of history seriously, because Scripture teaches throughout that history is a struggle, with the forces of evil conspiring against God and His anointed (Ps. 2). History is not a blind, impersonal force, as for the Marxists, but a very personal work of God primarily, and secondarily of men. Thus, conspiracies are real, because men are very real forces in history.

But, *second*, because the Bible denies that history is the product of unconscious, impersonal forces and drives, it asserts *individual responsibility*. In Genesis 3, it made it clear that the essence of sin is to blame other persons or the environment for one's own guilt. Adam, by blaming his environment (God), and his wife (Eve), for his sin only aggravated his guilt.

It follows, therefore, that we can alert people to what various conspiracies are doing to undermine or subvert a nation, but we cannot as Christians blame any conspiracy for our weakness or fall. Men stand or fall in terms of their faith and character. True, man's faith and character is subjected to attack, but so was Adam's; in this world, there is *always* testing, temptation, and trial. The question is, do we submit to it or overcome it? Dr. Sennholz was right; the people must change, before the trend can change. Any conclusion other than individual responsibility is a denial of Christianity and is an implicit Marxism.

Because so many ostensible Christians and conservatives lack a Biblically grounded faith, their actions and statements often end up in an unconscious anti-Christianity. As a result, some so-called conservative movements are moving into strange waters and revealing anti-Christian and anti-conservative tendencies.

Take, for example, an article in the summer, 1969, issue of *The American Mercury*, by Revilo P. Oliver, Ph.D., "Christianity — Religion of the West." The editorial heading indicates that the editors regard the article to be very good and of "major importance." The thesis of the article is that only Western (or European) man is congenial to Christianity. (The Bible says no man naturally is congenial to it, whatever his race, only God's supernatural grace conforms him to it, but, for Oliver, the natural Christian, and only real one, is the Western, racial man.) According to Oliver, missionaries only succeeded where imperialistic guns backed them, and failed where there was no backing. (This is, of course, the

Marxist line on the relationship of imperialism and missions. This does not mean that Oliver is a Marxist, but his non-Biblical thought places him in a common camp at this point.) Oliver chooses to ignore the vast evidences of native faith in Asia and Africa in the face of persecutions, nor does he acknowledge the frequent opposition of imperial agents to missionaries as "meddlers." His evidence is negligible and his total picture anti-Christian. True, in recent years Christianity has had serious setbacks in many parts of Asia and Africa, but not because imperialism has waned. The decline has been due to the same reasons for the decline of Christianity in Europe and America: men have turned to alien and humanistic faiths.

Oliver, *The American Mercury*, W. A. Carto, and others who are regarded as strong conservatives are also great admirers of the late Francis Parker Yockey and his work, *Imperium: The Philosophy of History and Politics* (1948). Yockey's position is atheistic and anti-Christian. Yockey was also a strong champion of race, and especially of what he called "Ethical Socialism" (p. 617). (Ethical socialism is the socialism you operate; the other man's socialism is always unethical!) Yockey's work has overtones of Nietzsche and an inferior echo of Spengler. Incidentally, his complaint against Marxism is not that it is socialistic, but that "the ethical and social foundations of Marxism are capitalistic" (p. 80). Yockey's book is a pompous, turgid restatement of every kind of immoralistic philosophy of the last century which said, "Somebody did this to us, not we ourselves." Like Adam, who said, "The woman whom thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree, and I did eat" (Gen. 3:12), so Yockey worked to absolve Western man of guilt, even as he compounded it with unbelief and moral irresponsibility.

The people must change, before the trend can change. This is not a popular program. People want an enemy to blame, not themselves. How much easier to expose and blame than to reconstruct! Marxism has a simple, sure appeal: "The bad guys did it to us." People, as sinners, love this. Biblical faith has an unpopular message: whatever anyone else has done, and as sinners they will sin, what about your responsibility and your guilt? The greatness of David was that he did not blame Bathsheba or anyone else; he acknowledged that it was his guilt, his act, his sin.

But most people today will not acknowledge their guilt. They attend churches which preach another gospel, and they will not break with them. They claim that they are trying to reform the church from within, but each year these churches become more openly anti-Christian, and they still remain. These people profess loyalty to Christ, but the only loyalty they manifest is to an anti-Christian church. Are they not guilty?

We can go on indefinitely. Suffice it to say that most people find it convenient to turn to the Marxist, environmentalist answer and say, "The bad guys are responsible for all our problems." And they continue to believe that they can redeem the public schools, a socialistic agency! They turn their children over to a non-Christian, socialistic school and then ask God to bless them. And they wonder why their children turn into rebels.

(Appended to this report is a graduation address by Gaye Patapoff, valedictorian, San Jose Christian School, eighth grade, June 13, 1969. Gaye reflects her Christian home and school in her address, and she has a maturity lacking in the eighth graders of our socialistic schools.)

But to return to our point: The trend will not change until the people change. We have too many people who want to change the world, too few who admit that man needs changing—and that only the grace of God can accomplish this. God's appointed means are Christian institutions. We must therefore begin reconstruction now, prayerfully and hopefully. We must stand on individual responsibility as against environmentalism. We cannot excuse ourselves by saying, "The woman gave me . . . and I did eat," or by saying, the Communists are to blame, or the Democrats, or the capitalistic warmongers. That excuse did not work when it was first tried by Adam. What makes us think it will work with God now? Adam to Marx to men today, it has been a ticket to judgment. Dr. Sennholz is right: the people must change, before the trend can change. Do you agree? Or do you prefer to line up with Marx and blame the system?

In case you missed it in your newspaper, a major university last June granted a master's degree to a student whose thesis was simply eight pages of lines of typed periods. The university accepted the thesis, and the vice president defended the action, although the library decided against filing it (*National Observer*, June 30, 1969). Now read the address of an eighth-grade student in a Christian School by way of contrast.

Valedictory Address, by Gaye Patapoff, eighth grade

Distinguished members of the board, our devoted principal, dedicated teachers, loving parents, most welcome guests, and fellow students:

It is with great joy that I am able to speak to you tonight in an effort to express the gratitude and thankfulness of my classmates and myself for being able to attend and graduate from the San Jose Christian School.

As we all know, there are many philosophies and ideologies striving to win the minds and hearts of the youth today. Christianity, in our

Reformed Churches, is being challenged by the theory that a sovereign God is no longer necessary when we have a "sovereign" federal government that will provide everything God can from the cradle to grave.

Communism is winning the minds of the youth in our country and throughout the world on the theory that when the youth become adults, the world will be theirs. This godless form of government denies the very existence of God. It bases its hopes for success on man being perfect and sinless, which we know is impossible, since man is totally depraved, sinful, and selfish.

Our world is in a state of turmoil and confusion. Wars which were once considered infrequent catastrophes are now every day current events. Students in high schools in large numbers are taking drugs as a rebellion against authority. Students in colleges and universities almost daily practice violence and defiance of authority as an expression of independence.

We, who are graduating, are thankful that we have learned not only English, history, mathematics, and science, but that God is the source of all truth, the creator of order in the world, and the author of all history, past and future. Our devoted teachers have taught us God's part and place in every subject. We have daily studied the written Word, and learned His instructions on how we must live to please our great Creator, thus insuring true happiness as we grow into adulthood.

Our greatest wish is that all the children in the world could attend schools such as this, with devoted teachers by whom we learn about God, His Word, and the peace that comes only through Jesus Christ our Savior.

I thank you again on behalf of the eighth grade graduating class for building a firm foundation on solid rock rather than sinking sand. I would like to close with our class theme, Romans 8:38–39: "For I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord."

252

COUNTER-COUNTER CULTURE?

Chalcedon Report No. 86, October 1972

HERMAN Kahn, director of the Hudson Institute, recently predicted that the counter-counterculture will dominate the next decade. There is, he holds, a growing reaction against the moods and ideas which dominated the 1960s. "The pendulum has swung too far. We've abandoned too many traditional values and we haven't replaced them with satisfactory new values." He believes that the upper middle class, the communications people, educators and students, and city planners "are all basically out of touch with reality." Crime in the streets has aroused anger in the great majority of Americans. He holds that 67 percent of America is "quite square and getting squarer," and that this is "the biggest thing going in America today and it will either dominate or heavily influence the next decade or two." Kahn favors this trend and adds, "I have a strong desire to give life a kind of meaning and purpose that can only come out of revealed religion." He regrets that he cannot believe in a revealed truth, but he insists that there is meaning to life. Kahn criticizes the claims that the United States is a racist society and adds, "No one has ever shown any good results from busing" ("Herman Kahn: The Squaring of America," an interview by Jonathan Ward in *Intellectual Digest* 3, no. 1 [September 1972], pp. 16–19). Kahn's opinions usually carry weight, and, without agreeing with him, we should give attention to his statements.

Others have given similar reports. Furlong has called attention to the fact that, whereas in the 1960s it was the alienated students on college campuses who dominated the scene, today it is increasingly the alienated working man and middle-class citizen of our cities. These people are angry at what has happened to their neighborhoods. They resent higher taxes, busing, corrupt politics, crime, and senseless change for change's

sake. They are ready to make peace with law-abiding blacks (and are doing so) to fight against politicians and bureaucrats. Such people "are not trying to change the system so much as they are trying to change the politicians who exploit it." These people are the "nonmobiles," the people who do not move but remain in a fixed neighborhood. "The white-ethnic, blue-collar workers generally, remained nonmobile through these years (after World War II), often living in well-defined pockets of the inner city" (William Barry Furlong, "Profile of an Alienated Voter," *Saturday Review*, July 29, 1972, pp. 48–51).

A similar protest has developed to a degree among many middle-class and upper-middle-class men. Companies who used to move men freely across country, and to promote only by moving, are now beginning to cut down on this process: too many good men now refuse to move and resent the rootlessness which has marked executive and professional life since World War II.

There is thus a markedly different mood now than that which marked the years from World War II to ca. 1970. It is conservatism of a sort, and more than a few have welcomed it as a sign of great changes ahead of a happier kind than those of recent years. Are they right?

But, before answering that question, let us examine a very important area of the new conservatism, one which is intense in its criticism of "big government," of ideas of a scientific elite controlling man and society, of a growing bureaucracy, and much more. This sector of the new conservatism is the growing number of "men's magazines" which emphasize nudity, free love, and a laissez-faire attitude towards sexuality, i.e., the abolition of all laws governing sexual conduct. Less well known to many is the fact that these publications carry this laissez-faire attitude into other areas. Joe Goldberg, in his study *Big Bunny: The Inside Story of Playboy* (New York, NY: Ballantine, 1967), called attention to the fact that one of Hugh M. Hefner's favorite authors is Ayn Rand (p. 64). *Playboy* accordingly manifests a continuing critique of strong civil government and a hostility to statism. Other magazines of the same general nature are equally vocal in their critique of statism and scientism. Thus, Al Goldstein has called various federal acts, and B. F. Skinner's book, *Beyond Freedom and Dignity*, an "Outrage Against the Soul." Goldstein sees *1984* and Orwell's nightmare looming ahead and speaks of the "outrage" of statist controls over man: "the Senate Finance Committee voted to require that all children entering the first grade after January 1, 1974, be assigned Social Security numbers. The rationale for this dictator's dream is that of combatting welfare cheaters, since duplicating numbers would be ended. Under the present law, a person normally obtains a number when he is

first employed. Since FBI dossiers are increasing in number and scope for each and every American, it seems only reasonable that Big Brother now wants to poke his nose into the kindergartens and diapers of our youth" (Al Goldstein, "The Garbage Pail: Outrage Against the Soul," *Cavalier* 22, no. 10 [August 1972]: pp. 6–10). This is not an isolated example. The hostility to and sense of outrage over statism and scientism is very strong in such circles, and it appears on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

A "fantastic tale" by Vlas Tenin, *Moscow Nights*, a product of Russian underground literature, reflects the feeling of pornographic bitterness in intellectual circles in the Soviet Union for statism and scientism. A song sung by the youth of the underground is savage in its hatred of scientific socialist planning, which aims at playing god, seeking to make figs grow among Eskimos, and snow to fall in the Sahara, according to the song. The song also says,

> Those bastard scientists, just for a bet,
> Have turned the whole world on its head . . .
> Whether it's rabbits they deal with, or man —
> The scientists couldn't give a damn!
> (Vlas Tenin, *Moscow Nights* [New York, NY: Olympia, 1971], p. 80.)

It would be easy to pile up data and make a case for Herman Kahn's belief that we are moving into a counter-counterculture. In fact, some might call it a counterrevolutionary mood. Even some of the Black Panther leaders have of late rejected revolutionary action in favor of legal process. The important point is this: is there anything in this new conservatism which offers hope for the future? We must remember that, the closer Rome drew to its collapse, the more it railed against the tightening noose of statist power, looked nostalgically to the past, and blundered ahead to its death.

The new conservatism is very heavily marked by a neo-anarchism, so that its very conservatism is in essence a radicalism. The new conservatism wants all the benefits which the state provides but not the state itself, an impossible picture. It wants a strong state to enforce its particular interests, such as ecological controls, welfarism, anti-racist legislation, and much more, but it wants a laissez-faire attitude with respect to sexual regulations, neighborhood schools and busing, privacy, and much more. To create a powerful state in certain areas of life means to create a powerful state which will not stay out of other areas. A power state which has the power of life and death over industry will exercise the same power over the little people of the country, whose ability to withstand civil power is much less than that of "big business." The stronger man makes the

state, the weaker he makes himself. Thus the new conservatism is very much a meaningless protest. Lacking a consistent philosophy, it can only win battles, never a war. It may succeed, in its middle-class and workingman's forms, in stopping busing, although even this is dubious, and it may stop a few other things, but it will not check the growth of statist power. In its neo-anarchistic forms, this neoconservatism may gain far more drastic abolition of sexual regulations, and it may win some victories for personal privacy, but it is also increasing statist controls by some of its other demands.

An even more serious weakness marks the new conservatism. The older conservatism, still present in the middle class, was marked by serious weaknesses and a divorce from its Christian roots. It had, however, this virtue: it was still production-oriented. The very deadly flaw of the new conservatism is that it is consumption-oriented. A fact seldom appreciated is that in most decadent and dying societies, there is a strong nostalgia for the past and a rootless and sentimental conservatism. The *faith* that made the longed-for past is dead, but the longing for its *fruits* is widespread. Today, for example, the Puritanism of early America, its strong belief in the sovereignty of God, its emphasis on God's law, and its insistence on godly order are all gone, but the antiquarian interest in early America is at an all-time high. Antiques command a growing price; early Americana of all kinds is prized; books on Americana sell at a rapid pace, and interest in the past has spread to Indian culture, early French-American culture, and early Spanish-American culture. A similar nostalgia for and interest in the past is common in Europe. This interest, however, is a part of the problem: it is a part of the consumption-oriented mentality which wants to enjoy the best of the past, present, and future, to consume and to enjoy, rather than to produce.

Friedrich Heer, in *The Medieval World* (1962), writes of the "open Europe" of 1100; men travelled freely from England through Russia, from Europe to Byzantium, and from Europe to the Islamic world. Trade routes were well travelled, and intermarriages were common. Even in Spain, despite the combat, marriages between Islamic, Jewish, and Hispano-Christian families, especially among the aristocracy and merchant classes, were common. In addition to the commercial travel, there was a great deal of movement across frontiers by pilgrims. Commercial travel is still very much with us, but pilgrims have been replaced by tourists, a significant fact. The pilgrim was moved by a strong faith and a vision of the Kingdom of God on earth; the tourist is concerned with seeing the past before it disappears. The tourist sees greatness in the past; the pilgrim sees it in the past in order to establish it in the present and the future.

A consumption-oriented conservatism thus looks to the past, builds museums, establishes national forests, and works to conserve a heritage in its outward forms. It often accomplishes worthwhile goals in its nostalgia. Winning some battles, it loses the war, because it sees no greatness ahead for man, only disaster. A production-oriented conservatism will not neglect the past, but it will regard today and tomorrow as man's best opportunity and his truest hope.

The older middle-class conservatism is still with us, and it is still production-oriented, but, having lost its Christian moorings, it has become rootless, and it has drifted into alien waters. Moreover, as a result of its humanism, it has picked up three ideas which are the essence of socialism in its every form. Increasingly, conservatives are ready to accept one or more of these premises, and, in all too many cases, all three. These three ideas are: *First*, a belief in the conflict of interests. Instead of holding that, basic to reality is God's sovereign government and law and an overriding, governing, and ultimate harmony of all interests, most conservatives accept dialectical, existential, pragmatic, or Hegelian philosophies with their principle of a conflict of interests. The theory of evolution makes conflict, and the struggle for survival, the basic aspect of biological reality. As a result, the philosophy of a conflict of interests, the economic form of which is the doctrine of class struggle, saturates both left and right. *Second*, both Marxists and many "conservatives" are agreed on the belief in a capitalist conspiracy behind all events, and some leftist periodicals are beginning to praise "conservative" literature on this subject. *Third*, Lenin called the acceptance of statist central banking and a paper currency "nine-tenths" of socialism; all too many "conservatives" are ready to demand both of these things as their hope. The "funny money" advocates are as "conservative" as Lenin! Philosophically and religiously, most conservatism is bankrupt and intellectually in contradiction to itself.

Morally, too, there is a bleak outlook for the "counter-counterculture." The amount of shoplifting today is an important factor in the price of many items, but great as this shoplifting is, the amount of theft by officials and employees in any business or shop is far greater. In many areas, theft adds more to the price of goods than do taxes. The most difficult part of any business today is very often the finding of honest employees. There is nothing modest about the stealing. One businessman recently stated that he discovered, in tracing only a portion of his losses by theft, that the daily profit to only a few employees was far greater than that of himself and his partner. Thefts, in fact, were endangering his survival, and his situation was no worse than that of many other businessmen, and

even better. The moral collapse apparent in all classes is very grave, and very deep.

Robert N. Winter-Berger, in *The Washington Pay-Off* (1972), gives a telling account, as a former lobbyist, of corruption in Washington, D.C. He is naive in believing that knowledge of these facts will arouse the country and save the nation. The corruption in Washington (and in capitols all over the world) is a corruption which reflects the life and morality of the people.

Knowledge of these facts has no long-term effect. Men are not saved by knowledge but by the grace of God. It is not knowledge of corruption, or of conspiracies, or of evil, which will revitalize man and society, but a knowledge of God's grace and His law-word. The "counter-counterculture" is a futile thing: it longs for the past when it should be building for the future. Man is in trouble, and the humanistic state is in trouble also. God is not in trouble, nor are we, if we stand in terms of His government and law-word. "Choose you this day whom ye will serve" (Josh. 24:15). Your life depends on it.

253

JUSTICE AND PURPOSE

Chalcedon Report No. 116, April 1975

As we have seen, institutions can lose their necessary place in society as they decline from their function and purpose. Knights and kings, once necessary to man, became irrelevant and were cast aside as impediments to society, and the church, once the key institution, became a peripheral one, membership in which was optional and whose social role was increasingly minor.

One such key era of transition, when institutions began to fail men, and men began to turn against them, was the 1400s. Long before the Reformation, men were feeling the shock of a world out of joint. The basic twin ideas of estate and calling governed men's minds, and, under different terms, they still do. It was assumed that men are sinners, but it was still held that, in a working society, men acted in some degree in conformity with their position and calling: an old man did not try to act like a youngster, a rich man made a point of being charitable, and a judge remembered that justice had to be his primary concern. Whatever their failings, men had to fulfil the requirements of their office or estate and calling.

Men did not suddenly become worse in the 1400s, any more than they have in the 1900s; evil tendencies were always there. What happened, rather, was the decline of strength of purpose and calling among the godly, so that society passed into ungodly hands by default. Thus, as men of the day looked at church, state, and law, they felt that the sense of estate and calling were gone, and that, without them, their clergy and rulers had turned into enemies. The *Reformatio Sigismundi* (ca. 1438) declared, "Obedience is dead. Justice is grievously abused. Nothing stands in its proper order. Therefore God has withdrawn His grace from us. We ignore His commandments." Johann Geiler in 1498 preached on the

consequences of the loss of estate and calling: "power-mad fools" now ruled everywhere. Indignant clergymen cried out that the church itself led in the violations of God's laws, and in 1481 in *Reynard the Fox*, it was charged, "Little crooks are hanged; Big crooks govern our lands and cities."

A common complaint was that the law had become an instrument of injustice. One pamphleteer of ca. 1500 wrote, "Adultery is licit, blasphemers are respected, the usurer has the law on his side, murderers sit in the judgment seat, and the plunderer of the church has become the very shepherd of the house of worship." As early as 1493 desperate German peasants began to plan revolt under the banner, "God's Justice Alone," a movement which led soon to disaster. More than a few had come to agree with a proverb of the day, "The devil is master of the world."

In spite of all this, it could well be argued that men were economically and materially better off than they had been a century or more earlier. The marks of progress were alive in one area after another. It was in 1492 that Columbus discovered America, and this was not an isolated event but part of a pattern of aggressive and inquiring advance, scientifically, geographically, and commercially. More people had full stomachs to complain on than people in earlier eras had.

It can be argued that it was the very rapidity of change and progress which left people restless and unhappy. The tempo of history had become too rapid, and the movement of things too complex for many, who yearned for the imagined simplicity and peace of the past.

All this is clearly true, and more, but it ignores a central fact: the marks of progress were there, but not of justice, nor of faith. Western man in 1500 found his society meaningless in terms of the requirements of faith and justice. To the movers of society, in increasing numbers, talk of God and justice had become irrelevant. It was a later age which affected dismay at Machiavelli (1469–1527) and his writings, not his own era. Machiavelli had simply expressed the philosophy of his century: man should be governed by, and should govern in terms of, *what is*, not what ought to be, in terms of pragmatism, not religion.

It was not until the twentieth century that man again affirmed openly the same philosophy, and the results, are again the same: the loss of estate and calling, the loss of meaning. Even though the man on the street is by and large a pragmatist himself, he hates, fears, and distrusts politicians as pragmatists, and he has contempt for a pragmatic clergy. The writers of our times are again full of self-pity for their plight, and, while themselves unjust, cry out for justice. Man cannot live long without justice; a world without justice soon quenches the spirit of man, or moves him to savage

rebellion. But, without the foundation of faith in the triune God, man's ideas of justice turn out only to be injustice. Isaiah declared (59:14–15), "And judgment is turned away backward, and justice standeth afar off: for truth is fallen in the streets, and equity cannot enter. Yea, truth faileth; and he that departeth from evil maketh himself a prey." Because the primacy of *truth*, absolute transcendental truth, had departed from society, justice and integrity were gone, and men were governed by and governed in terms of their evil.

Rome had world power in its hands when, in the person of Pilate, it pronounced truth irrelevant. "What is truth?" (John 18:38) said Pilate, finding truth irrelevant even as he faced it in Jesus Christ. Without truth, Rome decayed and finally collapsed. It was not really overthrown: it fell apart. Today, without truth, the modern world, with its pragmatism, is decaying from within. There can be no regeneration and reconstruction apart from Him who is the way, the truth, and the life (John 14:6).

254

NECESSARY ROLES

Chalcedon Report No. 115, March 1975

INSTITUTIONS, as they lose their function and purpose, forfeit also their lives, or, at least, their necessary role in society.

For example, the modern image of a knight or a lord is of a hand-kissing fashion plate and snob; for medieval man, he was a necessary source of law and order and a capable protector. However unjust and arbitrary he might be at times, he was still so valuable that his uses outweighed his faults. Medieval man knew that his lord had a poor life expectancy because of his military and protective function: as late as 1330–1479, about one in two of every English duke's sons died a violent death, and, as a class, their life expectancy was only 24 years.

Only later, when knights and lords lost their necessary function to medieval man, and began to work for their self-perpetuation and advancement in relation to the monarch, did they become irrelevant to those who once found them necessary to society. The peers of the realm became intolerable to European man, not because they had become worse in character, because it can be argued that their character commonly improved, but because they became irrelevant and therefore a burden.

The same point can be made with reference to monarchy, and also the church. For most of European history, the church was the most necessary institution, and, even in some eras of very real corruption, the church was not only tolerated but its reform urgently sought on all sides. As the institution most basic to the structuring and development of society, life without the church was to most men unthinkable. Thus, even as they damned the evils in the church, they sought with intensity its reform and renewal.

However, where the church made itself irrelevant, men gradually bypassed it, and, from a necessary institution, the church became an optional

one. Once as necessary as daily bread, it became a luxury or an extra item for those with a taste for it. Then and now, the church has done this to itself. In the medieval era, the concern of the church for self-perpetuation, the development of naturalistic theologies and philosophies, and the growth of mysticism and pietism, made the church progressively an irrelevant luxury. The Reformation and Counter-Reformation for a time restored relevancy, but the same old tendencies soon rendered the church irrelevant, an optional rather than a necessary institution.

In the modern era, the state and the state school have been the necessary institutions, and man's hopes have been closely tied to the state and the state school. The same irrelevance, however, is again setting in. The state school in Europe is mainly geared to preparation for civil service, in the United States, to the democratic life. In either case, it is less and less relevant to man's basic problems and needs. As a result, in the United States especially, statist education is dying, and independent Christian schools are growing very rapidly.

Indicative of the irrelevance of the state is the fact that, in the United States, as much money is spent for private policing and protective devices as for statist policing. The state has so hampered its police that one of the most basic functions of the state, protection from criminals, is passing into private hands.

Similarly, courts are increasingly geared to adjudicating equality rather than justice, and, as a result, the very central function of justice is less and less expected from the state.

As a result, both the right and the left are agreed that the state as it exists, the establishment, is the enemy. Both seek to capture the state and reform it, but, increasingly, most people expect less and less good from the state in any hands, and more and more evil and corruption. The modern humanistic state, once religiously revered, is increasingly distrusted and feared.

While the final break is not yet here, and the modern state is not yet regarded as irrelevant, there is a tendency in that direction. Associations, contracts, business arrangements, and prices are set with an eye to avoiding statist controls and intervention. Instead of utilizing the state, a growing segment of the population work to avoid the state, a most telling indicator of approaching irrelevance. Add to this the fact that, in the United States and elsewhere, recent elections saw a remarkably low percentage of people voting, and a trend towards irrelevance becomes clear. The state was once universally regarded as a necessary good; now it is seen by its very defenders as simply a necessary evil. The modern humanistic idea of the state is thus in transition to irrelevance.

This means, of course, very dangerous and trying years ahead. It means major dislocations and upheavals in what is already the most bloody and revolutionary of centuries. But it also means a time of opportunity without equal to present the whole counsel of God, and His law as the only tenable basis for men and nations. There is no other alternative to tyranny and anarchy. Humanistic man's order is coming to its necessary conclusion. Unless the Lord's people set forth His answers, the enemy will provide his alternative.

255

OUTLAW SOCIAL GOALS

Chalcedon Report No. 194, October 1981

One of the most important aspects of the modern age has been the triumph of what Dostoyevsky called underground man. Underground man is not necessarily a lower- or middle-class man: he can be very wealthy, or a member of the nobility and even royalty. What all such people have in common is their hostility to and resentment of the established social order. It is the passion of their life to see the faults and evils of that order, and to feel a great sympathy for all who are condemned by that society. Is the establishment hostile to criminals, homosexuals, abortion, the sexual revolution, or whatever else it may regard as lawless? Then the outlaw favors all those things. If, as with Henry Miller, who disliked homosexuality apparently and apologized for his disinterest, the outlaw is not in sympathy with one of the forbidden groups, he is unhappy about it.

The result of all of this is a powerful social force for a variety of causes, a force based on a common hostility to the existing order, whatever it is. (The Marxist countries have their own hostile, outlaw element.)

A telling example of this was Nancy Cunard, daughter of a titled English family. She loathed life; she was in rebellion all her life against her mother, Lady Cunard. Lady Cunard was a poor mother; she disliked motherhood and called it "a low thing—the lowest." Nancy set out to shame and disgrace her mother. For her mother's cautious adulteries, she substituted flagrant and open ones. She early had a hysterectomy, to give herself more "sexual freedom." Every cause which would be offensive to her mother's social set, Nancy Cunard espoused: she was friendly to the cause of lesbians and homosexuals, Anti-Francoism, communism, modern trends in the literary world, and more. She took a black lover to hurt her mother even more, and did her best to indict her mother

publicly, because her mother was ready to entertain wealthy rajahs, but not lesser men of another color. Nancy Cunard became a patron of the arts, a champion of liberal and radical causes, and also an alcoholic and a mental derelict (see Anne Chisholm, *Nancy Cunard*, 1979). By her own statement, she was at enmity with life, in fulfillment of Proverbs 8:36, "all they that hate me love death."

Much of the social impetus and action of the modern age has come out of this same outlaw temper. Persons at war with the establishment feel a kinship to every banned or disapproved cause, and they work for the overthrow of the existing order, even to their own destruction.

Having said this, we need to recognize a much more ugly fact. The social goals of the outlaw have at times overthrown existing customs, laws, and practices, some of which needed overthrowing. Social initiative in the modern age has too often belonged to underground man and his outlaw mentality. It has belonged to him by default, because the Christian church has either withdrawn from the world into a pietistic retreat into the inner world, or else has, with a guilty conscience and an awareness of its irrelevance, made common cause with the outlaws. In either case, it has been faithless to its Lord and the mandate of Scripture.

God's law-word is a plan of action for the remaking of all things in conformity to God's righteousness or justice. When John tells us that we are given "power to become the sons of God" (John 1:12), we must appreciate what these words meant in his day. In the religious mythology of the Roman Empire, the gods (Jupiter and others) often mated with human beings. The results were godlike men of superhuman powers, and with divine protection. These sons of gods were the earth's greatest heroes, the men of action, power, and dominion. It was the greatest compliment to be paid to any man, to compare him to the sons of gods, or god. Thus, when the centurion at the crucifixion said, literally, "Truly this man was Son of God" (Mark 15:39; there is no "the" in the original), he spoke out of the context of the Roman world and life view. Jesus, the miracle worker, was in his eyes so superhuman a man that He had to be in the Roman sense an offspring of some god.

Now, when John, inspired of God, declares that we are given by God's adoption of grace the power to be the sons of God, he meant even more than the Romans imagined by that phrase. We become God's dominion men, the people of power, called to occupy till He come (Luke 19:13). Instead of the ineffectual spirit of negation which marks all outlaw social goals, we have God's law-word as our plan for dominion. The most that Roman demigods could be was a conqueror, one to whom a triumphal arch was raised. Paul, however, tells us that in Jesus Christ "we are more

than conquerors" (Rom. 8:37); we are more than any Roman emperor could dream of being.

To return again to the outlaws. The 1960s saw the great American manifestation of a war against the establishment. Clearly, there was much that needed changing, but the rebellious youth was less interested in change that in negation and destruction. Their power to challenge and shake the status quo and the establishment was clearly very, very great, but the youth preferred hostility to constructive action, and their impetus was wasted. A goal of negation winds up being no goal at all. Their stands were a mixture of very conservative and very radical causes, not principles. For example, in World War I, constitutionalists rightly protested the use of drafted troops in foreign wars, since the U.S. Constitution allows only three uses for a militia (a drafted military force): 1) to suppress insurrection, 2) repel invasion, and 3) enforce the laws of the Union. The Wilson regime subverted the Constitution. The youth of the 60s had a great opportunity here, but they were not interested in it. At one university after another, I asked the question: Are you against the use of draftees in foreign wars as a constitutional principle? Would you oppose using them in both Vietnam and South Africa? Their lack of principles was quickly apparent.

A second area of failure was a lack of commitment. Milton Viorst, in his thoughtful view (with empathy) of the 60s, sees the end of the movement at Kent State. The issue then became this: were they ready to die for their practices? "On these terms, radicalism turned out to have a less committed following than had once been believed. Few were ready to die, and so the decade reached its end" (Milton Viorst, *Fire in the Streets* [New York, NY: Simon and Schuster, 1979], p. 543).

The disaster of our time is that Christians are about as uncommitted as the youth of the 60s. There are signs of a change. Men like Pastor Levi Whisner in Ohio, Dr. Lester Roloff in Texas, and Pastor E. Sileven in Nebraska have been ready to go to jail for their faith. (As I wrote this, Pastor Sileven was expecting arrest for reopening the Christian school in the Louisville church; instead, the church has been padlocked.) A growing resistance indicates that God is raising up dominion men who will not surrender Christ's domain to the enemy, and who are extending the frontiers of His Kingdom. The outlaw social goals are failures. Where the Lord's people move out in His name and power, the gates of hell cannot prevail (or, hold out) against them.

256

SNAKE OIL PEDDLERS

Chalcedon Report No. 384, July 1997

In bygone years, medicine shows featured snake oil as a cure-all for almost anything. The term has been since used for any nostrum presented as a remedy for a wide variety of ailments or problems.

Our world today has more snake oil remedies than the old-time medicine men would have dared to promote. Men of the Left and Right and in between have a wide spectrum of ideas as cure-alls for everything.

A snake oil remedy might be good for something, but it is a fraud if seen as a cure-all for almost anything. To illustrate, we have many who see our problems as soluble with a return to the U.S. Constitution. Now, the Constitution is a very modest document: it gives us no basic code of law but only a set of procedures to maintain representative government, i.e., terms of office, kinds of officers, sessions, etc., nothing more. To expect the Constitution to provide a national character is silly, and the same is true of common law. Morality and character come out of the faith and the life of a people, not out of documents. I recall vividly the establishment of the United Nations in San Francisco at the end of World War II. It was a depressing event because its founders saw it as the answer to the world's problems. The nations involved came from a variety of religious and moral backgrounds and had little in common.

It is precisely our lack of sound moral and religious grounding that makes snake oil remedies so popular on all fronts. At the same time, a fanatic and irrational hostility to one another is commonplace. Everyone tends to demonize other positions and to slander them.

Snake oil specialists insist on seeing the world as black and white. They see themselves as innocent victims of evil conspiracies. Silly trifles are viewed as monumental issues, and they are the heroic Galahads, pure, noble, and unselfish, who seek the Holy Grail successfully.

A key value of historic Christian orthodoxy is its insistence that true faith and worship require a continuing confession of sins. The Book of Common Prayer is to the point here:

> Almighty and most merciful Father; We have erred, and strayed from thy ways like lost sheep. We have followed too much the devices and desires of our own hearts. We have offended against thy holy laws. We have left undone those things which we ought to have done; and we have done those things which we ought not to have done; and there is no health in us. But thou, O Lord, have mercy upon us, miserable offenders. Spare thou those, O God, who confess their faults. Restore thou those who are penitent; according to thy promises declared unto mankind in Christ Jesus our Lord. And grant, O most merciful Father, for his sake; that we may hereafter live a godly, righteous, and sober life, to the glory of thy holy name. Amen.

Such a confession gives one humility, and this means not only with respect to what we are, but also with regard to what we do. On all sides, there are too many people in the messiah business, forgetting that there is only one true Messiah, and it is neither you nor I nor any other man! Humility, anyone?

257

THE NEW BARBARIANS

Chalcedon Report No. 378, January 1997

A barbarian can be defined as a man who has no history because he rejects history. The new barbarians are self-consciously so. They are products of the existentialism of Kierkegaard, Nietzsche, Sartre, and others. An existentialist lives in and for the moment only, without reference to the past, to family, religion, education, or consequences. He is a self-willed barbarian in that his is by choice, unlike the barbarians of centuries ago.

Everywhere now, statist education is the mass producer of barbarians, people who are ignorant of their past, who live rootless lives, and who feed their irresponsible goals with liquor and drugs. They live for the moment and its sensations.

The new barbarians do have their mythology. They believe that once happy natives populated the islands and continents, living happily guilt-free lives of sexual "freedom" until "corrupted" by Christianity. This myth has been repeatedly exploded, but it will not die because our new barbarians see it as their holy myth.

But when people deny their past, or cut their roots, they also deny their future, because life is a development, not a choice. We have today the insanity of people who insist that an evil establishment makes it impossible for them to realize their ambitions, when the truth is that they lack the application and endurance to achieve anything.

The new barbarians see themselves as victims, victims of racism, sexism, capitalism, and so on and on. Their mentality is one of entitlement. They assume that they should be heirs to their imagined goals because they want them.

One of the marks of ancient paganism, whether in ancient Vietnam or Greece, was the belief that not causality but an evil fate governs the world.

The Greek tragedies are examples of such thinking. For the "hero," the deck is always stacked against him. However innocent they are, the gods conspire to subject him to every kind of evil and to punish him relentlessly. Whether the Greek tragedies, or the Vietnamese tale of Thiess, we see in these documents an unrelenting destruction of the good man. Not causality but perversity marks life and events.

As we look at popular television and film fare today, we see too much of this same mindless perversity, causeless evil, and general meaninglessness. This is important for the new barbarians as well as the old. Why be good when life is evil? Why strive to be virtuous when life and whatever gods may be are radically perverse?

We see in the new barbarians the same basic belief in the ultimacy of perversity as was the case with the old. The Venerable Bede reported that an important aspect of the conversion of England to Christianity was the contrast between the bleakness of their paganism and the remarkable light of Christianity.

What is startling about the new barbarians is their preference for evil and darkness. They want to be terrified even in their entertainment! The love of evil has become a fascinating and enticing thing to many. This should not surprise us. It is closely related to the love of death. As Proverbs 8:36 tells us, "But he that sinneth against me wrongeth his own soul: all they that hate me love death." The love of death strongly marks the new barbarians. They are suicidal, and their future is a bleak one.

Christians who stand unequivocally in terms of Jesus Christ as Lord and Savior, and God's law as the way of sanctification, are the future of the world. They are the people of life, not death (John 14:6).

The new barbarians flirt constantly with death. Their "lifestyle" can better be called a death style. "Can a man take fire in his bosom, and his clothes not be burned?" (Prov. 6:27). The world around us is suicidal. We have a duty to build for life. We were not converted by the Lord to sit back, then, and wait for heaven, but to conquer a world for Him. Judgment awaits those who are called and will not serve.

258

WORLD WEARINESS

Chalcedon Report No. 355, February 1995

One of the recurring problems of man has been *boredom*, a weariness with life and the world, and a belief that almost everything is dull and uninteresting. Prior to the fall of Rome, a common complaint of many was *anomie*, a deadness within and an inability to enjoy life. In effect, the world had ended for such people, and life was barely livable.

At other times in history, the idea of a world weariness was remote and unreal. Life was exciting, and its problems were seen as surmountable. T. G. Masaryk, in *Modern Man and Religion* (1930), described this world weariness temper as a form of suicidism. Edmund W. Gosse cited the case of Thomas Gray, not alone in this disposition in eighteenth-century England. His melancholy was pervasive, and his disposition one of "deadly dullness." Like others of his day, such as Swift and Thomson, anything other than a mental depression was uncommon. Garth and Fenton "could not be persuaded to get out of bed" and "died of mere indolence" (Gosse, *Gray*, pp. 3–4). (For more on this, see my *Salvation and Godly Rule*, pp. 234–235.)

Many more examples can be cited, but it is enough to say that this has been a common problem in antiquity, over the centuries, and again now.

In the past few decades, I have been surprised and amazed to hear children whine and complain, saying, "I'm bored." Prior to the 1960s, I never heard such a statement. As a child, all other children I knew shared a common feeling that life was so wonderful that going to bed was our complaint. Boredom was something we knew nothing of. Now, it is a common complaint. Joy in living is gone. The signs of trouble became apparent in the amazing success after World War II of a book by Joshua L. Liebman, *Peace of Mind*. It enjoyed a long success as a paperback but gave no peace of mind to either its author or readers. Things have not

improved since then. In fact, this world weariness, coupled with a savage cynicism, is now common fare in novels and films, and television is a purveyor of it to countless millions.

Why this inner deadness? Why, when the material conditions of life are, in the Western world and elsewhere, better than ever before? In the past, people have often had very hard lives. The wives of some of the early settlers in the plains states, where neighbors were many, many miles away, would at times drive a horse and wagon to a railroad track some distance from home simply to see the faces of peoples at the windows of a passing train. Lonely, yes, but not bored, they were working under brutally hard conditions because they wanted a better life for themselves and their children.

Our culture is eroded by an inner deadness. Its origins are in the loss of faith and hope. People are ready to believe in nonsense because they do not believe in the triune God. They are numbed by nonsense, believing in the myths of overpopulation, global cooling and global warming, environmental disaster, and so on and on. The doomsayers are more credible to them than the sure Word of God.

Moreover, even those who profess Christian faith are too prone to allowing the world to load them with guilt for a multitude of sins, both imaginary and real. A people without a full and unwavering trust in the efficacious atonement made by Jesus Christ will carry a burden of guilt.

The ability to make men feel guilty is an instrument of power. Guilty men are made impotent by a sense of guilt. In every age, whether in church or state, evil leaders have controlled people by making them feel guilty.

But the strong Christian knows that he is a sinner *saved by grace*. God has already told him what He is through His Word, and by Christ's atonement, his sins are forgiven. He has no moral right to nurse guilt for forgiven sins, and anyone who encourages guilt feelings over forgiven sins is morally wrong.

Guilty men are impotent men. Their days are burdened with their sense of guilt, and their nights are haunted by dreams of unreason and guilt.

Christ gives us forgiveness through His atoning work, and newness of life. We are told by St. Paul, "Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature [or, creation]: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new" (2 Cor. 5:17). To drag around the corpse of our old nature, and to burden ourselves with his world weariness or his guilt, is strange behavior. As a new creation, we are the people of hope and victory.

259

ON SPONTANEITY

Chalcedon Report No. 395, June 1998

One of the highly prized characteristics of the modern era, especially since the rise of Romanticism, has been spontaneity. The idea has ancient roots; as it developed, it saw the writer, artist, or poet as a man governed by spontaneity and therefore a superior person, to some degree above the law and especially "middle-class virtues." Shelley, Byron, Blake, and others were intense Romantics dedicated to spontaneity.

For a Christian, this form of the concept is wrong, dangerous, and evil. The Bible defines unregenerate man as fallen and evil, and his spontaneous self-expression will be the same. The infant urinates and defecates at will; he requires feeding at his demand, and he expects the world to revolve around him. The process of civilization requires the inhibition of spontaneity. Mario Praz, in *The Romantic Agony*, showed clearly that the Romantic quest led into a world of perversity and evil. To stress spontaneity, as our modern culture does, is thus to undermine civilization. Not surprisingly, the student rebels of the 1960s urinated and defecated on public premises in their protests against civilization. Spontaneity is a modern fetish of a dangerous kind. We have seen too much spontaneity and too little civilization.

There is, however, a spontaneity of another kind. Unlike fallen man, Christian man develops another kind of spontaneity as he grows in faith. Psalm 119 gives us an account of this. The psalmist does not see God's law as a restraint but as a delight. He loves God's law, and his delight is in knowing and obeying it. It is a light and a lamp to him, and his joy. The spontaneity of the psalmist is not that of the natural man, but of a God-governed one.

At present, modern culture is dying because of the evil infection of its fallen spontaneity, which makes it the "culture" of sin and death. Henry

Van Til very aptly defined culture as religion externalized. Fallen man exalts his spontaneity because he glorifies his fall, his rebellion against God. In so doing, he exalts both sin and its consequence, death. Modern child rearing stresses spontaneity to the destruction of the young. Legislation exists to punish parents who discipline a child. To do so is seen as harming the child's spontaneity in development. Some sixty years ago, I read one educator's then "advanced" belief that if a child decided to throw an inkwell at the teacher, he should not be frustrated. Since then, I have heard adults and even elderly people justify misconduct because it represents freedom and spontaneity. "Christian" colleges stress courses in "creative writing" that glorify spontaneity. One English professor in a Christian college denounced a fine sonnet by an established writer because its form was "traditional" and not "spontaneous." Too many of our "Christian" colleges are really versions of humanistic and anti-Christian ones.

The question of spontaneity is a very obvious and simple one. The prevailing lack of comprehension as to its meaning gives clear evidence of the extent of our apostasy.

260

THE LUST FOR INSTANT GRATIFICATION

Chalcedon Report No. 229, August 1984

Forty years ago, as a missionary on an isolated Indian Reservation, I was quickly impressed by two things. *First*, the Indians had a high order of intelligence and ability; in aptitudes, they had a superior potential. *Second*, in performance, they were inferior, and, in fact, at the bottom level economically in the United States, and also in other areas ranked very low.

I noticed, too, that I never heard a crying Indian baby or child. Whatever sign the baby made of unhappiness led to immediate gratification. In talking with missionaries from a variety of foreign fields, among so-called primitives, a like pattern was presented in these places also, I was told.

I recognized soon that Biblical faith creates a radically different pattern of life. *First*, our lives must then be God-centered: "Man's chief end is to glorify God, and to enjoy Him forever," as the Shorter Catechism declares. This militates against self-gratification. *Second*, to affirm that the final and full reckoning for all men is beyond time and history in heaven and hell is to declare that our hunger for righteousness or justice, as well as for blessings and rewards, can never have its fullness in this world. It will, however, finally have perfect fulfillment. This postponement of gratification imposes a discipline upon all of us. It also creates a different frame of reference for child rearing.

What once marked the so-called primitive cultures now marks the Western world. We have seen the child-centered society create a student generation in revolt, demanding instant gratification in politics, economics, sex, and in drugs. That temper has also created an aborting society: no problems or inconvenience now, only sudden death for the disruptive unborn child.

In a generation which lusts for instant gratification, there are no solutions to problems, only executions. The demand for gratification now denies the validity of time and growth, and therefore of history. It copes with problems by revolution, by the mass murders of all whom it blames for the problems. The doctrine of heaven and hell affirms the reality of history and development.

The lust for instant gratification is a child of Rousseau and a father to revolution. It is ultimately an indictment of God for requiring man to suffer and to grow. More than two centuries ago, Thomas Boston, in *Human Nature in Its Fourfold State*, called attention to the foolish belief of some that they could "leap out of Delilah's lap into Abraham's bosom." The premise behind this, he held, was "a shelter to wickedness of heart and life."

The only real fulfillment of the lust for instant gratification is in personal and social suicide, because it is in its essence sin from start to finish.

261

THE BOND OF GUILT VERSUS THE BOND OF FAITH

Chalcedon Report No. 354, January 1995

One of the very difficult texts of Scripture is Proverbs 14:9 because the Hebrew text is so difficult. A very interesting translation appears in the Berkeley Version: "The bond [or, interpreter, intermediary] between foolish men is guilt, but between the upright it is a good will." The reference is to the differing reactions to a guilt offering by fools as against righteous men. We can say that sin unites the guilty in their hatred of the godly, whereas those who know atonement manifest good will.

There is a very important fact here. Over and over again, I have seen the coming together against a Christian of peoples who have only one thing in common, a hatred of the godly.

There are two aspects to this. *First*, the sinner hates God, and he hates the people of God. His immediate sympathies are with the wrongdoer. Before some people are aware of the facts of a matter, they choose sides with the guilty. More than once, jurors have told me of other jurors' refusal to convict the obviously guilty because "that could be me on trial," or, "that could be my son on trial." God is continually testing us by our allegiances. Whom we are loyal to reveals what we believe and what we are. More than once, I have seen people who despise one another draw together in a common hatred for a godly person.

But sometimes this hostility takes a different form. More than a few times, in fact, quite often, I have seen a man or a woman whose marital situation, an evil and horrifying one, becomes public through some episode become the object of much sympathy from many peoples. At other times, it may be someone exploited by others and cynically treated. The situations vary, but someone is seen to be an innocent victim. There is an outpouring of sympathy.

But, suddenly, this sympathy is replaced by venomous hatred. Why? Well, the victim does something to correct the evil, and the result is hatred.

In brief, the *second* aspect of this hatred is a resentment against those who overcome evil. *Defeated men hate victorious men.* They want everyone to remain a "martyr" to evil like themselves. The defeated insist that there is a virtue in defeat and surrender, and they demand that we share in their failure. Failed men resent successful men. Some of my bitterest enemies are persons who are failures. My efforts to help them did no good. They resented my successes.

Proverbs 14:9 goes on to say that the bond "between the upright is good will." They have a common life in the Lord, a common goal in serving Him, and a common hope in the future.

As I travel and speak here and there across the country, I come back with a strong sense of the richness of our Christian community. I know what a privilege it will be to share eternity with Christ's people. We have a rich community in the faith, and ours is indeed a goodly heritage. The bond, interpreter, or intermediary between us is One greater than ourselves. It is the Lord. Our relationship is thus greater than we are. As Christians, we have no *direct* relationship with anyone or anything. All our relationships are mediated through Jesus Christ, who made and remade us all. This gives a more solid and a permanent bond to our fellowship one with another.

262

THE SILENT MAJORITY AND DECAPITALIZATION

Chalcedon Report No. 60, August 1, 1970

Our concern this month is with two supposedly dissimilar subjects, the myth of the silent majority, and decapitalization; the two are actually very closely related.

The myth of the silent majority is not a new one; it has been widely used for almost two centuries by right, left, and center politicians. The basic feature of this myth is that all our problems are created by a small, evil minority, whereas the majority are good people and are simply misled. All the publicity and press is controlled or filled by news of this evil minority, and the good majority are silent. Who this evil minority is depends on the person propagating this myth: it can be a group of revolutionists, radical students, or a race; it can be capitalists or communists. It can be also a conservative organization, or a church.

The myth works all the better if some evidence exists that there are some communists, or nasty capitalists, or any other element which is clearly engaged in subversive activities, rioting, or lawless stands.

But the myth is anti-Christian to the core, in that it denies the fact of sin. According to the Bible, man's problem is sin, and, in every race, class, and group, sin is the central problem. Our problem today is that the vocal minorities and the silent majorities all over the world are rebellious against God and His laws, so that we need to pray, from our hearts, in the words of the general confession: "We have followed too much the devices and desires of our own hearts. We have offended against thy holy laws. We have left undone those things which we ought to have done; and we have done those things we ought not to have done; and there is no health in us." There is neither absolution nor grace in confessing other people's sins, and yet this is the essence of the myth of the silent majority.

Our bodies are always exposed to a variety of diseases; we fall prey to them when our general resistance is weak. Similarly, every body politic has always been exposed to a wide variety of subversions; it never succumbs to them as long as its general health remains. If the infection, the subversive minority, gains a foothold, it is because the body, the silent majority, is weak and unhealthy.

With this in mind, let us examine the class structure of society. Here, one of the most important studies is by Dr. Edward C. Banfield of Harvard, *The Un-heavenly City: The Nature and Future of Our Urban Crisis* (Boston, MA: Little, Brown, 1970). Banfield sees classes as an inescapable aspect of every society, and he divides society into four classes: upper class, middle class, working class, and lower class. The important thing about Banfield's work is the way class status is identified: "the individual's orientation toward the future will be regarded as a function of two factors: (1) ability to imagine a future, and (2) ability to discipline oneself to sacrifice present for future satisfaction" (p. 47). As Banfield observes, "It must again be strongly emphasized that this use of the term *class* is different from the ordinary one. As the term is used here, a person who is poor, unschooled, and of low status may be upper class; indeed he *is* upper class if he is psychologically capable of providing for a distant future" (pp. 47–48). Many men of great wealth are basically lower-class; they have no orientation to the future. The upper class has a personal and broadly social future orientation. The middle class is similar, but of more restricted vision. The working class's future orientation is limited to very personal factors; a comfortable home, a new car, or the like. The lower class has no future orientation; it does not plan. "Things happen *to* him, he does not *make* them happen" (p. 53). Outside the lower classes, when poverty occurs, it is "the result of external circumstances; death of the breadwinner, illness, involuntary unemployment, or the like." Even when severe, such poverty is not squalid or degrading, because standards are maintained. On the other hand, "Lower-class poverty, by contrast, is 'inwardly' caused (by psychological inability to provide for the future, and all that this inability implies)" (p. 126).

Let us now analyze the implications of this analysis of class structure. Very obviously, the old monarchies and nobilities fell because they had ceased to be a true upper class and had become lower class in mentality, geared only to the moment and its pleasures. The entrepreneurs who gained the ascendancy in the new society were thus not "middle class" but a true upper class, men with a future-oriented vision for themselves and society.

The United States was settled by men who, however humble their English origins, were upper class by virtue of their vision of the future. Many

of the immigrants who arrived were similarly upper class in vision: they left their native lands in terms of a future-oriented vision. The United States, usually cited as the great example of a middle-class culture, probably had, from the colonial period well through much of the nineteenth century, an upper-class orientation perhaps unequalled in history.

A Christian faith which is geared to victory and the establishment of a Christian law order is future-oriented. No other religion has been capable of creating a like progress, because none other has the future orientation of Biblical faith.

A future-oriented people capitalize a civilization; they work in terms of a goal. They forgo present pleasures for future gains. Their entire life and activity is geared to capitalization, and the family becomes a major instrument for capitalizing society.

Today, however, the mood of modern man can best be described as existentialist. It subscribes to a philosophy in which the "moment" is decisive. It is not future-oriented in that it does not plan, save, and act with the future in mind. The existentialist demands that future now. Some of the causes which concern student rebels may be valid, but their existentialist demand that the future arrive today makes them incapable of capitalizing and planning; they are instead capable only of decapitalizing a culture. Existentialism requires that a man act undetermined by standards from the past or plans for the future; the biology of the moment must determine man's acts.

Very briefly stated, existentialism is basically lower-class living converted into a philosophy. It is, moreover, the philosophy which governs church, state, school, and society today. The "silent majority," has perhaps never heard of existentialism, but it has been thoroughly bred into it by the American pragmatic tradition of the "public" or private schools.

Our basic problem today, all over the Western world, is that Western civilization no longer has a true upper class at the helm. Future-oriented men no longer dominate society, politically, economically, religiously, educationally, or in any other way. Instead, dreamers who are basically lower class, who believe that political power can convert today into tomorrow, are in charge. The result is the domination of our politics by an economic policy which is the essence of the lower-class mind and which leads to radical inflation. Spending today with no thought of tomorrow is a lower-class standard, and this is the essence of our modern scene. The vocal minority and the silent majority are both deeply in debt, and they create national economies which are deeply in debt. The growing anarchism of our social life is a product of this same lower-class mentality. This popular anarchism is a refusal to submit to law and discipline,

an unwillingness to accept any postponement of hopes and dreams. It is closely related to the tantrum of a child who demands that his will be done now. Every major social agency today, church, state, school, and home, is dedicated to creating this anarchistic, lower-class mentality.

The need thus is for a new upper class, a segment of society dedicated to a future orientation governed by Biblical faith. This means establishing new schools, free Christian schools, new churches, a new society in terms of our own readiness to live in terms of a broadly future-oriented purpose. The "public" or state schools are shaping a large new lower class, and the universities are finishing schools for this new lower class. The Christian schools are shaping a new upper and a new middle class.

The purpose of Chalcedon is to further the thinking and scholarship of a new upper class, of people geared to the future and dedicated to godly reconstruction.

To return to Banfield's book, Banfield cites two groups in American history which have had the strongest future orientation, the Puritans and the Jews, and both had it as long as their perspective was still colored with the belief that God summons man to work for "the realization of God's plan for the future" (p. 57). Biblical faith has been basic to American progress, to future orientation.

On the other hand, a characteristic of a decaying social order is that men decline and become more and more lower class in character. The women then provide whatever future orientation the society has. Among American Indians, too commonly, whatever stability a home has is provided by the woman. Among blacks, the woman again is usually the member of that family who does whatever planning and saving there is. In American society at large, the same fact is increasingly the reality; the woman is provident, plans for the future, is politically, economically, and religiously concerned, whereas the man has a rather lower-class absorption with the moment. A society in which men surrender leadership and lack a practical vision of the future is in serious decline.

Thus, the new barbarian is not merely in the slums; he is in the schools and universities, in business houses and factories, in the church, and in the home.

In their study of *The Lonely Crowd* (1953), Riesman, Glazer, and Denney showed that man today has become consumption-centered rather than production-centered. The group is now the source of morality and the framework of reference. The emphasis is thus more on morale than on morality. Man is other-directed rather than inner-directed, and the group has taken the place of God as the authority. What these men were describing was simply the development of the lower-class mind,

and we are beginning to see the shape of a world dominated by such a mentality. This lower-class mind has been some years in the making; it will take time and effort to shape a new mentality. It is necessary to work, therefore, while there is still time. The cause is recapitalization and reconstruction.

These are frustrating times for any man with a practical future-oriented character. Our world is geared to the present. When Lord Keynes was asked about the long-range consequences of his economic policy, he gave as his answer, "In the long run, we are all dead." This is a classic expression of a lower-class perspective. How then can a man plan for the future in a world that insists on living only for the present? How, when our politics, economics, religion, education, and all else expresses a lower-class worldview, can we assert again the priority of God's law and the future?

We begin by planning our own lives and assets in terms of the certainty of the collapse of any order that denies law and the future. We establish new institutions, churches, schools, and agencies. There are beginnings of new medical associations, standing in terms of principles. We need new associations of professional men to oppose the present link between humanism, the state, and the professions. There is a need for new insurance companies that will insure doctors who break with the AMA and stand in terms of Biblical morality.

From where you stand, what can you do? You can join the lower class, and eat, drink, and try to be merry, for tomorrow you may die. Or you can plan for yourself, assist others in their planning, and work to create again a future-oriented society. If a future-oriented, upper-class society is to be established, *you* will have to do it. The federal government *never* will. To look to politics for the answer is a mark of the inferior mind. It is time to upgrade ourselves, before the judgment of God flunks us out of history.

263

THE RELIGION OF THE CITY

Chalcedon Report No. 61, September 1, 1970

The *city* has a very important and central role in the history of civilization and human progress. We fail to appreciate this nowadays because the romantics have greatly obscured the role of the city. Some Christians condemn the city, because Cain built the first city (Gen. 4:17). They fail to reckon with the fact that Revelation gives as the goal of God's movement in history and beyond history, a city, the New Jerusalem, in which garden (or country) and city are combined.

The city represents a common life. From the earliest days, the function of the city has been to provide men with community, to bring like-minded men together in terms of a common purpose and life. The city served as an expanded family. Men felt "at home" in their city, because it represented a larger family and a closely knit sense of community.

This aspect of the city is now gone. Instead of a sense of belonging, the city gives a sense of isolation. The word *citizenship* comes from the word *city*; citizenship was originally membership in the common life and faith of a city. Instead of *citizenship*, modern man finds instead *alienation* in the city. The modern poet, Jack Fulbeck, in 1951, wrote of life in the city with words which eloquently expressed the fact that modern man is a stranger in the modern city:

> Not in the jungled city can I find
> That vagrant tribe my memory pursues.
> Here are fidelities I did not choose . . .
> I sleep with strangers, crying for my people.

Another important aspect of the city in history has been a common faith. In ancient times, a city always represented a common faith. To be a citizen meant to share in the same religious faith as all other members

of the city. The law of the city was derived from that religion, as well as all other standards. No one could share in the life of the city if he denied its faith. To do so made him an alien, if not an enemy. This is why it was necessary for the Christians to face persecution once they denied the city's faith, and this is why, when they conquered, the reorganized city or country had to have a religious unity. Every law and standard which binds man to man, in state, school, church, commerce, and society, is a product of religion. When that common faith is denied, the people of the city become strangers to one another.

Next, the city was man's greatest source of material protection. The city provided walls, a watch, and other men as a means of mutual defense against enemies. From ancient times, men have fled to the city in times of catastrophe as their best and surest defense. A dramatic example of this deeply-rooted feeling is the eruption of Mount Pelee, a long dormant volcano, in 1902. Some time passed after Mount Pelee became active again. Rivers of lava flowed daily down the mountain side; homes and business places were destroyed day after day; the cable to the outside world was cut by the shifting of the ocean bed. Finally, when Mount Pelee climaxed its eruptions on May 8, 1902, 8:02 a.m., 30,000 people died. The two survivors were a prisoner sentenced to death and a madman. Why didn't the people leave? As a matter of fact, people fled from farms and villages *into the city*, although conditions were no better in the city. Professor Roger Bordier, of the Lycee of St. Pierre, summed it up thus in describing the people's attitude: "They had a blind faith in the protection of the town." When the press assured them that all was well, the people were ready to believe the word of the newspaper against the sight of their eyes, because their faith in the protecting power of the city was so great. It had almost become instinctive with men to believe in the city as protection.

The twentieth century has rapidly changed that ancient role of the city. Air war has made the city the most vulnerable area, and the most practical place to attack. As a result, in World War II, Britain sent many children out of London into the country for their protection. The city, in modern warfare, had ceased to be the place of refuge and had become the most exposed arena of warfare.

But this was not all. The new religion of the city, humanism, cannot bind man to man, and, as a result, the city has become a house increasingly divided against itself. Race and class warfare have become a part of the life of the city. Warfare has thus been introduced into the heart of the metropolis. Urban sprawl is in part due to this fact. Men of the city flee from the city to its borders in order to escape the city's newer citizens and their warfare. Man now feels nowhere less protected than in the

city. More and more city dwellers arm themselves with guns, watchdogs, barred windows, and an alarm system. The city has become the battlefield of the twentieth century.

Pollution has also altered the life of the city. When, in the mid-thirties, this writer had a physical examination at the university, the examining doctor said, "You're from the country." Why? The dust of the farm showed on my lungs, whereas city dwellers had cleaner lungs. This, of course, is no longer true. Today, in many areas, it is the city dweller whose lungs show the effects of city life and smog.

The city is also being destroyed by modern money. The stability and growth of the city and its economic life depends on good money, hard money, gold and silver. Modern paper money inflation works harm in every area of life but especially to the city, because the life of the city is so intensely dependent upon the flow of sound money. When inflation finally debauches the paper currency (or radically adulterates the coinage), the city suffers a massive heart attack, because money is its lifeblood. Continuing inflation finally helped destroy urban life in the Roman Empire, so that, when the City of Rome fell, it was a shadow of its former self. It had ceased to be the place of imperial residence, and its population had declined greatly. When the end of an age witnesses also the breakdown of money, it means also the death of the city.

The problem of the city is not "congestion." This is its advantage. It puts us close to other men, to opportunities, advantages, and instruments of progress. Congestion can mean more stimulating ideas, more possibilities of progress, but *only* if some kind of community is maintained. A good religion unites people in terms of a common faith and purpose. Good money also unites people, in that it makes economic community and progress possible. Remove good religion and good money, and the situation moves toward anarchy. *The very advantages of the city become its disadvantages.*

The city is today being destroyed. But the city must be rebuilt if civilization is to continue. The city represents life in community; it represents industry and commerce, progress and achievement. There is no progress without community action, and, in the city, community action is giving way to statist action, and there is a growing paralysis of the spirit of enterprise.

The true life of the city is a continuous rebuilding in terms of a continuously improving perspective on the goals of godly society. It is a life of change because it has goals. Where men believe only in change, all things are equal, and therefore there is no value in change. Chinese philosophy very early accepted the ultimacy of chance and change, and as a result,

Chinese civilization stagnated. It constantly required outside conquerors to revivify it, before they too succumbed to its stagnation. Change should be a product of a faith which is discontented with the present and continually reshapes the present in terms of a future-oriented goal. Thus, Biblical religion rather than Chinese philosophy has produced progress and advance. It will do so again.

Briefly, a good city is an upper-class product. It is future-oriented, and, as such, it is a religious, cultural, and economic center. The city represents the free planning of many men of enterprise who chart the future in religion, economics, education, science, and other areas. When the city becomes lower-class-oriented, it also becomes entertainment-oriented. Not planning for the future but enjoying the moment becomes all-important. Instead of a concern for the future, people become concerned with the present, and with status. In a class-structured society, governed by an upper class, men are important to the degree that they command the future by their enterprise. In a lower-class society, the present is all-important; and caste prevails; lines are hardened in terms of birth and color, because, almost all being lower class, men feel threatened by one another. Instead of groupings in terms of degrees of superiority, men seek to maintain their groupings artificially. On some levels, it may mean a social register; on another level, it is neighborhood hostility to an outsider. Thus, the more "equal" men become because of their present-oriented, lower-class inferiority, the more they divide one from another. Then caste lines are resorted to in order to freeze society; socialistic legislation is used to freeze the economy; the church tightens its laws and works for unity in order to constrict and limit the power of truth; the schools tolerate everything except a Christian upper-class, future orientation. Then the city, the focal point of progress, becomes the focal point of decay and death.

But the power and the Word of God cannot be bound. God requires change because He requires progress, sanctification, development, and growth. His people are called to be "pilgrims and sojourners" here, because they are forbidden to absolutize the moment or the present, but must move forward as citizens of that city whose builder and maker is God. The present must be reshaped in terms of the future. The hymn writer, Henry F. Lyte (1847), in "Abide With Me," reflected a Greek, not a Christian perspective, when he wrote of "change and decay" as though they were two things of a kind. Decay must be coupled with death; in this world, change is essential to life and growth, basic to a future-oriented and Biblical faith. The lower-class mentality and its cities have a destiny of decay and death. Is that your choice?

264

AGRICULTURE

Chalcedon Report No. 63, November 1, 1970

We have been analyzing in our recent reports the meaning of upper-class culture. An upper class is the future-oriented element in a society; the term "upper class" does not mean members of a social register; such people are all too often lower-class and present-oriented today. An upper class is made up of those who have a realistic and future-oriented perspective; such people forego present pleasures in terms of future goals and plans. They plan and execute their affairs in terms of providing for a future for themselves and for society under God. An upper class provides the spiritual and material capitalization of a society; a lower class decapitalizes a culture. Because a lower class is present-oriented, it uses up inherited spiritual, intellectual, and economic capital without any realistic planning for tomorrow. The lower-class man dreams about the future; the upper-class man works to bring it into being.

The relationship of agriculture to class is a very important one. Farming and ranching require a certain amount of foresight in order to operate at least passably. Historically, the fact that the suppliers of food have been lower-class has meant that food has been a chronic problem in world history, and most people have lived at the bare subsistence level.

In England, under George III, an important change took place in agriculture. Britain, defeated by the American colonies and while apparently declining into insignificance as a power, actually began to revive and moved ahead to its greatest strength. The agricultural revolution was a basic aspect of this change. Agriculture had been a meager way of life for many people. Now lords and gentlemen saw their lands as fields of investment and as areas for skill and scientific management. The sandy soils of eastern England were made highly productive. Robert Bakewell defined a sheep as "a machine for turning grass into mutton." As White notes,

"Nothing less than aristocratic patronage and resources could have achieved the transformation of agricultural organization and technique within the intensely conservative society of rural England at that time." Even King George III began to patronize agricultural reform and to be proud of the title, "Farmer George" (R. J. White, *The Age of George III* [New York, NY: Walker, 1968], pp. 10–11).

Some have bewailed this agricultural revolution: it forced many poor tenants off the land, into the cities or to America. The half-starved tenants found work in the cities, and the Industrial Revolution had the manpower to move ahead. Those who bewail the conditions of the working class then forget that it was a major step upward for them, economically.

This continuing agricultural revolution has taken a major step forward in recent years, especially since World War I. It is a fallacy of the lower-class mind to see things in terms of numbers, by counting noses. We are told by such people that half the labor force was on the farm in 1900; as recently as 1945, one-third of the U.S. population was on the farm; now it is less than 10 percent, and, especially with the move of the Southern black into cities, it is dropping even lower. But does this mean the decline of agriculture in importance to the economy? In reality, fewer men are producing more food than ever before. According to Drucker, "The main engine of economic growth in the developed countries during the last twenty years has been agriculture. In all these countries (excepting only Russia and her European satellites), productivity on the farm has been increasing faster than in the manufacturing industries" (Peter F. Drucker, *The Age of Discontinuity* [New York, NY: Harper & Row, 1969], p. 5). The steel industry is second to agriculture "as a moving force behind our recent economic expansion," and steel faces problems because of obsolete methods. Railroads, electronics, plastics, and other areas of industry all lag behind agriculture, where a smaller labor force has steadily increased its productivity. The American expansion, as well as the Japanese, has been possible because agricultural progress has supplied the country both with food and a released labor force to make industrial growth possible. Japan, with 60 percent of its population in farming at the end of World War II, now has barely 20 percent on the farm. Drucker feels that "a period of very fast increase in farm productivity for the developed countries may be just ahead" (p. 14). Agriculture has become in these countries "the most technologically advanced and the most industrialized of basic industries" (p. 111).

The results of this development are important. In America, it has meant that less and less of a man's income has had to go for food, since food has been produced more cheaply. In lower-class cultures, a major

portion of a man's income has to go for enough food to survive. Today, the percentage of income spent for food is at an all-time low in the United States, but with a larger consumption per person. This releases more money for other expenditures, or for capitalization. As the *Farm Journal* has observed, "Our amazing farm productivity is a chief reason for our national affluence. Americans can spend 86 cents out of every dollar of personal income for things other than food. In India where they have only 40 cents left per dollar after buying food, the economy can't get off its back. Russia has a third of her work force tied up producing food — she can marshal resources to go to the moon, but it's a disappointing trip to the Russian food store." Moreover, "Farmers are industry's best customer, using each year 1/2 as much steel as the automobile industry; enough rubber to put tires on 85 percent of the new cars; and more petroleum than any other industry. Farming employs more people than any other industry and is the biggest customer for the products of the nation's workers. In 1970, farmers' production expenditures will reach $40 billion — with another $32 billion of family spending" *(Farm Journal*, October 1970, p. 62). One reason why many businessmen who try to enter into agriculture lose heavily is because they are not accustomed to operating as carefully and narrowly as farmers and ranchers.

What does all this mean? It means that, while the urban culture of the cities of the Western world has declined from its status as the vanguard of civilization and become steadily an area of lower-class culture, the countryside, once a lower-class area, has become progressively middle- and upper-class in character. There is a significant trend of once-great industrial families to the land, to successfully operating farms and ranches. The fact that agriculture has had proportionately fewer federal controls has stimulated its growth as an area of freedom and enterprise.

This does not mean that the future of agriculture is assured. The California grape strike and the lettuce strike represent an important indicator. California wages are higher than those of other states. The strikers have asked for much more per hour than grape pickers of any calibre regularly make. The key lies elsewhere. The productivity of California has made it America's chief supplier of foods; in some products, 90 to 100 percent comes from California; in very many, over 50 percent of the nation's supply is California grown. Control of California farm labor, and the ability to strike and to stop the flow of that produce to market, could, in a general strike, produce food rationing across the United States in a fairly short time.

There is much more that can be said. The 1970 corn blight is straw in the wind. Abuse of the soil and its microorganisms, plus hybrid plants

(more productive sometimes but also more vulnerable), has been a part of a growing present-oriented perspective which mines the soil rather than developing it. Oil companies and their subsidiaries are now major advertisers in farm periodicals (in one case, an owner apparently) and their products have been heavily promoted. Short-term gains have been real; long-term consequences are probably equally real and a potential threat.

Rural conservatism has also eroded. The county and small-town church long remained Christian when its city branches were captured. Today, the dry rot of unbelief has infected the countryside.

The man firmly grounded in Scripture is future-oriented; he is required by God to be responsible in all things, redeeming the very time of day as a religious duty. For many generations, Puritan children and many Americans were brought up on Isaac Watts' *Divine and Moral Songs for Children*. The first, third, and fourth stanzas of one of the best known read:

> How doth the little busy bee
> Improve each shining hour,
> And gather honey all the day
> From every opening flower!
>
> In works of labor or of skill
> I would be busy too;
> For Satan finds some mischief still
> For idle hands to do.
>
> In books, or work, or healthful play,
> Let my first years be past;
> That I may give for every day
> Some good account at last.

I can recall, while a student at the University of California at Berkeley, hearing a degenerate professor of English read this poem as a prize joke, and the large class roared with laughter. A new generation, a lower class, had been born and was being bred to despise work, thrift, and responsibility.

We should not be surprised at what has happened in recent years. Each area of the upper-class mentality is being overwhelmed and destroyed by the lower class, of which the modern university is a major representative.

A recent murder of an entire family had as its excuse only one fact: they were rich, and the murderer hated them for it. (The murdered man had begun in very poor circumstances, unlike the murderer.) The lower-class mentality is given to envy; its action is basically twofold, to spend and to destroy. A lower-class culture is thus easily led into revolution as its solution to problems.

Our need today is for a new upper class. It cannot be created without a thorough and systematically Biblical faith. Christian Reconstruction begins with man, regenerated in Christ, and then proceeds to reordering the world.

265

SEX AND CULTURE

Chalcedon Report No. 70, June 1, 1971

EARLY in this century, an English scholar began to study the relationship between sexual regulations and cultural behavior. He was skeptical of the idea that there is a direct consequence, that chastity and monogamy produce a high culture and a superior class. As J. D. Unwin wrote, "Frankly, I hoped to dispel the idea, but I had not proceeded far before I was forced to conclude that the brave hypothesis probably contained an awkward and perplexing truth." Unwin was compelled by the data to revise his personal philosophy.

It is not our purpose to go into a detailed analysis of Unwin's study of *Sex and Culture* (Oxford Press, 1934). Very briefly, a society which permits its youth to be "sexually free" produces a low culture; where prenuptial and postnuptial chastity are absent, the culture is on an exceedingly primitive level and manifests little intelligence, production, or foresight. As the level of sexual regulations increase towards a Biblical standard (although Unwin would not use that term), the level of culture improves. Where virginity before marriage and chastity after marriage becomes the standard, a high level of intelligence, culture, science, and religion appears. Unwin's conclusions were based on a study of every society for which sufficient data is available. The cultures studied included ancient civilizations as well as the American Indian tribes, African, South American, and Asiatic tribes and societies. Unwin also held that, "The amount of energy that uncivilized people could display is the same as that of any other society; the amount they do display depends on the degree in which they have satisfied the necessary conditions." Moreover, "In human records there is no case of an absolutely monogamous society failing to display great energy." In fact, Unwin found, "The relation between compulsory continence and cultural behavior . . . exact enough to

be expressed by means of mathematical symbols." In three generations, by sexual license, an upper class can reduce itself to the lowest class level. Moreover, "if I am right in concluding that these potential powers can only be displayed under conditions of compulsory continence, such conditions cannot be unnatural."

Writing again in 1935, in a summary address on his work, Unwin, in *Sexual Regulations and Cultural Behavior*, saw a growing rebellion against the morality which alone produces an upper-class culture. There was a possibility, if men retained their moral standards, of great cultural advance and a major scientific era. He added, however, "Soon there will be born into a new tradition a new generation that will probably submit to almost any external conditions so long as it is permitted to eat, drink, dance, copulate, and sleep as it desires. I hold no brief for social energy, which may or may not be desirable, but there can be no doubt that a study of human records reveals the fact that a group in such a psychological condition has never displayed a great energy, and that such ambitions are typical of societies in a state of little or no energy." Unwin's predictions were certainly to the point: we now have, indeed, a generation that does "submit to almost any external conditions" of filth and disorder as long as it is free "to eat, drink, copulate, and sleep as it desires."

The cultural changes Unwin describes were not the product of any rational decisions. No lower-class culture suddenly decided to raise its status and then proceeded rationally to implement that change. Instead, the changes were products of religious conversion, a new religious faith, which introduced a new motivation and force into society.

Unwin saw cultural energy as a direct product of moral standards and laws. It must be added that moral law is in turn a direct product of religion. As George Washington saw so clearly in his Farewell Address of 1796, every moral order presupposes a theological order. He wrote, "Let it simply be asked, Where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths, which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition, that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect, that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle." To deny this, Washington felt, was an attempt "to shake the foundations of the fabric," which he could not look upon with indifference.

Since Washington was making a political address, his argument was practical rather than philosophical, but it was still true; the basic faith of a culture determines its morality and character.

C. G. Jung, in the epilogue to *Modern Man in Search of a Soul,* wrote that, "It is becoming more and more obvious that it is not starvation, not microbes, not cancer, but man himself who is mankind's greatest danger, because he has no adequate protection against psychic epidemics, which are infinitely more devastating in their effect than the greatest natural catastrophes." The "psychic epidemic" of our time is a lower-class mentality, a rejection of work and discipline, and above all, a rejection of the sovereignty of God.

In the 1920s, José Ortega y Gasset foresaw the rise of this new mentality, and, in 1930, set forth his earlier thesis in *The Revolt of the Masses*. He held that "the type of man dominant today is a primitive one, a *Naturmensch* rising up in the midst of a civilized world. The world is a civilized one, its inhabitant is not: he does not see the civilization of the world around him, but he uses it as if it were a natural force. The new man wants his motor-car, and enjoys it, but he believes that it is the spontaneous fruit of an Edenic tree. In the depths of his soul he is unaware of the artificial, almost incredible, character of civilization, and does not extend his enthusiasm for the instruments to the principle which made them possible." The scientific specialist of our day is also a barbarian: "He also believes that civilization is *there* in just the same way as the earth's crust and the forest primeval." As a result of this abandonment of "principle," Ortega said that "Europe has been left without a moral code." Of the talk, then, of a "new morality," Ortega said, "When people talk of the 'new morality' they are merely committing a new immorality and looking for a way of introducing contraband goods."

Ortega, Unwin, and others have seen the issue, but they have not looked to the answer. The morality or immorality of our day is a lower-class phenomenon; it is a present-oriented perspective which considers the future irrelevant and the present all-important. John Lukacs, in *The Passing of the Modern Age*, has made an important point with respect to property. Ownership, or property, has lost its importance in modern society, and consumption has replaced ownership as a goal, but consumption itself has failed to satisfy modern man. We can add that consumption is a lower-class goal; it is present-oriented entirely, whereas ownership or property is a future-oriented and upper- and middle-class goal; it represents work, planning, and capitalization.

This lower-class morality cannot be replaced by a lower-class religion. Even at its best, the "Jesus movement" is almost entirely lower class in nature because it substitutes emotionalism and enthusiasm for discipline and work. A man's religion can be defined as what he has when he is tired, discouraged, and disappointed; when hope and success are stripped

from him, then his spiritual capital, or lack of it, is in evidence.

The average so-called Christian today has little or no spiritual capital when his happy-happy meetings, his lovely choirs, his beautiful churches, and his robed clergy are taken away from him. Not surprisingly, in his religion he is consumption-oriented and lower-class. Just as in the realm of politics, he wants the state to provide him with cradle-to-grave security, so in the realm of the church he wants similar provision. He wants to remain a babe in Christ, endlessly fed pious pap and given a religion, whether "evangelical" or "liberal," which satisfies his appetites as a consumer. The fallacy of socialism is that it assumes that society's problem is essentially one of distribution and consumption; it fails to recognize the priority of production, and, as a result, every socialist society is beset by problems it cannot solve. The *future* has a habit of becoming *today*, and the consumption-oriented man eats up his inheritance from the past and sells out his future in order to "enjoy, enjoy," today.

Thus, much more than a religious revival is needed; what is required is a serious application of fundamental faith to every area of life; thought, work, and discipline are required, and the patient work of reconstruction. The smorgasbord principle is good eating at times, but, applied to religion, is false. Man is not sovereign: he cannot pick and choose what he wants to use in religion. God is absolute Lord and Sovereign, and man must obey Him whether it pleases man or not, and He must obey in everything God requires of him. Because of this smorgasbord principle in religion, a systematic theology is denied today because it requires assent to the sovereign God.

A good way to see what modern thought means is to listen to black leaders: they echo, simply, directly, and bluntly, the basic faith and morality of modern man. John R. Coyne, Jr., in *The Kumquat Statement* (1970), cites a black student who was involved in serious acts of violence at San Francisco State University as saying, "I've been denied so long that anything I take is right." This is a familiar and old refrain, heard by many pastors and counsellors as they deal with men and women seeking self-justification. The most affluent people of all history reek with self-pity. This cancer of self-pity is today apparent in the blacks, the hippies, parents and children, and in virtually all peoples in our society.

Not surprisingly, with a lower-class generation, we are in difficult times, and many hold it against God that all is not sweetness and light. They want to walk by sight and have all problems eliminated in advance. Spurgeon wisely observed, "If we cannot believe God when our circumstances appear to be against us we do not believe Him at all. We trust a thief as far as we see him; shall we dare to treat our God in that fashion?"

Reconstruction must begin with our faith; it must continue into our institutions, Christian schools, homes, churches, and vocations.

In 1940, Unwin, in *Hopousia: or, the Sexual and Economic Foundations of a New Society*, saw less hope for civilization than in 1934. Writing in Hitler's and Stalin's day, he saw America as "the most degenerate of the white nations." While few Americans would agree with that judgment, his comment on the world scene is of interest: "The power of thought has diminished. The Press dictates, suggests, insinuates. A collection of highly selected data masquerades as news, giving a false impression of events. There is little real mental activity although there is a great deal of talk. The mob falls a ready prey to the oratory of demagogues who, in their will to power, create dissension in order to secure their ends. Numbers, that is quantitative criteria, rule everywhere; and since the rule by numbers always implies a rule by force, force is the weapon the governments use more and more. In international relations the rule of force is covered by words of idealism, but it is there." Unwin's only answer was a plea for a return to moral discipline, a futile plea to men without faith and without moral principles. Unwin's plea was pragmatic, not principled.

Because reconstruction must be principled, it must begin with God as man's priority: "And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might" (Deut. 6:5; Luke 10:27). It must then apply God's priorities to man's life and world, to his institutions and his practices. The goal Unwin desired comes not by pragmatic calculation but by moral discipline and religious force.

266

PRESENT ORIENTATION

Chalcedon Report No. 68, April 2, 1971

A lower-class society is one in which the spirit and will of the lower class predominates. Practically, this means that the society becomes present-oriented and is governed by envy and class hatred. The lower-class mind does not respond to excellence with respect or a desire to excel. Its reaction instead is to hate and to tear down, to level all things to its own status instead of seeking its own advancement by work and emulation. Instead of having working goals, either independent or imitative, the lower-class mind responds with envy and hatred. Whenever a society sees the rise to power of a lower class, it also sees the growth of class conflict and social warfare.

When this happens, it is also a part of a parallel development on the upper levels of society, the breakdown of the upper classes. Power is turned into license, and responsibility is abdicated. The monarchies of old Europe, for example, had become thoroughly lower class; they were pleasure- and present-oriented, contemptuous of moral responsibility, exploitive of the poor, and heedless of the future. Instead of respect, they excited envy. The wealthy and the poor increasingly had a common social goal, to "live it up," and to exploit the opportunities of the present without regard for the future. The poor envied the nobility, because they shared a common present-oriented goal.

Society was given a new leadership by the rise of a class of merchantmen, entrepreneurs, who were future-oriented, and social renewal and progress followed. Now, however, the decay of that class is again creating a growing mood of envy and class conflict. The basic answer to social problems is again the revolutionary and lower-class alternative of levelling. But where class conflict begins to govern, progress wanes proportionately.

Some years ago, as a student, I recall hearing the passionate defense of his country by a foreign student. Someone had questioned the native ability of his people by calling attention to their lack of progress. His answer was in essence this: "We have a large number of brilliant men, many educated in America, but we do not have your religious situation nor your freedom. Certainly, we do not have your moral stature, so that credit and honesty in transactions is impossible. Policing is largely a personal matter; there is so much lawlessness, that a fair share of our income goes for bribery and protection. Survival and self-protection take up so much of our time and income, that too little is left for capitalizing society. We have the intelligence and resources, but we do not have the background of America's Puritan self-discipline, and so our capital and energies are dissipated and progress is difficult." He could have added that most of their energy also went into class warfare.

Consider the plight of North Ireland and of England today. Religious warfare in the one and class war in the other are destroying these countries. Industry is leaving; superior men are beginning to migrate elsewhere, and social energy goes into conflict rather than into progress. Where the commitment to social conflict is deep or total, peace and progress become difficult or impossible.

In the Soviet Union, class warfare is a matter of religious and philosophical principle. The ills of society are always ascribed to a hostile class. This means that there is a built-in inability to cope with problems, because the principle of responsibility is denied in favor of environmentalism. An evil, hostile class is always responsible. The bourgeois mentality is credited with pervasive powers and conspiratorial activities against the regime, and therefore unrelenting warfare is the answer. This warfare continues from year to year, but the inner problems are not resolved. Instead, they are aggravated.

In Western nations, class conflict is deepening. It is the lower-class answer to problems. Instead of developing spiritual, moral, economic, and social capital, the people increasingly want to blame their ills on a clique, class, or cabal. Such groups exist, and a lower-class society makes their spectacular rise to power possible. In a class-warfare society, conspiracies and revolutionary disturbances proliferate, because every faction begins to see them as both the answer and the threat.

A society which assumes that class conflict is a natural and permanent state of affairs is doomed. It has lost the capacity to be a society or a community. Instead, it is now a battlefield in which all peoples are the potential victims. To demand class warfare is to commit social suicide.

There can only be a *society* where there is a harmony of interests. The

word *society* in Old English meant what we now call *communion*. The Apostles' Creed before the Norman Conquest, read, instead of the modern "I believe . . . in the communion of saints," "And of the saintes the societie." Without either the saints (the believers) or the communion, there is no society.

The modern liberal is well aware of the need for communion; his goal is a society living in peace. His answer, however, is to ignore the fact of sin and conflict, and to insist on peace by enforced legislation. By neglecting sin, he neglects the roots of conflict, and by trying to legislate peace, he aggravates the conflict. As a result, the nation drifts deeper into class conflict.

Let us consider one aspect of that conflict, the racial situation. The attempts to force integration and to force segregation by law are very old. With Assyria, forcible integration was a policy of state. All these attempts failed when the social conditions militated against them. If two peoples were relatively equal and religiously congenial, integration quickly followed, despite all legal obstacles. Where the differences were marked, neither opportunity nor law was able to bridge the gap. Neither legalized integration nor segregation accomplish anything more than to aggravate a situation. To introduce the state into an area of personal, religious, and moral decision is to abdicate the harmony of classes for a statist imposition. If a person or if a people are inferior, nothing can compel their rise; if they have a potential, why prevent their development? Where there are religious and social reasons against mixed marriages, nothing can further such marriages as long as the faith and the society are strong. If these factors are invalid or disappear through disbelief, nothing can prevent integration in the short or long run. The energy expended on both sides to force by law what is an act of principle and based on a way of life is a waste of energy. To rebuild or to build a society, develop your faith. The modern answers are statist. The state takes over, for example, education, and then the factions struggle to control the state in order to impose their concepts by force. The result is class warfare. Where people are free to establish their own schools and do so, the decision is then their own. In statism, men try to decide for others, rather than for themselves.

A harmony of interests is not the same as an identity of interests. The goal of class warfare is to create an identity of interests, to level society to one status and a common interest. Such a society is of necessity totalitarian and equalitarian. A harmony of interests assumes a diversity of interests. This the totalitarian mind opposes. I recall, not too many years ago, at a symphony concert, listening to the many foreign tongues spoken in the lobby. A fair percentage of the music lovers were of foreign backgrounds.

The resentful reaction of one person was, "They're in America. Why don't they speak English?" Of such stupidity is class warfare begotten. Is there an obligation to hate their homeland in loving their new country? Must we have an identity of interests in order to be unified as a people? An identity of interests is not compatible with freedom, nor is it possible. A harmony of interests allows for the free, independent, parallel and unified development of classes and races according to their progress and achievement.

The *consequences* of a harmony of interests are social, economic, and political. Its *roots* are religious. Only when men share a common faith in the sovereign and almighty God and His government can they recognize a common law and destiny. Amos rightly asked, "Can two walk together, except they be agreed?" (Amos 3:3). One of the first steps towards a harmony of interests is for man to recognize that the government of all things is not upon his shoulders, but the Lord's (Isa. 9:6). This means that he cannot absolutize his thinking nor project his own will against history. God always remains the Lord. God having made all men, all races and all classes, has His purpose and His judgment in mind for all. Our duty is to fulfil our calling in our place and to uphold God's law order in all things. The force of God's law must be maintained against all men, including ourselves. Our relationship towards other classes and other races cannot be essentially one of warfare, integration, or segregation, but basically one of a) requiring all to obey God's sovereign law, and b) proclaiming the saving power of the gospel to all men. Neither church nor state can require more than that legitimately. In class and race warfare, the warfare is first of all against God and His law order. Victory in warfare can impose a truce, a cessation of formal warfare; it cannot bring in either peace or a solution. Nothing was settled by World War I, except to lay the foundations for World War II, which in turn has even deadlier consequences in store for the world. The drift is steadily into a more radical conflict and a greater loss of freedom.

We must therefore rebuild the foundations. We cannot assume, with the foolish liberals, that the response to their peacemaking is peace. Their concept of peace is not God's peace, and it does not have His blessing. Neither can we assume, with many foolish conservatives, that the answer is in making war victoriously. To win a war no more eliminates our moral crisis than losing a war; it only eliminates an enemy outside, when the greatest enemy is within. Short-term gains cannot eradicate major and abiding losses. A dying man who becomes conscious and talks briefly has not thereby escaped death. Our real sickness is moral and spiritual, and our real solution rests in a religious renewal, in personal and societal regeneration.

Envy, hatred, and warfare offer easy and ready answers to the lower-class mind, but the results are short-term answers and long-term disasters. For the upper-class mind, the answer is not warfare but reconstruction in terms of Him who said, "Behold, I make all things new" (Rev. 21:5).

The grace of God can keep us from envy and hatred. His grace can make us proud and content with the gifts and calling which is our inheritance from Him. We are what we are by the grace of God, and our being is His gift to us. "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" (Matt. 22:37–39) has four conditions, all of which are inseparably related. First, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind." Second, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor," and, third, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor *as thyself*" meaning that you shall love yourself and be content and happy with what God made you to be. If a man hates God, he will also then hate himself and his neighbor, whatever his class or color. If a man loves himself, he will respect and develop his own abilities instead of envying another man his abilities. Fourth, "love is the fulfilling of the law" (Rom. 13:10), so that to love God and our neighbor means to obey God's law and to work "no ill" to our neighbor. Deep and radical divisions exist in our world today; they will not disappear either by talk of peace or acts of war. The only remedy is the sovereign grace of God and man's response of love and obedience to God's law.

Envy is a form of hatred, and our world talks at length, and hypocritically, of love while it fosters and cultivates hatred.

Peace and love are byproducts of our relationship with God; when these are made primary and are divorced from God, then they become a dangerous mask for a multitude of evils. We cannot have the gifts of God without the Giver. The lower-class mind is very different from a working-class mind. The lower-class mind has appeared in kings and bishops, rich men and poor men, and it is essentially an existentialist mentality, living for the present and governed by the biology of man's moment rather than by the Word of God. The peace and the harmony of interests the lower-class mind aims at is a graveyard peace and harmony.

Before it is too late, we must examine our institutions and ourselves. Have we been contributing to class conflict and warfare, or are we working for a harmony of interests?

DRIFTING CLASSES

Chalcedon Report No. 64, December 1970

When Louis XIV came to the throne, he felt that the monarchy was threatened by France's powerful nobility. One of his central policies thus was to undercut the power of the nobility. He attached the nobility to his court and gave them a great variety of functions which seemed to confer favors on them. As Dr. Wolf remarks, "It became important who 'gave the King his shirt,' who 'held his candle at night,' the service of his table; even the bringing of the 'pierced chair' took on solemn overtones." What Louis did was to separate "the reality and the *mystique* of power and position," so that finally, in the next century, "the nobility had become of a parasitical class without meaning to the real life of the nation" (John B. Wolf, *Louis XIV* [New York, NY: W. W. Norton, 1968], pp. 270–271). From powerful lords who managed vast estates and helped govern France, the nobility was reduced to social butterflies who gambled, danced, and drifted from one sexual escapade into another. What Louis XIV had done was to destroy the nobility as an upper class and reduce them to a lower-class mentality. From being a future-oriented group of leaders whose planning might run counter to the wishes of the crown, the nobility was reduced to a group of ineffectual, present-oriented incompetents who were a hindrance to the life of the nation.

This process was furthered by two things: *first*, the association of work with something beneath the dignity of a gentleman, and, *second*, the secularization of society.

To consider the first, a gentlemen came to mean a man who did not work but lived off an estate. This meant, practically, that he lived off the past accomplishments and work of his family, and the present work of underlings. This meant that a gentleman was clearly lower class, that is, not future-oriented; rather, he was intensely present-oriented, sensitive to

matters of dress, appearance, and impressions made on others. The gentleman lived for the moment, and to be heedless of the future was made into a virtue. As early as in the days of Louis XIV, fortunes were gambled away carelessly at the tables of Versailles. Earlier, in the Renaissance, Castiglione had set forth the standard for the courtier, a relativistic standard. The important thing was not a faith, but an impression made on others, not meaning, but the impact of selling one's self, salesmanship on a courtly level. In the eighteenth century, the expression of this faith was the "dandy," and in the twentieth century, it is the existentialist who has formulated the same faith into a philosophy. Thus the French novelist Alain Robbe-Grillet "feels that nothing is so fatal to literature as a concern with 'saying something.'" According to Robbe-Grillet, "The world is neither significant nor absurd. It *is* — quite simply" (*Time*, December 2, 1966, p. 419).

This ties in with the second aspect, the secularization of society by humanism. If God is denied, then man lives in a world without meaning, a world without law, without standards, and without purpose and direction. The future offers no grand design unfolded by God. The culmination of humanism is relativism: since every man is his own god and law, then no one law is truth, since every man is his own private truth and law. The only thing that matters is the moment, since *existence* is all that man has in a world without meaning. In a relativistic world, where absolute standards and law are denied, men look at the world through out-of-focus binoculars; everything is blurred or unseeable. Relativism destroys vision and standards; it produces a present-oriented, lower-class mind.

A lower-class society becomes a *political society*. Because the majority of men have become lower-class and are incompetent in the basic task of social planning, the state is given the functions of individuals, and state planning replaces individual and social planning. Where people are unwilling or incapable of planning for the future, this task is handed over to the state. But statist planning is *political planning* and is thus present-oriented and lower class. The purpose of statist planning, whatever its declared goals, is to gain votes and assure political power. The state therefore aggravates the already existing evil: it adds to the incompetence of a lower-class people the burden of a radically lower-class national policy. How extensive this deterioration of functioning power is on the statist level was indicated by statistics issued by the vice president emeritus and former business manager of a middle western University, according to which, "$1.00 of relief to a needy individual through a private volunteer agency costs seven cents; through a Municipal Welfare, twenty-seven cents; through a State Welfare Agency, one dollar; and through a

Federal Welfare Agency, two dollars" (*Review of the News*, November 4, 1970, p. 20). Statist planning (or welfare), being always primarily political planning, the political cost is high, whether it be welfare or road construction. The more society is politically governed, the more incompetent it becomes in coping with its problems.

The lower-class mentality also dominates education, and to the degree that education is state controlled, to that degree it represents education into a lower-class world and mind. The academic community today is an example of the lower-class mind; it is relativistic, existential, and politically-oriented in its problem solving. The academic community has steadily withdrawn from the world with contempt. All too often, where men cannot compete successfully, there they run down the competition by contempt. The academic community thus approaches the world only with revolutionary contempt and hatred. A century ago, scholars wrote for the world; thus, the great historians expected to be read by literate men everywhere. Since then, the academician has progressively written for other scholars, not for the public; he has written to gain academic approval, not to apply knowledge to problems. The scholar is usually so busy protecting his statements from possible criticisms by other scholars, that all too often he says little or nothing. The Marxists have at least had the courage of their convictions and have sought to be relevant; much of their influence on students has been due to the fact that they have at least been plainspoken.

Education as a whole, however, because it has become relativistic, existentialist, and state controlled, has been the major means of creating a lower-class society.

A society can drift into a lower-class culture and, in pride, maintain that it is on the high road to greatness. Spain gives us a classic example of this. Ferdinand and Isabella united their kingdoms and sought to make Spain "Spanish" and Catholic (Ferdinand almost certainly was in part Jewish). The "Moors" were expelled; the number of Muslim conquerors who came to Spain much earlier numbered only 25,000 at the most; by 1311, of the 200,000 Muslims in Granada, only 500 were of Arabic descent, according to an Arabic document. Powerful Muslim, Jewish, and Christian families regularly intermarried to consolidate their power and alliances; all were equally "Spanish." But, in the name of "purity," the Moors were expelled, then the Jews, and finally the Germans (who had helped Charles V bring Spain to greatness), and only "Spaniards" were left, of supposedly pure blood. (The question of pure blood could never be asked of the royal family!) In brief, only "gentlemen" were left. The businessmen and the farmers of calibre had been run out. As the

Catholic historian, Heer, has pointed out, the results were disastrous: "The Spanish did not cultivate the land. Agriculture in Spanish hands declined catastrophically. Until the nineteenth century there was no such thing, strictly speaking, as an economy. In the fourteenth and fifteenth century the Spanish left this to the Germans, the Ravensburg Trading Society and the Foggers, and then to the Flemish. Later they had to leave it to the French, the Dutch, the English, and the Americans. The Spanish built cities, monasteries, and palaces, as settings in the world theater and as suitable trappings for its world-spectacle" (Friedrich Heer, *The Intellectual History of Europe* [Cleveland, OH: World Publishing Co., 1966], p. 255). Spain lived parasitically off its colonies. Its standards became those of the picaresque novel they produced, the clever opportunist who lives without work.

This same prolonged drifting cannot occur now. Every modern country, virtually, is a modern "Spain"; it is substituting grandiose ideas and plans for production, and the result is a steady decline everywhere into socialism. But socialism is by nature imperialistic; since socialism cannot produce goods successfully and economically, it must expropriate. Expropriation at home is followed by expropriation abroad. The imperialism of the Soviet Union is a necessity: it is its means of gaining fresh capital. As the other powers move deeper into socialism, they too will extend their area of expropriation. Just as the lower-class man steals casually to make ends meet, so too does the lower-class state.

Our answer to this problem cannot be political: that is the lower-class answer. This does not mean that we abandon politics, but that we recognize that politics is a reflection of the life of the people. The answer is essentially religious and moral. No election can make men future-oriented; only a living faith in the sovereign God can do this. A scholar, in analyzing the thinking of colonial Americans, has remarked on their amazing confidence. Whatever their problems, they were confident that men who moved in obedient faith to the sovereign God would triumph, that neither the hostile forces of nature, Indians, nor a tyranny in England could long survive in a battle with God's freemen. Very simply, they believed that victory is built into the universe for God's people. They were thus future-oriented: they built for the future. They kept diaries and records faithfully for unborn generations. Reverend Samuel Hopkins dedicated his "Treatise on the Millennium," i.e., on the era of the triumph of the gospel, to the people who should be living then; he expected that golden era to come not too long after the year 2000.

In 1930, in *The Book of Journeyman*, Albert Jay Nock said, "We have hopefully been trying to live by mechanics alone, the mechanics

of pedagogy, of politics, of industry, and commerce; and when we find that it cannot be done and that we are making a mess of it, instead of experiencing a change of heart, we bend our wits to devise a change in mechanics, and then another change, and then another." Men are trying to enter the Kingdom of God by manipulation rather than regeneration.

Men have moved in fear rather than in faith, and the courage of faith. In 2 Peter 2:5 we are told that God "spared not the old world [before the Flood], but *saved* Noah." The word translated "saved" can be better rendered "guarded." In the face of all the hostility of that world, we are told that Noah was guarded or preserved, because he had been called to a new world, and to rebuild in that world, and Noah was faithful to that call.

Men who seek to survive are doomed; their interest is in their own skin, and they are a form of lower-class mentality. Men whose desire is to rethink and to rebuild under God are men geared to life and faithful to the Lord of life.

Whatever men may do, God cannot be dislodged from the throne of the universe. If God is our Savior, then He is also our sustainer and vindicator. We can face the future in the confidence of His government, and we must at all times think, act, and rebuild in terms of that certainty. "If God be for us, who can be against us?" (Rom. 8:31).

268

CLASS

Chalcedon Report No. 62, October 1, 1970

We have in the last two reports, been analyzing the significance of an upper class and its decline, and the growing victory of the lower-class mentality. Our concern now, as we study the lower-class mind, is to examine the popularity of two very different peoples, the American cowboy and the Polynesian.

In America today, the cowboy is a popular television hero, and a national symbol of sorts. The sheepherder, on the other hand, has no like prestige, nor does the farmer. We must remember, too, that the cowboy's prestige does not include the cattleman, except to a minor degree. The cattleman, the ranch owner, is a responsible, independent man. The farmer, too, is a man who must exercise foresight, patience, and diligence to survive and prosper. The despised sheepherder is actually only a hired hand, like the cowboy, but with a difference. The sheepherder must live with the sheep in a sheepwagon, doctor and care for them, living alone continuously. He must thus be a responsible, patient, and future-oriented man. Significantly, few young Americans ever become sheepherders today. The pay is good, and, after ten or more years of such work, a herder who has saved his money can go into some enterprise of his own. Few Americans are so future-oriented or patient. Most sheepherders must be imported: Basques, Greeks, and some Mexicans. After a period of time, these herders retire to their homeland as well-to-do citizens, or they go into ranching or business in America. Many of the most important citizens of the Western intermountain areas of the United States are ex-sheepherders, or their sons.

On the other hand, it is rarely ever the case that a cowboy saves up his money to go into his own enterprise. Many cowhands have only the clothes on their backs; they are drifters, gamblers, and present-oriented

spendthrifts. But it is the cowboy's very lack of foresight and law, his heedlessness of responsibility, which makes him a folk hero today.

The modern mind is existentialist. It is concerned with the moment, not the future. It despises thrift, patience, and enterprise. John Cage has recommended to other musicians and composers that the proper approach to writing must be a "purposeful purposelessness." The arts work towards a breakdown of rational control, purpose, and meaning. Robbe-Grillet has called for the end of the "universe of signification," i.e., the world of meaning, in the arts, so that we have, according to Erich Kahler, the jeopardy of language itself and the triumph of incoherence. We have, he states, "the outspoken attempt to produce incoherence . . . What these movements ultimately arrive at, what in the end they want to accomplish is the total destruction of coherence, and with it the deliberate, and that means, the conscious destruction of consciousness" (Erich Kahler, *The Disintegration of Form in the Arts* [New York, NY: Braziller, 1968], pp. 95–96).

Returning to the cowboy, he is a natural rather than a philosophical existentialist, and as a result, he is a television hero. On television, the cowboy is, naturally, not a married man; marriage means responsibility; it means the necessity of thinking about someone other than yourself. Moreover, the television and movie cowboy rarely solves problems: his answer is the gun. Thus his "solution" is, in effect, war and revolution, not a constructive development. The cowboy hero wipes out problems: he does not solve them. Having left death and destruction in his wake, dead men, rooms turned into a shambles, and grieving people, he gets on his horse and rides on. There is no thought of reconstruction.

The future-oriented, upper-class man knows that every act today has implications for tomorrow. His actions are aspects of a planned life, and he is highly conscious of what the future may bring. As a result, his actions are responsible and future-oriented. He "counts the cost" as a religious duty, because Jesus Christ requires it of His followers (Luke 14:27–33). To count the cost means to recognize that we live in God's universe of law, and that ideas and actions alike have consequences. Any man who fails to count the cost is a fool, and a lower-class mind, whatever his wealth or social position.

A generation which is lower-class in outlook will seek lower-class heroes, and, as a result, the cowboy is its folk hero. Another kind of person widely idealized in our time is the Polynesian. From Melville's day to the present, the Polynesian has been to many people a citizen of paradise, a person living in a beautiful sexual heaven where there is neither work, responsibility, nor consequence, only erotic and dream-like native girls to titillate their idiot imagination.

Dr. Robert C. Suggs, anthropologist, has recorded some data about Polynesian orgies (he regards them as a wonderful people): "Much of the really heavy drinking done by the adults was done in the spirit of contest to see who could manage to drink under the table the husbands of the most accessible females and still remain conscious enough to possess the victor's prize. Many such contests soon became sexual orgies, with discretion and custom thrown completely to the winds; wives took lovers right beside their dead-drunk husbands, young boys lured women of their mother's generation into the bush, and even incest prohibitions were transgressed" (Robert C. Suggs, *The Hidden Worlds of Polynesia* [New York, NY: Mentor, 1962, 1965], p. 110). This is the appeal of Polynesia to the lower-class mind, and not only hippies but young executives are busy trying to turn the Western world into a new Polynesia.

The lower-class mind is not future-oriented because it does not recognize that it lives in a world of law. To the extent that any culture departs from Biblical faith, to that extent it becomes lower-class, because it denies God's sovereign counsel and law, and it is therefore not future-oriented. Only to the extent that man recognizes that the world is under God's law does he at every point then plan and act in terms of that law. Lower-class religion, economics, politics, and all things else deny that any absolute law exists which can bind man. Man must move in terms of the moment and human need, according to these humanists. Instead of a future conditioned by God's law-word, by supply and demand, by economic realities and basic laws, the future is seen as entirely made by man. Man makes his own law, his own future, and his own consequences, according to humanists, in radical contempt of any law alien to man.

But when man strips the world of meaning, he also strips himself of meaning. This is very sharply apparent in the writing of archeologist Geoffrey Bibby, *Looking for Dilmun* (New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf, 1969). Bibby gives an interesting account of a great ancient civilization, beginning about 3000 B.C. and dying about 1000 B.C., whose name was even unknown to us for 2,400 years. In conclusion, after describing his work, Bibby wrote:

> And when, one day, it will all have been said and done, when the last basketful of earth has been carried up from the diggings, and the last word of the last report written — what will it all have mattered? That Dilmun has emerged once more from the mists of oblivion, that we can cross the threshold which Uperi, king of Dilmun, trod, look up at the fortress walls that guarded the emporium of all the Indies — what does it matter? Does it matter who the people were who, in the dawn of our time, opened up the trade routes from Meluhha to Makan, from Makan to Dilmun, from Dilmun to Sumer?

> For two and a half millennia even the fact that they had been was forgotten, and the world went on happily enough, unaware that it was unaware. Among all the lost volumes of human history, what is one lost chapter more or less?
>
> They are dead and gone, these merchant adventurers of another age; and neither the archaeologist's trowel nor the pen of the chronicler can bring back the argosies that once sailed the blue waters of the Arabian Gulf. It can matter as little to them as it does to us, that now once more we know a little of their doings, a few of their names. (p. 383)

How long can research and science endure when the work men do has no meaning because the universe is for them meaningless? The sickness of the world of science and learning is this sickness of meaninglessness.

Men whose lives are meaningless are incapable of making sound decisions. In fact, they postpone decision-making. Intelligent men make decisions because their future-oriented thinking calls for responsible actions. A crisis confronts them with live options, and they decide in terms of a planned evaluation of alternatives. The lower-class reaction to a crisis is to postpone decision in the hopes that the crisis will go away: he wants "time" to solve what he is morally required to solve. (The September 1970 International Monetary Fund meeting's answer to the world's economic and monetary crisis was to "mark time.") The lower-class man floats with the current because he will not look beyond the moment. According to Solomon in Proverbs 16:22 (Berkeley Version), "Prudence is a fountain of life to its possessor, but folly is the chastisement of fools." The fool is the man who does not consider consequences; his mentality is lower-class.

Class is thus not a social issue, nor is it related to a social register. All too many whose names are in a social register are lower-class descendents of upper-class ancestors, who now coast on an inherited name and wealth.

Class is ultimately a religious matter. It is the recognition that the world is God's world and therefore under God's law. At every point, we must therefore count the cost; we must be future-oriented, otherwise we are trash, "neither fit for the land, nor yet fit for the dunghill; but men cast it out. He that hath ears to hear, let him hear" (Luke 14:35).

History is God's handiwork. If man and nations do not reckon with the future under God, religiously, politically, economically, ecologically, and in every other way, they will wind up on the manure pile of history. Is that your destiny?

> Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light. See that ye walk circumspectly, not as fools, but as wise, Redeeming the time, because the days are evil. (Eph. 5:14–16)

269

MORE ON CLASS

Chalcedon Report No. 65, January 1, 1971

A lower-class culture is generally politically-oriented; its major concern is with the state, and it sees the state as man's instrument for regaining paradise. The state is given a paternal role: as father, the state provides cradle-to-grave security for its children. A statist culture is thus a lower-class culture, childish and present-oriented.

This does not mean that politics and the state are not important, nor does it mean that we should neglect them. The fact that sound nutrition and good eating habits are important does not mean that we should become gluttons and live to eat. Similarly, the importance of politics by no means can be made a justification for statism.

A political society is one in which politics takes precedence over all things and governs all things. This is exactly what Lenin required, declaring, "Politics cannot but have precedence over economics. To argue differently means forgetting an ABC of Marxism" (Cited by Lin Biao, *Report to the Ninth National Congress of the Communist Party of China*, Delivered on April 1 and adopted on April 14, 1969 [Peking: Foreign Language Press, 1969], p. 60). In a political society, politics governs economics.

It also governs education. Just as economics is made to serve political goals, so is education. The school becomes an instrument for the control of the people, or, as James G. Carter, co-founder with Horace Mann of statist education in America, stated it, "an engine to sway the public sentiment, the public morals, and the public religion, more powerful than any other in the possession of government" (Carter, *Essays Upon Popular Education* [1826], pp. 49–50; see also R. J. Rushdoony, *The Messianic Character of American Education*). The purpose of controlling education becomes, not to further education, but primarily to increase the control by the state over the people.

A political society also seeks to control religion, and a major target of dictatorships is always the church, which is either suppressed or controlled. Man's religious independence from man, his allegiance to God, and his strength from God, are challenges to the state's claim to be man's only lord and savior.

Similarly, the family is controlled, and the independence of the godly family is viewed with distrust.

A political society inevitably moves towards totalitarianism. Before World War I, an Englishman, A. G. Gardner, in *The Pillars of Society*, described Theodore Roosevelt as the consummate politician. He quoted Roosevelt as follows: "The most successful politician is he who says what everybody is thinking most often and in the loudest voice." In a *godly* society, a politician moves in terms of higher law and his conscience, with a sense of responsibility to God and to man. In a *political* society, Roosevelt's definition holds true: the politician is the voice of the crowd.

When the United States was founded, its leaders feared the crowd mentality. Thus, Mason, Jefferson, and others feared the growth of cities because they feared a crowd culture, a lower-class society. Others like Hamilton felt rightly that cities were not the problem but the minds and hearts of men; as a result, Hamilton began to work towards a Christian Constitutionalist party to develop a godly and responsible electorate. His death cut short his efforts. The rise of humanism and the erosion of Biblical faith destroyed both upper- and middle-class culture in city and country alike, and the entire country began to develop into a politically-oriented society and a lower-class culture.

Where there is no restraint of a higher law, politics soon becomes the art of people pleasing. Instead of statesmanship, politicians manifest only a desire to gain votes by pleasing the crowds. The upper-class mind is future-oriented; it plans practically in terms of long-range goals. The lower-class mind is present-oriented; it thinks primarily in terms of the satisfaction of present needs.

Today, we have no lack of intelligent politicians, but they are almost all present-oriented because little else gains votes. Politicians and people, priests, pastors, and teachers, are alike present-oriented and lower-class in mentality. The socialite and the welfare recipient differ only in wealth; they are alike in thinking essentially of today as the truly lower-class people they are.

A lower-class society is like a ship without a rudder; being geared only to the existentialist moment, it is driven by every wind. It does not give direction to life but takes direction from the weather. As a result, it is catastrophe bound.

The lower-class mind, moreover, does more than drift into catastrophe: it provokes and invites disaster. The man who plans practically, with religious vision and hardheaded economic knowledge, knows that it takes *time and work* to realize a dream. The lower-class mind, being politically-oriented, despises both time and work. If it wants something, it seeks to realize its utopia by political action. The only major result of such political action is more taxes. The result: disillusionment and despair, and then a revolutionary rage. If the television set does not work, kick or smash it; if the political order does not produce on demand, burn and destroy it. If the old order is destroyed, then, miraculously, a new paradise will emerge from the ruins.

The lower-class mind, the political mentality, is a gambler's mind. The key to the future lies in a gambler's hope, a miraculous break which will reward the gambler. Work is thus avoided to play the political slot machine. Let us finance John Doe, who will save our country if elected. The fact that John Jones, John Johnson, and every other financed hope has failed them does not register with them. Can a lower-class electorate elect anyone but a lower-class politician? But the gambler does not believe in logic or the odds: his hope is in miracles, godless miracles. Thus, he pins his hope, come every election, on another great "white hope."

Feeling and fantasy begin to govern such a nation. To be reasonable is regarded as the epitome of sterility and reaction. People begin to cultivate experience for experience's sake. Perversions, pornography, new taste sensations, more and more flamboyant dress, an emphasis on the perpetually new, these and like emphases mark the lust for experience, for satiation in terms of the present.

A present-oriented people grows heedless of the consequences. We are safe today: why worry about national defense tomorrow? We eat today: why bother about planning ahead? A present-oriented economy is thus of necessity inflationary: it burns up past, present, and future assets in terms of its demands now.

One of the chronic problems of mankind is that it has usually been dominated by a lower-class mentality, whether ruled by kings, oligarchs, dictators, or democrats. The lower-class mind is ultimately the mind of Satan, a denial of causality, a declaration that man is his own god, and an insistence on the existential moment. An upper-class society can only develop where a truly Biblical faith governs men, where the absolute lordship and saving power of the triune God is recognized, and His sovereign law acknowledged. Where there is no respect for, obedience to, and delight in God's higher law, there can be no upper-class mind or vision. Where men acknowledge with pleasure that the world of men, of physics,

economics, biology, politics, and all things else are governed by God's law, there men will be future-oriented and will be upper and/or middle class in outlook.

The significance of God's absolute law is that it requires a future orientation. Law speaks of consequences, of penalties, of rewards for obedience, of life and death, success and failure. Because law indicates causality, it requires that men who respect law analyze cause and effect and be governed by that knowledge. To reject law is to reject the past and the future.

A purely experiential religion thus stresses the mystical or emotional feelings of the moment; it derides time and history. An experiential economics is only or largely concerned with needs, not with the practical matters of supply and demand.

The politics of the New Left and of the Old Left is an ugly expression of Romanticism and the Romantic depreciation and denial of time, history, and, above all, law in favor of experience and the moment.

Preaching in the church has long been aimed largely at generating experience, too little towards teaching God's law. Many evangelicals cite Joseph A. Seiss as their mentor, but Seiss, in his lectures of 1859, declared there could be no preaching of grace without a teaching also of the law. The goal of Christian redemption and action he held, is "Restoration" (Joseph A. Seiss, *Holy Types; or, The Gospel in Leviticus*).

Restoration or reconstruction requires the law, for law is the instrument, in every area, of planning for the future practically. We cannot expect to live long by taking poison, nor to prosper economically by denying sound economics. The redeemed man therefore plans to structure his life and future, and that of his society, by means of God's law.

Earl Warren recently called for a "new civilization." He asked for a new law order in which men "become truly partners in a new creation — creation of a new heaven and a new earth — better than any which preceded it" ("Earl Warren Asks 'New Civilization,'" *Los Angeles Herald-Examiner*, December 14, 1970, p. A-10). Warren has for years worked to use the courts to further that "new civilization" of humanism. Warren's new heaven looks, unfortunately, more and more like the old hell.

The most beautiful cathedrals and buildings always represent not only beauty, but planning, work, and dedication. To expect a happy future by electing John Doe is to court disaster, a habit with the lower-class, political mind. To work, slowly, patiently, and under law, to establish godly order and justice, to maintain and develop all things under law and with patience, is to assure, not paradise today or tomorrow, but progress steadily towards a world under God's law. This our purpose. Is it yours?

270

FUTURE ORIENTATION

Chalcedon Report No. 66, February 1, 1971

No society has yet existed without its share of lower-class people, that is, persons who are incapable of a future-oriented life and who are often parasitic in their living. Very often, the number of upper and middle-class minds in a culture has been very limited, a thin strata of future-oriented and planning minds governing and directing the vast majority of men. The remarkable progress of Western civilization in the nineteenth century was due to the fact that great numbers of people moved into the ranks of the middle and upper classes. Society was radically altered; instead of a limited number of men governing a culture, an increasing number of self-governing and foresighted men were rapidly expanding the potentialities of man and society in every area of life. The result was a great era of progress. The ranks of the lower classes of Western countries shrank markedly, especially in the United States, where society, as the community of men whose vision was of a prosperous, developing, and expanding future, came close to including most men, and, in some areas, almost all. The American mission of Manifest Destiny was to spread civilization, religion, and liberty to every corner of the continent, if not the whole world (see Frederick Merk, *Manifest Destiny and Mission In American History* [New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963]).

The school was a very important aspect of this vision. A future-oriented people believed emphatically that education was basic to a people with a mission. The purpose of the schools, from grammar school on through the university, was to educate for leadership, to prepare the man of the future for his responsibilities. Schooling meant dignity and a status. Commencement exercises were a great joy to parents, especially of immigrant children: the student had now advanced a step towards the upper class, into the ranks of those who govern rather than are governed.

Men shared a vision of a world transformed by religion, education, and free enterprise into a realm of liberty and progress in which all men dwelled together in contentment and prosperity. It is easy to criticize various aspects of this vision today, but the fact remains that the nineteenth century did witness vast strides in conquering age-old problems of human society. There was not only a very extensive material progress, but one of the greatest advances in Christian missions in history.

Today, however, a very real cultural counterforce is in operation. The ranks of the lower classes are again growing because of the collapse of the upper and middle classes. Civilizations decay when the leadership falters and fails, when its upper class abdicates its responsibilities or abandons its character.

The school as the agency of creating the upper and middle classes of the modern era has become the great mass producer of a lower-class mentality, of a present-oriented generation. The modern academic community presents an ironic picture. On the one hand, there are monumental buildings and beautiful grounds which echo the old vision of planning and order. On the other hand, there are the unkempt minds and bodies of the faculty and student body to set forth the new contempt for the old order. It is as if a barbarian horde has captured the temples of an ancient faith. Some curious facts confirm the change. The intellectual today is more susceptible to propaganda than are other people. There is also a correlation between vulnerability to hypnosis and education. Instead of strengthening the mind for leadership, education today weakens it and makes a man a better follower. Occultism, astrology, and other forms of ancient superstitions have had a ready receptivity among educated peoples. Whereas once the educated man derided these things, today he tends to show interest in them and promote them. More and more universities are adding courses on magic, astrology, and other superstitions to their curriculum.

What has happened? Why have the schools created to educate an upper and middle class become the great creators of new barbarians, of the most powerful lower class in history?

The reason lies in the studied rootlessness of modern education. Because the intellectual is at war with Biblical faith, he is at war with the past; he rejects it as lacking his own enlightenment. In terms of modern thought, enlightenment begins by a denial of God. This denial of God is accompanied by an assertion of the autonomy of man and his reason, his mind, and this autonomy means a deliberate rootlessness, a calculated severing of ties with the past. In other cultures, the lower-class mind was rootless because it was too poorly educated to have root in the past, and too indifferent religiously to think and plan in terms of a religious faith.

As a result, such a lower-class mind cuts itself off from the past and from the future by default. The new lower class of the modern intellectuals cuts itself off from the past by choice, by a revolutionary choice and act, and is more rootless than any previous lower class. This rootlessness is reinforced by its philosophical existentialism, its exaltation of the moment, of the present, and its attempts to cut off that existential moment from any influence from the past and from any fear of future events. As a result, the intellectuals are rapidly becoming the most truly lower-class element civilization has yet seen.

Not only is there a rootlessness grounded in philosophical principle but also in emotional hatred. The intellectual refuses to see himself as a true child of his past. As Molnar has pointed out, with reference to Sartre, he sees himself as a "bastard," an outcast and an enemy to the past. The bastard mentality, antibourgeois, revolutionary, nonconformist, and perpetually at war, is made into the modern hero by the intellectuals. More than a hero, he is also seen as the new prophet. "The new philosopher abandons the traditional role of the *teacher* and assumes that of the *prophet*." Instead of investigating and communicating immutable truths, this bastard-prophet gives a vision of a new world which depends on the ruin of the present order (Thomas Molnar, *Sartre: Ideologue of Our Time* [New York, NY: Funk & Wagnalls, 1968]). This vision is a vision of hate, and even love is defined as hate by Sartre. In *Le Diable et le bon Dieu*, Sartre defined love as the "hatred of the same enemy." To love is simply to be united in hatred of God and His order.

Not surprisingly, the new barbarians, like Lenin, Trotsky, Stalin, Hitler, Mao, Castro, and others, emphasize, not truth and justice in establishing a new order, but the power of "charisma" (miraculous power) by commanding personalities (see L. Clark Stevens, *est: The Steersman Handbook* [Santa Barbara, CA: Capricorn Press, 1970], p. 130).

The goal is *freedom*, but freedom as defined by Hitler and Stalin is not freedom as defined by Christ. Almost thirty years ago, de Rougemont saw clearly what freedom had become for modern man: "For most of my contemporaries, Liberty is the right not to obey. When they are given this right they are bored and clamor for a tyrant" (Denis de Rougemont, *The Devil's Share* [New York, NY: Pantheon Books, 1944], p. 97). This is it exactly. For an upper-class mind, freedom is the opportunity to plan and work realistically for future goals and to create a personal and a social order in terms of those goals. Freedom becomes the condition for work and planning: it has a function in terms of the present and the future. For the lower-class mind, freedom is "the right not to obey," and the right to disrupt and destroy an order that requires obedience.

Obedience is a future-oriented virtue. Children are taught obedience because they must be schooled into living with reality and mastering it. Dictatorships require obedience from their subjects in order to further their plans for the present and the future. Obedience comes into its own in a free society, where men by an inner discipline commit themselves to practical work and planning for the future. Such men maintain this discipline in the face of disappointments and frustrations, because the ability to use failures and setbacks profitably is an aspect of their future-oriented nature.

Philosophically, therefore, our schools today are gravediggers, committed by principle to destroying the past and to denying that God's absolute laws govern man's past, present, and future. Dr. Timothy Leary is a true product of the modern university and has a natural appeal to a generation educated into the rootlessness he represents. In a New York meeting, Leary once declared, "We do not pray to anyone up there but to what is inside ourselves . . . Let us go back and free the world from good and evil . . . Then we are all through with the good-evil thing and you will be reborn" (Diana Trilling, "Celebrating with Dr. Leary," *Encounter*, June 1967). This is the dream: dispense with good and evil, with all absolute law, and live as "free" men in a world where moral law, economic law, all law is destroyed in favor of "free" man, man with a total right not to obey.

As men face a world collapsing around them because the lower-class mind, like a plague, is infecting old and young, they have two ways out. *First*, they can retreat into pessimism and despair. They can recognize the hopelessness of dealing with lower-class minds and surrender. This is easy to do. A particularly vicious young hoodlum was killed by police recently in a gun battle. The record of violence by this teenage criminal was a serious one. The mother, with no criminal record, is proving herself even more depraved than her son. She is demanding action against the police, who fought in self-defense, for killing her murderous son. Her son could rob, maim, and murder as a part of his right not to obey, but she refuses to recognize the right of the police to require obedience to the law and to use force to protect the law, innocent victims, and themselves. Such an attitude becomes daily more prevalent. It is easy to become discouraged. But to surrender is in effect to deny God; it is to deny that He is on the throne, and that, "Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end" (Isa. 9:7).

The *second* course is the realistic one: to rebuild. Are the schools our gravediggers? Then we must build new schools. Already, every year, more and more children and youth are being educated in Christian schools and

into a Biblical perspective. The future belongs to those who prepare for it, not to those who destroy it, or who fear it.

Only as future-oriented men, men of God, begin each in his own calling, to rebuild all things in terms of their faith, can there be any restoration or direction to history. We will never regain that direction if we wait for the majority to join us; we are then only weathervane men, incapable of doing more than responding to the winds of history. We shall be driven instead of driving. We will then, whatever our professed faith, have joined the lower class. The reconstruction of schools, families, churches, civil governments, and vocations will be accomplished only as men under God feel that they have no other alternative but to act. Then, by faith, as free men whose calling it is to command the future for God, they will, a step at a time, accomplish His purposes in history.

271

PERMISSIVENESS AND CLASS

Chalcedon Report No. 67, March 1, 1971

American Indians are the subject of much romance as well as much prejudice, so that it is often difficult to make a realistic appraisal of their cultures. So much in Indian history suggests remarkable abilities: men like Joseph Brant, Tecumseh, Chief Joseph, and others were clearly men of rare abilities. On the other hand, despite evidences of a superior genetic inheritance, Indians are on the lowest level of American society all too often. Very early, Indians showed an amazing ease of adaptability; they recognized the horror Europeans in America felt towards their cannibalism and torture, and they readily took on the mores of their surrounding settlers. They usually showed, however, an inability to unite; they were divided into hostile and warring tribes, and within each tribe the various bands were often more uncongenial to one another than to the European settlers. Then too, despite their intelligence and ease at adaptation, they failed to develop beyond a certain point, and, in all too many cases, became a part of the lowest class in American life.

It is important for us to understand a central cause of this failure, because it is very closely related to the rapid slide of all America (and Western civilization) into a lower-class status.

Indian cultures had a fairly uniform concept of child rearing. As Wallace has noted of the Seneca Indians of the colonial era, early observers noted that "Parental Tenderness" was carried to a "dangerous Indulgence." Punishment was lacking, and "Mothers were quick to express resentment of any constraint or injury or insult offered to the child by an outsider." Moreover, "such control as the child obtained over its excretory functions was achieved voluntarily, not as a result of consistent punishment for mistakes. Early sexual curiosity and experimentation were regarded as a natural childish way of behaving, out of which it would, in

due time, grow" (p. 35). Freedom was important to the Senecas and other Iroquois. "The intolerance of externally imposed restraints, the principle of individual independence and autonomy, the maintenance of an air of indifference to pain, hardship, and loneliness — all these were the negative expression, as it were, of the positive assertion that *wishes must be satisfied, that frustration of desire is the root of all evil*" (Anthony F. C. Wallace, *The Death and Rebirth of the Seneca* [New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf, 1970], p. 74; italics added).

The situation has not greatly changed since then, as I can witness, having spent eight-and-a-half years on an Indian reservation among two Western tribes. I never saw a frustrated Indian child; perhaps an Indian baby cried at some time, but I cannot recall it. The baby or child was fed when it wanted to be fed; it was not denied but was rather indulged at every turn. The love for and delight in children was real and sometimes moving, although it was obvious how unhappy the consequences of that indulgent love were. I found the Indians a lovable people, of real ability and more than a little charm, but the *permissiveness* of their society guaranteed their continuing unhappy and low estate.

An unfrustrated child is inescapably in for trouble. It is impossible to live in a fallen world where conflict of wills is a daily problem, and a minor one in the face of our major world and local problems, without having frustrations. Discipline in childhood is a schooling in frustration and a training in patience and work. Discipline not only prepares us for frustration, but gives us the character to work towards overcoming frustration. Permissiveness in child rearing thus avoids frustrating the child only to insure continual frustration for the adult.

The reaction of the Indian to frustration from very early times was escapism, and alcoholism was a major form of such a retreat. The more the Indian met frustration, the more readily he became an alcoholic. It was at the request of Indian leaders, who were aware of their people's weakness, that prohibition of liquor for Indians (now repealed) was legislated at the beginning of the last century.

In American society at large today, the same permissiveness in child rearing prevails. Earlier, alcoholism was more often linked, among white Americans, to an intense perfectionism. Such alcoholics were or are very capable, hardworking men, frustrated because they make too great a demand of themselves and life. Now, increasingly, the alcoholic is a product of permissiveness, of his or her inability to accept a world of frustration and overcome it. Instead of too much drive, it reveals a lack of drive.

Similarly, sexual immorality was and is a serious problem in Indian life. Indians who deplore it are often guilty of it, but they find themselves

too weak of will to maintain the standard of fidelity they admit is best. As a result, Indian family life is regularly shattered by dissension and conflict. The inability to deny themselves leads to greater unhappiness and frustration.

Increasingly, too, American life as a whole sees a like pattern. Permissiveness in the home, church, and school has created an undisciplined people who feel that freedom is license and that degeneracy is health. A popular singer expressed the feeling of the age in a half-sobbing song which said at one point, "Don't deny me."

A common consequence of permissive societies is a high suicide rate. Suicide is the ultimate in self-frustration. Anyone who has talked with would-be suicides knows how intense their self-pity is. Sometimes their problems are very real, and at other times appallingly trivial. In either case, there is an inability to accept frustration and an overwhelming self-pity that life should bring them to such a pass.

Suicide is historically very common among American Indians, and some have seen this as evidence that their origin is in the Orient. Rather, it is a mark of their permissive culture, and, as religious faith has declined in Western civilization, and as a permissive, humanistic society has grown, suicide has increased.

A permissive society lacks the capacity to overcome problems, because it retreats into liquor, narcotics (peyote among the Indians), sexual immorality, and a criminal and revolutionary rage whenever frustrated. Dr. Nathan Ackerman (whose viewpoint is not ours), in commenting on the Great Depression, remarked, "In those days, regardless of impoverishment, there was more constraint of behavior. I cannot imagine looting thirty-five years ago. Despite want, the patterns of authority prevailed. Today, those standards have exploded. Looting and rioting have become sanctioned behavior in many communities" (Studs Terkel, *Hard Times: An Oral History of the Great Depression* [New York, NY: Pantheon Books, 1970], p. 219).

We thus have today a more affluent society than ever before, yet less capable of accepting frustration than ever before. As a result, we now have what Dr. Gunther Stent has called "a view of the end of progress." Progress is an impossibility where there is no patient work to overcome obstacles and to improve on things. Both revolutionary rage and narcotics represent forms of escapism, of a refusal to cope with problems constructively, and both are evidences of a lower-class mentality.

One of the problems facing anyone who works with people today, young and old, is this radical lack of discipline and the lack of ability to meet frustrations realistically and to overcome them. The desire of most

people is to walk away from problems. But nothing does more to increase the problems inherent in a society and constant to a man's life than the refusal to meet them head-on and then work patiently to overcome them. To ask for a trouble-free, unfrustrated life is to ask finally for death, and, before death, a lower-class, slave status.

Slavery has been a constant problem in history. Many slaves have been victims of kidnapping and war, but many more have been victims of their own demand for security. As Sir William M. Ramsay long ago pointed out, the Romans wanted slavery; serfdom began on the imperial estates. "The paternal government was 'Salvation.'" In fact, the entire concept of salvation was in essence a form of slavery to the emperor. "The 'Salvation' of Jesus and Paul was freedom: the 'Salvation' of the Imperial system was serfdom" (Sir W. M. Ramsay, *The Bearing of Recent Discovery on the Trustworthiness of the New Testament* [London, England: Hodder and Stoughton, 1920], pp. 191–198).

This is no less true today. The salvation of modern man is some form of socialism, some form of slavery to the state. The state is asked to guarantee man against frustrations and is given increasing powers for that purpose. The more the state does, however, the deeper the discontent grows, because a permissive culture intensifies frustration as it increases gratification, because it thereby decreases man's ability to bear up under any kind of inhibition or trouble. Today, people increasingly "fall apart" under less and less tension and trouble. Like the Senecas, they see frustration of desire as the root of all evil, and, short of becoming themselves God, they are inescapably doomed to frustration by their human estate.

Christian Reconstruction thus begins in the home with godly discipline. The influence of Biblical law on Hebrew life and society was an important factor in their society, and the lingering respect for and obedience to that law has given Jews an advantage in Western history. The advantage of that law-discipline was once basic to all Western civilization, but it is now being rapidly eroded. An upper class is the product of a law and discipline which gives it a practical future-oriented perspective. Too often, however, such a class, having arrived at power, seeks "liberation" from discipline by living for the moment, by treating immorality as a prerogative of wealth and power. As a result, it cuts the vital nerve of its power and rapidly declines into a lower-class mentality which is easily toppled by any serious challenge.

Wallace reports that, in 1657, the Jesuit chronicler of the Iroquois mission wrote, "There is nothing for which these peoples have a greater terror than restraint" (p. 38). Much the same can be said of modern man today. Freedom is seen as freedom *from* law, not freedom *under* law.

Man's life then becomes a study in irrelevance, in an evasion of reality, because his concept of freedom is destructive and negative, not positive and constructive. Not truth but satisfaction then concerns man. Edward Dahlberg, in *The Carnal Myth* (1968), wrote, "Ultimately, it is only style that is important." This is a concept of writing with Dahlberg; with many, it is the program for life. Thus, in fine style, they march towards death and the ultimate frustration.

Let the dead bury the dead. Those who self-consciously make themselves a lower class encumber the earth; they are suicidal, and they shall perish.

Meanwhile, there is a social order to be reconstructed, frustrations to overcome, troubles ahead to be met and solved, and much hard work to do. This is the way of life, and of true joys also. Those who run out on problems have abandoned life. Have you?

The implications of this came to focus not too long ago on a television program. The master of ceremonies was talking to young school children, asking each in turn what they considered the best age to be. When he came to one little girl and asked, "And what age would you like to be?" she answered, "A baby." The surprised master of ceremonies asked, "Why?" "Because then people do everything for you." This is the modern dream, and even little children have caught it, to be an unfrustrated modern baby in a totally permissive world.

A neighbor of an internationally famous film director, currently in America, reported that it was not the nude sunbathing or strolling which surprised her at this beach colony. The surprise was in other areas. The totally nude young mistress of the film director sunbathes with a pacifier in her mouth.

At least the builders of Babel said, "Go to, let us build us a city and a tower" (Gen. 11:4), the City of Man. The builders of the modern Babel are working instead to build the City of the Baby, the Kingdom of the Child. They are working to create a social order which will serve as a grand pacifier for all our self-made babies.

So you don't like problems, troubles, and frustrations? Join the babies; you will have lots of company. And buy yourself a pacifier and go to bed. Get out of the way. The rest of us have work to do.

272

THE GOVERNING CLASS

Chalcedon Report No. 42, February 1, 1969

G. William Domhoff, associate professor at psychology at the University of California at Santa Cruz, has written a very interesting study of *Who Rules America?* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967). The book is extensively researched; Domhoff goes to conservative sources, such as Dan Smoot, as well as to very liberal writers. But he could not be more wrong in his conclusions. Domhoff finds that "the American upper class" controls the executive branch of the U.S. government, controls foundations, education, the CIA, most important corporations, mass media, and much more. There is a "governing class" in America, he believes, and he lumps together such families as the Rockefellers, the Pews, and the Lillys as a more or less working team in this "governing class."

How does he define this "governing class"? Here Domhoff is a faithful scholar: he gives us his premise:

> A "governing class" is a social upper class which owns a disproportionate amount of a country's wealth, receives a disproportionate amount of a country's yearly income, and contributes a disproportionate number of its members to the controlling institutions and key decision-making groups of the country. (p. 5)

The key word here is "disproportionate": it can mean whatever we want to make it mean. If the governing class *earned* their income and power, is it disproportionate? If they exercise their income and power in the name of the people or as the dictatorship of the proletariat, does it cease to be disproportionate?

The plain fact is that any and every society has its "governing class" in Domhoff's sense. Does a group represent a conspiracy simply because

they govern? There has never been a society without a "governing class." Sometimes that governing class has gained power fraudulently, but, all the same, in every society it is there, for better or worse.

Domhoff's thesis is not unlike C. Wright Mill's *The Power Elite*. And there are many such studies written, from both the right and the left.

Let us examine this idea from the perspective of an old American belief, in the natural aristocracy of talent. The founders of the United States believed in an aristocracy, but not an hereditary one; they believed in the natural aristocracy of ability and talent. Such an aristocracy always rises to the top: the best attitude of a country should be to further its progress to the top rather than to impede it. In other words, *superiority asserts itself and governs*. If the moral character, if the faith of a people is defective, then the superiority which prevails is of an evil sort, but, if the character be godly, then a godly superiority prevails.

This does *not* eliminate the fact of conspiracies. Any group of people who take counsel together to gain an end or goal are conspiring, whether for good or evil. If the times are evil, then the superior men of evil will prevail. If it be an age of sound faith and character, then superior men of righteousness will prevail.

With this in mind, let us examine some of the conspiracy ideas which are commonly bandied about in some circles. Some maintain that a Jewish conspiracy secretly governs the world; what they are actually saying, then, is that the Jews are the world's true elite and that a handful of them can govern the vast masses of the world. Others hold that the real conspiracy is a German one, and everything is viewed in terms of a new German threat; again, these people are declaring implicitly the superiority of Germans and their belief that only a world anti-German policy can save us from the German menace. Still others see the threat as an English one, involving the Rhodes funds and much more; again, this is a confession of English superiority.

But there *are* conspiracies, and they *are* a threat, some will protest, and they are right — up to a point. Let us examine one of them, where court and federal records document the conspiracy: communism. In the hands of Karl Marx, a sorry, disorganized bumbler, Marxism was simply wild, confused hatred. But superior men, but evil men, took over, and they made Marxism an instrument of *power* and *superiority*. Take Lenin: vicious, depraved, ruthless, all that and more, but also very intelligent, clearly *superior*. His writings are still amazing reading, and they explain why, in an evil age, he could ride that tide to power. For example, he saw clearly that any abandonment of gold as money, and the adoption of a central banking system, was *nine-tenths* of socialism, so that the logic of

economics would drive a world going off gold and into central banking into communism in time. We are busy today proving Lenin was right here and elsewhere. When Khrushchev said, "We will bury you," he had in mind the inevitability of the forces at work in the free world. Get rid of every communist in the United States, sever relations with the Soviet Union, and defeat communists in Vietnam and elsewhere, and the United States will still go communist because of its present monetary policy, one in operation for a generation and more. The worst "communism" in the United States is that which is written into our monetary policy, and there is no sign of a change.

Am I suggesting that we stop fighting communism? Far from it. But you can't fight atom bombs with pop guns.

Let us examine the basic issue: *First*, a natural aristocracy of talent always rises to the top in a society congenial to its moral bent. This is true even where a hereditary caste exists. Over the centuries, many of the nobility, and royalty, rose and fell in terms of their ability or inability to rule. We may sometimes regret the passing of a good line, but if it fell, it was *either* through inability to rule, *or*, if they were still able, because the moral foundations of their rule were destroyed. In old Russia, the schools and universities created a generation of men whose moral foundations were anarchistic and anti-Christian: this new breed represented tremendous but evil ability, and the war enabled them to capture power. The moral foundations were at the same time destroyed in a number of countries: the difference in the time of collapse was made by the crisis of the war and the blockade of Russia. Today, those same moral foundations are virtually gone everywhere.

Second, because there will *always* be a governing class, and that governing class will reflect the good or evil directions and impulses dominant in society, it is important therefore to do things, *one* to produce and train a superior class, and *two*, to produce and train a vast body of people who will want the leadership that new superior class can provide.

It is most certainly necessary to fight against subversion and against heresy, but something more is needed, a new faith and character in society at large, and a new leadership, a new governing class in terms of that faith and character.

Today, the liberal and leftist establishments or governing classes prevail in virtually every area of the world. They are powerful, but they are sterile. They have promised the humanistic masses they rule a paradise on earth, and increasing disillusion with their promises and abilities is leading to a generation of dropouts, people who believe the liberal myth but disbelieve increasingly in its leaders. These revolting youths

are themselves sterile: they share the same myth and lack the capacity to communicate it or realize it.

What needs to be done is, *first*, to bring forth a new people. This is the basic task of evangelism. Moral dry rot has not only destroyed the older Christendom but the newer humanistic world order. There can be no new class as long as we remain tied to the forms of the old, such as statist schools. Truly Christian schools must be established, and both old and young reeducated in terms of a total faith. Every sphere of life must be viewed in terms of the whole counsel of God.

Second, new leadership must be trained, a new aristocracy of talent in terms of the new humanity of Christ. This leadership must rethink every discipline in terms of Biblical thought: theology, philosophy, science, economics, statecraft or political science, law, and all things else must be rethought and reestablished in terms of Biblical premises.

Remember, there will *always* be a governing class. Our present schools, colleges, universities, churches, and foundations are essentially geared to producing a humanistic leadership. Fight this order all you will, but as long as it shapes the minds of the leaders and the followers, it will continue to prevail. Document its evils and chronicle its corruptions all you want, and you will not change it unless at the same time you work to establish a new people, and a new leadership.

This is our purpose. Are you with us?

THE FAMILY

273

THE FAMILY AS GOVERNMENT

Chalcedon Report No. 371, June 1996

Our perspective is so much dominated by church and state (especially the state) that most people cannot think in terms of other priorities. Paul at Mars Hill spoke of God as Him in whom "we live, and move, and have our being (Acts 17:28), *but* for modern man it is the state which is man's habitat and atmosphere.

For many years, I have spoken about the family as government, without much disagreement but also with almost no response because people have so thoroughly equated government with the state.

Of the Ten Commandments, four center on the family: 1) "Honor thy father and thy mother" (Exod. 20:12); 2) "Thou shalt not commit adultery" (Exod. 20:14); 3) "Thou shalt not steal" (Exod. 20:15); 4) "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house . . . wife . . . or anything that is thy neighbour's" (Exod. 20:17). Property in the Bible is family owned, and inheritance from one's forefathers to be passed on to one's descendants (1 Kings 21:3).

When we examine Biblical law, we see that the basic powers in a society are almost entirely given into the hands of the family. The most important of these are, *first*, the control of children, which means control of the future. The modern state seeks to command this power in a number of ways, beginning with statist education. The Christian school and homeschool movements are regaining that power for the family. *Second*, control over property is again control over the future. God's law gives power over property to the family and does not tax property. Here again, the modern power state is usurping a family right. *Third*, control over inheritance means a control over the future. In God's law, the eldest or most godly son gains a double portion, and the care of the parents. The ungodly are disinherited. This means the godly capitalization of the future. Today the state

takes the role of the firstborn and the main heir by its inheritance taxes. *Fourth*, education is again control over the future and is a family power, one which the family is in process of regaining. *Fifth*, charity is a family power in Scripture, and the poor tithe was and is basic to God's law.

The family has other powers, but these are the basic ones. The only major power withheld by God from the family is the death penalty (and hence Cain could not be executed).

The family is man's first church and where his best instruction in the faith takes place. It is man's first government and his most basic one. It is also the key school in man's life, his basic source of economic education, and much, much more.

More than a few cultures have survived the loss of civil government for centuries when their families have been strong, most notably Jews, and Armenians.

Families need to recapture their God-ordained powers. Family trusts need to be created, the able minds provided with funds for schooling on all levels, and planning adopted for the generations to come.

Family reunions need to be encouraged, and family records kept. Remember, the Bible has many genealogies, and they include far more than the Messianic line. In school, I memorized the names of the American presidents; my father, born and reared in the old country, had memorized the names of his forefathers from the time of their conversion, over 1600 years. (It helped that they all lived in the same village and were buried in the same churchyard!)

Remember, our Lord Jesus Christ was born into a family, and God Himself uses the language of the family to describe Himself as "our Father" (Matt. 6:9).

It has always baffled me that this does not delight Christians. We should better understand God since we are family members after the flesh. His love for us should be more understandable. We know our own parental joys and griefs, and we can thereby better know God as our Father.

At present, much on the national and United Nations levels is antifamily. The family is regarded as incompetent by a variety of forces determined to make it so.

Our calling in Christ requires us to become godly members of families. True enough, the family and marriage are for time only, but so, too, is preaching. There are no sermons in heaven! Does that make preaching unimportant?

I believe that a new reformation is under way. Many forces are involved in it. The central one, I believe, is the family. This reformation begins with you.

274

THE WAR AGAINST THE FAMILY

Chalcedon Report No. 371, June 1996

The modern age has long seen a war against the family based on Enlightenment and statist premises. We now see it emerging from the Christian community.

More than four decades ago, in a retirement area, I saw its clear outlines among the elderly. Too many retired to build lovely homes designed for two people only. They were open in their desire to have no children or grandchildren visiting or staying overnight. But Dorothy and I both saw such people weep in their nursing home beds because none or few come to visit them. Of course, they had moved often hundreds of miles from their children; they had made them unwelcome in their new homes; now they felt sorry for themselves because they were neglected!

These were all good evangelicals, but their faith was a shallow one which placed appearances above true faith. One sickening event involved a kindly and wealthy man with an evil wife; retirement made life unbearable for him. Because divorce was "unthinkable," he committed suicide, staging it as an accident. All his friends thought this a noble act—and continued to enjoy his wife's hospitality.

More could be said of the irresponsible behavior of that generation of the 1950s; I cite them to illustrate my premise that the revolt of youth in the 1960s began with the antifamilistic and egocentric attitudes of their pious grandparents. When the youth of the 1960s declared, "Never trust anyone over thirty," they were rejecting first of all their own parents and grandparents. It is true that the campus radicals mainly came from radical families, but it was also true that on the fringes were youth of "Christian" families.

By the 1970s, parents, on retiring, were often sporting a most shameful bumper sticker: "We are spending our children's inheritance." They

meant it, too. In a beautiful Western mountain ranch, a young man was taught the history of the place from the day a forefather first settled it. He loved every foot of that great domain. But his father sold it, offering to give his son an education at the university of his choice, or nothing. The son, a rancher at heart, took nothing and became a ranch hand. The parents spent a fortune in travel and entertainment.

Another case from 1995: the family business was sold, but not to the son, who had offered to pay his parents their annual income, or whatever percentage they wanted, for life. It did not matter to the parents that their fine son was deeply hurt.

The family is in trouble because too many members, young and old, are indifferent to it. It is not at all surprising that many sons and daughters want their parents far from them. If they have had an antifamilistic statist education, this is natural. Television, films, and popular culture have taught that parental love and concern is *interference*. The attitude is, stay away, but leave me your money.

But the family is an inescapable part of life. After the Russian Revolution of 1917, the Bolsheviks, intensely hostile to the family, tried to create a new order for human incubation. The result was a dramatic debacle. The Western world is creating a like debacle with its hostility to the family. Too many people grow up viewing parental love and concern as *interference*. There are too many instances where parents, who did all they could to help their children get an education and start their life's work, are now either forbidden to see their grandchildren, or the children have relocated at the other end of the country. Were the parents "domineering"? In the instances familiar to me, this has not been true. Rather, the children have been demanding of one thing after another while insisting on their "freedom."

This is an urgent religious concern as well as a social one. We must remember what God declares: "Honour thy father and thy mother: that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee" (Exod. 20:12). God tells us that *the promise of life* is essentially connected to obedience to this commandment. St. Paul reminds us of this fact (Eph. 6:1–3) but urges that fathers avoid provoking their children to wrath and "bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord" (Eph. 6:4).

Social decay begins in the family, and it is now far gone. Given the priority God gives to the family, the church and Christians are derelict in failing to stress that priority.

The evil temper of our time has made fatherhood anathema to many. It is well to remember that it is a *chosen* title of the Almighty: *Our Father.*

275

FAMILY LAW

Chalcedon Report No. 184, December 1980

A major area of revolution in law has been family law. The family has been redefined to eliminate the Biblical meaning of the family by degrees, and the process is well under way. We are told that the family in law must include the voluntary family, and sociologists are among those promoting this new definition. The voluntary "family" can be homosexuals or lesbians living together, or a group of runaway youths sharing quarters, or a sexual commune. By being voluntary, such a "family" is held to be morally superior to the Biblical family, which is "coercive."

The "coercive" family is the target of more and more abuse, legislation, and regulation, whereas the "voluntary" family is quietly being accorded status.

For years now, we have been told of the need for legislation to control child abuse. Child abuse is an ugly fact, and a symptom of a lawless and godless society and a people without love or faith. However, we have long had more than enough laws to cover cases of child abuse. The problem has not been a lack of legislation. In fact, the proposed laws move rather in the direction of statist controls over all families, not the correction of an evil, but the imposition of a greater one.

Moreover, in all the newspaper and political talk about child abuse, the central and growing term thereof is rarely ever mentioned, discussed, or condemned. The traditional family is the target, whereas this new, deadly, and rapidly growing form of child abuse is outside the family. It is the sexual exploitation of young boys and girls by homosexuals and lesbians. This practice is in fact being promoted as a sexual right by many and is called "intergenerational sex." One advocate is a nationally known writer. Child abuse of the worst and most prevalent sort is thus being made a right and a needed freedom.

On occasion, some macabre murder cases have come to light, the murder of a number of boys by some homosexual. We then see a glimpse of the sordid world of homosexual child abuse. What we do not see on the part of these humanistic reformers is any concern about this particularly vicious form of child abuse, the sexual exploitation of children by homosexuals.

There is a reason for this unconcern. Humanism has no desire to uphold, defend, or maintain the Biblical standard of law and morality. The world it envisions is free from God and His law, and from the Christian family.

The present direction of statist "concern" for the family should arouse Christians to action. Our faith, after all, sees the family as God's basic form of government, not the church nor the state. Moreover, the Bible is most revealing as an antistatist document in these and other matters. It tells us, for example, of Pharaoh and the Egyptian state, and their planned extermination of the Hebrew children. The greatest condemnation is reserved for Molech worship (king or state worship), which required the dedication of all children to the state, and their possible sacrifice to the state's welfare. We see Babylon seizing all superior children, such as Daniel, separating them from their families to rear them as civil servants. Supremely, of course, we see Herod slaughtering all the children of Bethlehem up to two years of age, in his effort to kill the Christ child. The Bible gives us every reason to be suspicious of the state, especially when it professes a concern for our children. Add to that "concern" a humanism which is anti-Christian through and through, and it becomes sinful to be indifferent to Caesar's usurpations.

The tragic fact is that many families are not only unbelieving but evil in their care and rearing of children. The state is no better, and its record of custodial care is even worse, so that the failures of bad parents are compounded by a supposedly beneficent state. It is a very serious error to believe that problems have solutions outside of Christ. All around us, we see statist and humanistic solutions routinely aggravating problems.

I once heard a humanistic high school teacher say to a student who intended to leave a blank space for a question he could not answer, "Come up with some kind of answer. At least it will show you are thinking." On all sides today, people are demanding "some kind of answer," any answer, to problems. They then wonder why evils are compounded.

The family is God's first and basic area of government. It rests on the self-government of the Christian man under God. If we do not have such self-government, we will not have valid government in any area of life, including the state. Again and again, we have seen in history that

declining and corrupt civil governments, as they decay, increase in their insistence on omnicompetence. The statists see themselves and their ideas as the solution to all problems. Men find such a view agreeable, because they like to believe that they can sin and then eliminate the consequences of sin by a legislative or administrative act. Sin is a moral fact; it is not solved by bureaucratic fiats.

We have a crisis in family life; this is a moral fact. We will continue to have a crisis in family life until there is a moral renewal, regeneration, among men. Moral facts have moral answers, not bureaucratic ones. This is the requirement and fact of Biblical faith.

276

MOLECH WORSHIP AND BAPTISM

Chalcedon Report No. 450, March 2003

> And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Again, thou shalt say to the children of Israel, Whosoever he be of the children of Israel, or of the strangers that sojourn in Israel, that giveth any of his seed unto Molech; he shall surely be put to death: the people of the land shall stone him with stones. And I will set my face against that man, and will cut him off from among his people; because he hath given of his seed unto Molech, to defile my sanctuary, and to profane my holy name. And if the people of the land do any ways hide their eyes from the man, when he giveth of his seed unto Molech, and kill him not: Then I will set my face against that man, and against his family, and will cut him off and all that go a-whoring after him, to commit whoredom with Molech, from among their people. (Lev. 20:1–5)

What this text deals with is a very important matter. Children are the future of any society: control over the children means to command the future. Now, Molech (also seen as Moloch, Melek, Milcolm, and Malcolm) means *king*. Molech worship was state worship, and the ceremony referred to in Leviticus 20:1–5 means the dedication of the child to the state.

Who Owns the Children?

Every culture has had rites of dedication of the child (often the male child, to symbolize heads of families) to the father, tribe, clan, or state. Ownership was affirmed by the rite.

In Molech worship, the child was passed over a low fire, or incense burner, before an image of the king, or the god of the state, or some insignia of the state to indicate that the child's life now belonged to the state and could be used at the ruler's will. Only on rare occasions was a child actually sacrificed, or slain. Most of the time, the ritual meant

dedication. It was a rite of ownership. We have Molech worship with us still, the claim of the state to own the child and to command his life.

This makes understandable why God takes the dedication of the child to the state or any other false god as so evil. He is the Lord, the Creator. "The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof; the world, and they that dwell therein" (Ps. 24:1). To give our children to any other than the Lord God is a criminal act, a fearful sin. We cannot give God's property to anyone other than the Lord: we are stealing what is His to give to another.

In some cultures, as in Sparta, a deformed child could be exposed to die; the state in other instances could decree abortion or ban it, depending on its need for warriors and state servants. All these represented forms of Molech worship.

Modern education is statist education for statist goals. The curriculum is designed, not to glorify God and prepare the child for His service, but to prepare the child for citizenship in the modern power state, to live or to die for social concerns. Humanism has demanded more human sacrifices than any other religion known to man. Marxism alone is clear evidence of this.

God's Ownership

As against all the pagan forms of dedicating the child to some variety of Molech worship, the Old Testament required circumcision. Circumcision means cutting off the male foreskin. It is a symbolic castration. It declares that man's hope is not in generation, but in regeneration, in the saving power of the Lord God of Hosts.

According to Ezekiel 36:25, the sign of the new covenant would be baptism:

> Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you.

The Jews baptized proselytes to indicate that their entrance into the covenant was through the Messiah.

Now, baptism of children is no more an act of choice on their part than was circumcision on the eighth day an act of choice on the part of a male child. Our salvation is not an act of choice but God's act of grace. Properly understood, all baptism, and especially the baptism of children, is a witness to our faith in predestination. In the baptism of our children, we give them to God, promising to rear them in His nurture and admonition, and we pray that He makes them His own, members of His congregation and Kingdom.

The baptism of a child is thus an affirmation of the sovereignty of God's grace. It is a declaration of His property rights over us and over our children. We have a duty to serve God, and also to pray for our children's children, that they be God's children also.

Having received grace, we affirm our children's need for grace. Baptism is thus a witness to our faith in God's sovereignty, His mercy, His predestinating grace, and His mercy unto our children's children.

277

THE FAMILY

Chalcedon Report No. 331, February 1993

A while back, I read a study whose author, while hoping to replace the family with a more "advanced" institution, still recognized it to be the basic and most influential governmental unit. The Bible, in its laws, makes clear the fundamental nature of the family in government.

This has very important implications. It tells us that, if a country fails, it is because its families have failed. There can be no health at the top if there is rottenness at the bottom.

Our Lord tells us that if He, the Rock of Ages, is not the foundation of a house, that house will not survive the storms of life (Matt. 7:24–27). A society cannot be stronger than its families.

This means that we must stop blaming political parties, conspiracies, racial groups, capital, labor, or anything else for our troubles. They begin at home. They begin with us. Our national failures are family failures.

The most hopeful of all things today is the growing renewal of many families. Parents are paying to put their children in Christian schools; homeschools are increasing very rapidly. Family worship is returning. More and more people are refusing transfers to better jobs in order to be closer to parents and grandparents. The family is becoming more important to many people, and the ties are becoming stronger. True, the disintegration of many families also grows more fearful, but a countertrend is clearly in evidence. In the face of a beginning disintegration, Joshua said plainly, as so must we always, "as for me and my house, we will serve the LORD" (Josh. 24:15).

Changes at the "top" will not occur until there are changes in the family. The only hope any country has begins in the home, with the children. They are the future.

Too often in recent years, our "experts" have propagated the idea that

fathers and mothers should spend more time playing with their children. There is nothing wrong with such recreational activity, but our *calling* is to be fathers and mothers, not playmates. I am reminded of a fool who was always too busy with camping trips, baseball and football games, scouting, everything to help his sons, ever to attend church; he could not understand why the boys turned out badly! His authority was nothing at all; he was simply a playmate whom the boys outgrew.

Since God Himself uses the name of *Father*, our calling as men is a very great and important one. Why should men forsake a calling God honors for the status of playmate, which has no value. Most boys have many playmates, but they have only one father. When he abdicates that calling, the family is in trouble.

We cannot leave the future in the hands of politicians, pastors, teachers, sociologists, psychologists, or anyone else, however fine they may be. The children are our future, and they are a *parental* responsibility. No abdications permitted!

278

THE FAMILY

Chalcedon Report No. 406, May 1999

In the twentieth century, we have seen three new observance days added to the Christian calendar: Mother's Day, Father's Day, and, to a lesser degree, Children's Day. These days are not without good reason. However, in the earlier years of this century, some opposed all three as non-Biblical. Their position was that these observances were non-Biblical and too individualistic, that a better vein would be *the family*.

Scripture has much to say about the Biblical family. At least three of the Ten Commandments protect it: honor thy father and thy mother; thou shalt not commit adultery; thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife. Biblical law requires the dowry, a sizeable amount, as the wife's protection against abandonment. This protected the girls in a family, in that the bridegroom had to accumulate considerable wealth before marrying to provide a dowry. Godly sons were protected by an inheritance; the oldest godly son received a double portion to enable him to care for his parents; lacking sons, daughters could inherit a man's assets.

This system protected Jewish families over the centuries when they were without a state or a synagogue. It is needed now to advance Christian civilization.

Since the family is the focus of three of the Ten Commandments, it seems strange that it is so much neglected in preaching and teaching. Strong Christian families make for not only a strong church, but also a strong civilization.

Some scholars have called attention to the fact that, at times, not only has the church been anti-family, but especially the state has been so as well. If we want to honor mothers, we need to begin by honoring the family as required by God. The family under God is a very great blessing. It is a testing ground for our faith, as well as the locale of true happiness. The

family is not a rival to the church, but a basic aspect of its life and work.

God's *law* indeed *requires* that mothers be honored, but they are best honored when we heed and obey all of God's law, in particular His laws concerning parents and the family. Families are a key aspect of God's creation plan and purpose, and we honor God when we honor His law and His ordained order. Mothers and fathers are clearly a part of His order.

279

CULTURE VERSUS FAITH

Chalcedon Report No. 417, April 2000

One of the problems of our times is the false faith in culture. To illustrate, I have known more than a few humanistic parents who have been horrified by the vicious delinquencies of their children. Given the "good" family background, home, and environment, how could their son or daughter be so "insanely" delinquent?

Their error is to assume that good character is inherited. They will cite the good character of grandparents and great-grandparents, the good environment and schooling, and they assume some freakish circumstance to be responsible. They are environmental, not Christian, in their analysis.

As Christians, we do not believe that we are the primary source of character in our children. God is. If we assume that we are, we are playing God. Character is a religious product. It can and must be supplemented by family, church, and school, but without the Lord it does not exist.

This means that public schools and many churches are off base. The reason more youth are not delinquent is, as one teenager confessed to a friend, "I don't have the guts to do what _____ is doing." His condition was cowardice, not character.

Education is important, but modern man too often substitutes education for Christ and the faith. As a result, we see cultural decay on all sides.

Henry Van Til observed, "Culture is religion externalized." The common externalized religion is humanism.

As Christians, we do not believe that we are the primary source of character in our children. God is. If we assume that we are, we are playing God.

Today, too many in the church expect the state school to provide character for their children, an illusory hope. Character comes from the faith,

through the home and the church. Rearing children means far more than providing them with food, clothing, and shelter.

Chalcedon has done much to further strong families and Christian education. We do not believe that good character is an automatic product but a Christian one. We must apply our faith to child rearing and education. This is our calling.

280

FAITH AND THE FAMILY

Chalcedon Report No. 446, November 2002

In antiquity, the family often had a major religious function, although of a false variety. Ancestor worship was common in many cultures and still survives in this century. The Biblical emphasis was covenantal: the family under God and His law by His sovereign grace.

In the Old Testament, we see that fathers had a priestly role, the duty to guide the family in worship, and in the sacrament of communion, the Passover. A son would ask, "What is the meaning of this that we do?" And the father as priest would then explain the meaning of the Passover and of God's salvation (Exod. 13:14ff.). This, the central act of worship, was very strictly tied to the family. In the early church, while the Christian Passover was celebrated by the church, a chorus of boys would still ask the question, "What is the meaning of what we do?" In both the Hebrew family and the early church, the boys who asked the question were very young, perhaps about six years of age. But from their early years, they were expected to understand the meaning of salvation. In Scotland, after the Reformation, a central duty of church elders after a time came to be the visitation of all families in the congregation to question the children on their memorization and understanding of the Westminster Catechism. The family was the teacher, and the church verified the character of the teaching. The duty of the family was to *teach* the children the faith. It was also the duty of the family to *educate* the children. Even as late as the establishment of the United States, a high percentage of the Founding Fathers were homeschooled. Thus basic education in both the Bible and literacy and general learning were the routine duty of the family.

In Genesis 2:24 we are told that Adam and Eve were made "one flesh" by their union. This is plainly stated as a glorious religious fact. At the same time, from Abraham through Paul, we see that there must be a

common faith: we are not to be unequally yoked to an unbeliever because marriage is a religious covenant. Both the physical and religious union are celebrated as godly facts. In the New Testament, the metaphor of marriage is applied to Christ and His church. While both sexuality and worship can be defiled, as created and intended by God, their purposes are glorious.

Thus the family comes into its own in every sphere as it serves God and lives by faith. *Faith* is our right relationship to God, and it is His gift to us. Faith is *not* simply believing, because the very devils in hell believe and tremble (James 2:19). Faith is, according to Ephesians 2:8, "the gift of God." It is not our act of believing, "lest any man should boast," (Eph. 2:9), but a supernatural grace.

Thus, although the Christian family is a biological unit, it is, because it is redeemed by God's grace, more than a natural fact. It is a fact of grace.

Socialization

Man's life is both *personal* and *social*, and, very clearly, life is most personal and social in the family. We are never more fully and obviously personal in all our being than in the family, and nowhere else is our sense of community, our socialization, greater. State-school critics of home-schooling insist that the homeschooled miss out on socialization. This is an especially absurd claim because socialization in any healthy sense is best learned in the family. Moreover, when the family is the faith center, the personal and the social aspects of life are learned under grace.

One of the curses of school life in the years since the secular revolution has been the rise of gangs. Earlier in the century, if two boys disagreed and fought, other boys formed a circle around them and broke up the fight if one of the two fought unfairly. Now a disagreement can lead to a gang assault on one boy.

Gang activity is socialization, non-Christian socialization, and the major form of such activity in many areas. There is nothing good as such in socialization: it can be either good or bad, and in a non-Christian context, is normally bad. Its most common expressions in many non-Christian circles are gang activities and lawless sexuality. Non-Christian socialization leads to immorality and the depersonalization of life. We need to make clear to these humanistic champions of socializing the child that their method is precisely the problem we want to avoid.

At present, many churches are in crisis because too many members' children are in state schools and their characters have been shaped by

Christ's enemies. Humanistic education denies that there is truth; it denies God. As one writer has stated it, citing Naum Gabo, "There is no such thing as absolute truth or falsity. Anything and everything can be both."[1] What is also being said is that there is no absolute meaning, if any meaning at all.

Grow or Die

Neither time nor man stand still. Our faith either grows or dies. We should not be surprised when artist Jean Dubuffet said, "I believe very much in the values of savagery; I mean, instinct, passion, mood, violence, madness."[2] We see all around us a polarization taking place, and, as unbelief deepens, so, too, does faith. Erich Kahler spoke some years ago of "the outspoken attempt to *produce incoherence*, a veritable cult of incoherence of sheer senselessness and aimlessness."[3]

As against this, Christian faith is becoming more consistently Biblical, more coherent, and more directed. Whereas a generation ago, children simply grew up biologically without too much direction, more and more Christian families are providing a strong focus and objective. Their children are remarkable in their faith and goals.

We are in the early stages of one of history's most dramatic struggles and shifts. At one time, the church dominated civilization, but during most of history the state has been the commanding force. Now we see a growing cynicism directed at the state. Earlier, revolutions were viewed as the corrective, but they usually produced a more evil state. Now we are seeing a double movement. On the one hand, humanism seeks a world state, a new tower of Babel. On the other hand, the family in Christ is decentralizing society by beginning with the education of its own children. The statists see the full extent of this threat and are attempting to destroy this movement. In this battle, the family is both gaining ground and is increasingly winning. God warned Zechariah against all who despise the day of small things (Zech. 4:10). To do so is to despise God's work among us.

1. James Johnson Sweeney, "Modern Art and Tradition," in Katherine S. Dreier, James Johnson Sweeney, and Naum Gabo, *Three Lectures on Modern Art* (Port Washington, NY: Kennkat Press, 1949), p. 47.

2. Katharine Kuh, *Break-Up: The Core of Modern Art* (Greenwich, CT: New York Graphic Society, 1966), p. 32.

3. Erich Kahler, *The Disintegration of Form in the Arts* (New York, NY: George Braziller Inc., 1968), p. 96.

281

FAMILY AND GOVERNMENT

Chalcedon Report No. 444, September 2002

Over the years, I have again and again stressed, in writings and lectures, the centrality of the family in God's plan. I have been bitterly criticized for this from more than one source. The fact remains that all the basic governmental powers in society, save one, the death penalty, have been given to the family, not to the state nor to the church. *First*, and foremost, is the control of children, and to teach, govern, and guide children means the control of the future. For this reason, the state seeks increasingly to usurp this power. The state's entrance into education has had as its goal the de-Christianization of society and decrease of the family's power. *Second*, in Biblical law, property is family-owned, a trust passed on to one's godly children and never seen as private property but as family property. This was Naboth's position in 1 Kings 21:1–2. The Biblical perspective provides the family with a solid and endearing basis in society and makes it a stable and enduring power. *Third*, inheritance is a family power. The godly seed must receive the inheritance, and the main heir has the care of the poorest. Such a view meant that the godly generation to come was always capitalized and enabled to command the future. Today, while we still have community property, alienation is permitted, and the godly seed are not necessarily favored. The state taxes both property and inheritance, contrary to God's law, and it thereby decapitalizes the family. *Fourth*, education, a family power, has become a state power. Here Christian and home schools are regaining lost ground, but much still remains to be done. *Fifth*, charity, the care of the needy, is in God's law a family duty. Modern welfarism has replaced this, with devastating results.

It is well now to review the basic areas of government. Our use of the word *government* is a deadly one: we tend to mean by it the *state*, what colonial Americans and early members of the republic *always* called

civil government. Unless we are totalitarians, the word *government* has a broader meaning. Its main references are as follows. *First*, the self-government of the Christian man is the primary sphere of government. The alternative to this is dictatorship, and, without Christian self-government, dictatorship is our logical goal. *Second*, the family is man's basic governmental unit. It is men's first church, school, economic sphere, and much, much more. It is central in God's law, and four of the Ten Commandments are family oriented. *Third*, the church is an area of government although now much weakened by hostile forces. *Fourth*, education or the school is a governing sphere. *Fifth*, our vocation or job governs us. *Sixth*, various voluntary agencies, the community, friends, and more, all govern us. *Seventh*, the state is a government, one among many. At present, the state seeks to govern and control all other spheres, and this is a revival of the ancient pagan powers of the state.

A mark of anti-Christianity is the move to strip the family of these powers. In Red China, it means a denial of the freedom to have more than one child. In almost every country today, the freedom of the family is under attack. In this century, attacks on Christianity have meant attacks on the family as much as the church.

Humanism

David Ehrenfeld, in *The Arrogance of Humanism* (1978), wrote of humanism as "the dominant religion of our time" (p. 3), and said that its

> core [is] a supreme faith in human reason, its ability to confront and solve the many problems that humans face, its ability to rearrange both the world of Nature and the affairs of men and women so that human life will prosper. Accordingly, as humanism is committed to an unquestioning faith in the power of reason, so it rejects other assertions of power, including the power of God, the power of supernatural forces, and even the undirected power of Nature in league with blind chance. The first two don't exist, according to humanism; the last can, with effort, be mastered. (p. 5)

Humanism thus begins by severely limiting the nature of reality to this world and especially to reason. Because of this, there is a marked hostility to Christianity and the family. Both are seen as basically irrational and therefore as roadblocks to progress. Man, instead of being viewed as a creature made in the image of God, is seen as an animal whose sole redeeming quality is his reason. The goal of society and of education becomes then the exercise and application of rationality, not the service and enjoyment of God forever. Man's goal becomes man himself as the high point of human evolution.

The Humanist's Answer to Man's Problems

As we look at the problems we face in our world today, we face a contradiction, in fact, a major division, in attempts to answer them. One began with President John F. Kennedy, who in a major speech defined mankind's problems as essentially no longer *moral* but essentially *technological*. He aptly described the cultural shift that has taken place. Education, humanistic education, and technology are the answers. Problem solving is now entirely shifted from morality and character to education and/or technology. Consider, for example, the so-called war on drugs. Information is provided, and scientific data is presented. Youth are then told, "Just say no." But to say *no* is a moral response. We know that the use of drugs is rare in Christian youth circles where a strong religious and moral teaching prevails, and yet our society refuses the Christian moral approach. The humanistic culture around us rejects the Biblical premise that the solution to social problems is a religious and moral one. Man is best governed when he governs himself in terms of God's grace, Word, and power. Scientific data on drugs converts no man, and the fear of consequences soon wanes. For example, herpes type 2, and then AIDS, *briefly* frightened many into some restraint in their sexual misconduct, but not for long. There is no substitute for a religious moral self-government, and all efforts which bypass the Christian solution are doomed to fail.

In the economic sphere, advancement is again a matter of character. Thrift plus work are necessary to capitalize a society. This the family does best. A sensate culture faces decapitalization. It is not an accident that five of the six major food-producing countries all reflect the character of Puritanism. Not natural resources, but faith and character determine most the ability of a people to develop economically.

The family is the key. Civilization requires faith and character, and the family is the God-ordained training ground for men and nations. Our problem today is the corruption of the family. A major concern of children in state schools is that, in terms of the standards of statist education, their parents are ignorant and retrogressive. These children should be ashamed of their schools; instead, they are ashamed of their parents, a clear signal of cultural decay. But, despite great hostilities, Christian families, homeschoolers, and Christian schoolers are taking the initiative in the restoration of Christian civilization. Instead of being schools for barbarians, they are schools for the children of the Great King.

282

FAMILY AND CIVILIZATION

Chalcedon Report No. 445, October 2002

To reduce civilization to political entities, races, nationalities, or other like groupings is to insure misunderstanding, for a civilization is at heart a *faith* and a *community*. The faith is of course *religious*. Civilization for us is a Christian one based on Jesus Christ as Lord and the Bible as God's enscriptured Word. But civilization is not only the expression of a faith, it is being part of a *community*. There is a very important distinction here that in our time is often obscured, the difference between *becoming a member*, as against *belonging*. We can become a member of a club, of a social circle, or of a church; but, where a family is concerned, we do not join it: we *belong* to it, and not by choice. Membership means choice, whereas belonging means no choice because it is something we are born into and, like our bodies, is always a part of us. This is God's ordination, not ours. We may rebel against God's choice, but to do so is useless and morally wrong. We can change churches, but we cannot alter the nature of our birth and its locale.

The Basic Community

Now, the family is the basic community; its ties are normally lifelong. But *faith* also means community, and Jesus Christ requires that, if need be, we leave father, mother, and children for His sake (Matt. 10:37). If *faith* and *family* coincide, we then have an especial strength as we face the world.

From the Christian perspective, faith and the family are basic to civilization, and culture is religion externalized, to use Henry R. Van Til's definition. From the viewpoint of humanism, education and technology are basic. One writer, for example, sees utopia ahead by means of licensing all parents, guaranteeing work for all, and so on and on, even

to ending death itself, and all progress is seen as inevitable because of evolution! Randall Craig Fasnacht (*Life Child: The End of Poverty*, *The Case for Licensing All Parents*, 1992) is indeed a man of great faith in Darwin's theory. Paul in 1 Corinthians 15:26 declares that Christ will finally destroy death itself. For Fasnacht, a blind, impersonal evolution will do so. The difference between the two positions is very great. For Fasnacht, civilization is an automatic goal of evolution, whereas for us it is the expression of a faith and a community. This impersonal and mechanical vein of things is currently responsible for our problems. Society is reduced to the outworking of blind, biological forces.

During the tenth century, there was a radical disintegration of public authority in Europe. Its origins were certainly in the decline of the faith, not impersonal, evolutionary sources. The revival of civilization came about because of a *faith* revival.

The family as a biological entity has received some attention in recent years from sociologists, and, while their approach is sometimes of interest, it is defective. The *Christian* family is more than a biological entity. On the biological side, the Christian family is an example of *redeemed* nature in that more than biology is involved in its life because we have in the Christian family *redeemed* nature plus *grace*. The Christian family cannot be reduced to its physical components because it is radically altered by grace. This means that a supernatural power has been introduced into history to alter it.

Serving Grace

The early church father, Lactantius, stressed the family as the center of community life. For him, the family was no longer a unit of the Roman state nor the servant of social goals, but a unit in the Kingdom of God. Its task is to serve God and to obey Him rather than being a humanistic agency.

This was a major revolutionary step in that nature was seen as called to submit to and serve grace. For the Romans, *piety* was the proper emotional attitude towards one's parents and the state. For Lactantius, "the contemplation of God is the reverence and worship of the common Parent of mankind." Lactantius used the word *humanity* and meant kindness and humaneness, that which is properly characteristic of man. In his words, "For what is humanity itself, but justice? What is justice, but piety? And piety is nothing else than the recognition of God as a parent."[1]

1. Lactantius, *The Divine Institutes*, bk. 3, chap. ix, in Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, eds., *Ante-Nicene Christian Library*, vol. 11, *Lactantius*, vol. 1, (Edinburgh, Scotland: T. & T. Clark, 1871), p. 157.

This is an important statement because God as the Father of all families requires justice, His law applied, and this means piety, reverencing Him as our Father. Civilization, then, is not a product of society and the state, but of men in families working together to apply God's law-word to every area of life and thought, with Jesus Christ as their Redeemer-King.

Civilizations in the broader sense have been created by fire and sword so that we can speak of Assyrian and ancient Chinese civilizations, but, in the Christian sense, civilization is a faith product which is inclusive of every area of life and thought and begins in the Christian family.

Earlier, we referred to the revival of civilization in tenth-century Europe. It was a faith revival, but its error was that it was state centered. Subsequent revivals of European civilization have been either state centered or church centered. What is now needed is one that is family centered.

Steven Ozment, in *When Fathers Ruled: Family Life in Reformation Europe* (1983), called attention to the impact of the Protestant Reformation on family life. Despite lingering medieval ideas, the Reformers saw that marriage and the family should serve, not church, state, or men, but the faith and Christ's Kingdom. Like church and state, the family should serve God. Because family life is most personal, it is thereby closer to the totally personal God. Celibacy was seen as a social error where stressed above marriage and the family, and, while the suppression of convents and monasteries by Henry VIII was evil and brutal as well as politically governed, in countries other than England, the movement was religious.

Earlier, as in the Cleric Reformation, monks had been the source of reform. After Luther and Calvin, the family slowly became the nursery of the faith. In the homeschool movement, a great development of this impetus is under way.

This meant, in the early years of the Reformation, a strong emphasis on informed and disciplined marriage. One aspect of this still survives in premarital counseling.

The trends towards the continuing reformation by means of the family were thwarted by an evil development which began in the eighteenth century with the Marquis de Sade and came into fruition with the modern twentieth-century sexual revolution. Neil Baldwin called it a movement believing in "the sovereignty of pleasure" (Neil Baldwin, *Man Ray: American Artist*, p. 213). Western civilization has moved from the sovereignty of God to the sovereignty of the state, then of man, and now to pleasure. This is a shift of very major dimensions.

What we see in such things as the homeschool movement is a reversal of this pattern. Two facets of this are especially revealing: it begins in the family, and its motivation is mainly Christian. This makes it an

important development and basic to any realistic appraisal of the future. When great numbers of parents tax themselves in money and time to homeschool or Christian school their children, we see a social change in the making, and a sign of the renewal of civilization.

EDUCATION

283

THE CHURCH AND THE SCHOOL

Chalcedon Report No. 154, June 1978

The meaning of the word *church* in Scripture is essentially congregation or assembly, i.e., the Kingdom of God in all its functions. As we analyze the meaning of the church in the Old Testament, the pattern for the New, we find that basic to the functioning of God's congregation is the work of the Levite. Tithes were paid to the Levite; the Levite apportioned them to the priests, to the musicians, to health, education, and welfare. The three basic responsibilities of the Levites were, *first*, the management of the tithe and tithe agencies; *second*, instruction in God's law-word (Deut. 33:10); and, *third*, supervision of sacrifices. Christ's atonement replaces this third function. It is clear, however, that education remains as central to the Levitical function, and the Levitical calling is instruction, not the direct ministry of the preaching of the Word, and administration of the sacraments. It is even more clear that this teaching function is basic to the life of Christ's church, so that Christian schools are not peripheral but central. Where this function is denied or controlled, as in the Soviet Union, the church declines dramatically. Where this function is revived, the life of the church flourishes. In the life of the church, the great leaders have been teachers, and the life of the church has been governed by this teaching function, as witness Anselm, Aquinas, Luther, and Calvin.

The modern state is at war with the church, and most directly with its teaching ministry, with its lifeblood. State after state seeks to control this Levitical function and to deny its centrality in the life of Christ's church. For the church to surrender this area to the state is to deny Jesus as Lord. For churchmen to submit the Levitical ministry into Caesar's hands and control is to forsake the faith.

284

DR. FRANKLIN MURPHY'S "CULTURAL AWAKENING"

Chalcedon Report No. 16, January 1, 1967

No better means of understanding the purpose or goal of modern education, and especially of colleges and universities, has been offered us by the opposition than a statement by Dr. Franklin Murphy, chancellor of the University of California at Los Angeles. This statement appeared in the "California Living" section of the *Los Angeles Herald-Examiner*, Sunday, December 11, 1966, in an article by John Bryan, "Franklin Murphy on the Return of Renaissance Man."

What we are rapidly moving into, according to Dr. Murphy, is a renaissance, i.e., a rebirth of man, but it is unlike the Italian Renaissance because "[i]t has few historical benchmarks"; in fact, "I think it's more of a revolution than a renaissance because it has very few roots in the past." This revolutionary change "is especially evident in the arts."

What are the sources of this glorious "cultural awakening"? reporter Bryan asked. "I'll list three major inputs," Dr. Murphy replied quickly. "First is the death of Calvinism, that set of traditions which said that to live richly in one's emotional life is a dishonorable thing for a man to do.

"Secondly . . . the impact of the scientific revolution. It's shaking up everybody's confidence that there are any timeless verities. It's leading to an acceptance of experimentation. That's almost the name of the current game.

"The third input is the growth of a new open-endedness, a willingness to look candidly at the old prejudices, which we find today in our entire society. All of this is producing what you may call a Renaissance man . . . what some have called a 'man for many seasons.'" Of course, he is not being born without a certain amount of friction. "People are having a hard time understanding, for instance, the reluctance of the Supreme

Court to restrict freedom of expression by rigid definitions of what is 'obscenity'" (p. 6).

Dr. Murphy felt that the Supreme Court justices actually "are a bit behind the times." For him, the purpose of the university is to create this renaissance man.

Now, all three of Dr. Murphy's "inputs" add up to one thing alone: the death of God, of morality, of truth. There must be no "timeless verities" or absolute truths, no absolute right and wrong — only "experimentation," total moral relativism. It is significant that Dr. Murphy called this "new man" *Renaissance Man*, because the Renaissance was dedicated to moral relativism. It held, according to John S. White, in *Renaissance Cavalier*, that "[g]ood and bad are not absolute concepts, but products of their time . . . Good is what conforms to its time, what corresponds to actual society — in other words, good usage. Bad is what is out of date — the antiquated" (p. 13).

This moral relativism, or moral anarchism, went hand in hand with statism and totalitarianism in the Renaissance, and the same is true today. Because moral relativism denies that there is an absolute right and wrong, it puts no moral limits on the powers of the state. Also, it does not allow any moral grounds for criticizing the state. If nothing is really evil, then nothing is really morally wrong with anything the state does. Wherever and whenever moral relativism flourishes, then and there totalitarian statism also flourishes. Dr. Murphy and other modern educators are thus educating for totalitarianism.

The Death of God movement which is at the heart of all this, is one of the most deeply rooted and most basic movements of our time. It states openly what is prevalent secretly.

One of the social effects of this decline of Biblical faith is the operation of the principle of Gresham's law in every realm. As the *Santa Ana Register* editorial of Monday, December 19, 1966, (p. B8), observed: "Gresham's law states that bad money drives out good money. The same principle appears to apply to people." Isaiah observed long ago that a religious and moral breakdown meant also a breakdown of authority: "As for my people, children are their oppressors, and women rule over them" (Isa. 3:12). In such an age, there is not only a desire to make the bad rulers, but the good see the futility of the situation and say, "make me not a ruler of the people" (Isa. 3:7), because they recognize that the people cannot be led except into evil and slavery. It is a dangerous education we are giving in our colleges and universities. It is education for slavery. We should not be surprised at the results.

285

GRAMMAR AND FAITH

Chalcedon Report No. 211, February 1983

In an interesting report on Shannon's theory of information, Jeremy Campbell, *Grammatical Man: Information, Entropy, Language, and Life* (1982), we have a return to a medieval definition of the word "Information." In terms of this, information is the form, meaning, or instructive force or character within all things. In terms of this, "nature" is not only matter and energy but also information.

One of the first points of attack this perspective takes is against *Darwinian* evolution (without abandoning evolution), because *information* is an anti-chance concept which recognizes a pattern in all things. It is not our concern here to dwell on the fact that there are very obvious connections between information theory and the ancient Greek doctrine of the idea or form. The theory reestablishes the place of meaning in the world in a particular form but is not thereby Christian.

The theory is important to Christians, however, because of its clear recognition of the place of law and meaning in all things. Of particular importance are the implications of the theory for man and for speech. As Campbell says, "Grammar is an anti-chance device, keeping sentences regular and law-abiding. It is a systematic code applied at the message source" (p. 165). Underneath all languages lie universal abstract principles and rules, and these are "unconscious systems of rules" (p. 172). "Universal grammar is the innate, anti-chance device in the brain which restricts syntax in this way" (p. 177), and, "Grammar can be thought of being like Kepler's laws of planetary motion," setting down the constraints which govern language (p. 179).

Let us briefly examine some of the implications of this for Christian thought. In our day, the teaching of grammar is at a low ebb, and we have a nation of functionally illiterate youth. These are products of statist

schools which are governed by a humanistic faith and the Darwinian worldview. They are thus reared systematically into a religion of chance.

There is, in the faith taught by the state schools, a denial of God and meaning, and an affirmation of chance. The validity of rules is denied, and grammar with it. In fact, the most recent dictionaries in many cases affirm this rejection of grammar and rules. The result has been a growing breakdown of language.

The Christian schools, on the other hand, begin with a Biblical faith, the triune God as Creator, and a universe of total meaning. They are thus by faith committed to a rejection of meaninglessness. It is natural and necessary for them to stress grammar, because by faith they are dedicated to a world of meaning. We should thus expect that, as their understanding of a faithfulness of the faith grows, Christian schools will increasingly excel in grammar and all things else. It is the Christian who through Scripture is informed by the word of God, reformed by Christ, confirmed by the Holy Spirit, and daily formed by the knowledge that this is a universe of total meaning whose Creator and meaning is His Lord. His faith is anti-chance, whereas the faith of the state schools is in chance and meaninglessness.

286

THE MEANING OF ACCREDITATION

Chalcedon Report No. 149, January 1978

A growing and central issue of our time is accreditation. The central area of conflict is with schools; in the background lurks another issue, the accreditation of churches (by welfare agencies, because of their nurseries; by councils of churches for their legitimacy, etc.).

Accreditation is an act of faith. We express our faith in someone when we go to them for accreditation, for approval. Paul speaks of accreditation when he tells Timothy, "Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth" (2 Tim. 2:15).

The root meaning of accreditation is *credo*, I believe. When a school goes to an accreditation council, it declares, I believe in you and in your word, and I present myself as one who seeks to be approved by you. If you approve of me, then I need not be ashamed, for then I teach the word of truth and respectability.

Again and again, we have seen seminaries established in order to reform the church. The new seminary wants to teach the true word, it claims, but one of its first steps is to seek accreditation. Very quickly, the new seminary begins to resemble the old, and, in all its ways, it seeks the approval of the very world of humanistic scholarship it abandoned. As a result, the new reform begins to resemble more and more the old sin.

This is no less true of Christian schools. Parents rebel against the corruptions produced by the humanistic state schools. Christian schools are started and flourish, but soon evil voices begin to promote the need for accreditation, and they seek the approval of the same corrupt system they abandoned. Such men are no different than the Israelites in the wilderness journey who said, "Let us make a captain, and let us return into Egypt" (Num. 14:4). Such men are governed by the principle of reprobation.

Whose approval do you seek? Where your faith is, there too is your source of accreditation. Those who seek accreditation from humanistic agencies carry within their heart the principle of captivity and sin. They feel naked if they stand in terms of the Lord and His Word, and they demand of the enemy, come and clothe us with the rags of your accreditation.

Accreditation is the humanistic form of circumcision or baptism. It summons the faithful humanists to show the marks of their faith and to witness to it. Accreditation councils simply require the faithful to stand up and be counted in terms of their faith in humanism and its agencies.

The real cause for the persecution of the Christian church by Rome was the refusal of the church to submit to licensure and taxation by Rome, i.e., to submit to state approval and accreditation. Rome promised to leave the church more or less alone if only Christian leaders would offer a little incense before Caesar's image and say, "Caesar is lord." They would then be licensed or accredited and free to go their way. Instead, Christians confessed, "Jesus is Lord," and resisted; the apostates were accredited. The same issue is with us today, and, again, the apostate cry is, what harm is there in licensure, in accreditation? The harm is still the same: another lord is confessed, another creed is affirmed, and another faith is put into practice.

287

CLASSICAL EDUCATION?

Chalcedon Report No. 386, September 1997

An absurd notion, much too prevalent in Christian and non-Christian circles, is that what our schools need is a return to a classical educational curriculum. This makes about as much sense as a return to Greco-Roman religion in order to have a true revival of religion.

Classical education, in all its forms, Greco-Roman, medieval, Renaissance, and modern, is essentially and radically humanistic. Do we want this?

In 1935, I found a local library that carried the works of the older Bohn translations and the new Loeb texts of classical writings, and, determined to educate myself, I began, systematically and omnivorously, to read these works. I soon realized how wayward and evil the older schooling had been. These classics were simply the body of thought setting forth the paganism of old and its adoption by elements within Christendom. (I learned years later that Otto Scott had come to a similar conclusion.)

Consider the writings of the Greek tragedians, Sophocles and Euripides. What is their essential message? It is a simple and evil one, namely, that man's fate is a perverse one because the gods have stacked the decks against mankind. A man, like Oedipus, is an innocent victim of the gods, who use him perversely to bring evil upon evil on him. If you want to hear the spirit of the Greek dramatists today, listen to juvenile delinquents and adult criminals justify themselves as the innocent victims of fate. That is what Greek drama was about.

In perpetuating these classics of old, not merely as documents of a failed culture but as timeless and enduring treasures of thought, the West has taken poison into its kitchen and fed itself with evil. The rebels against Christendom have been happy to center education on classical literature because thereby they have made a thoroughly anti-Christian

force basic to education. To add to this, Latin has been studied rather than Hebrew and Biblical Greek, although the contribution of the latter two has certainly been very great.

There is a place for classical literature if we face it realistically for what it was — the culture of humanism, of cruelty, of slavery, of evil. We need to challenge the old assumptions also, i.e., that Ciceronian Latin was better than medieval Latin. Why? Each was best adapted to its purpose, and church Latin had a greater subtlety as a philosophical and theological language.

Education is always future-oriented or it is dead. What faith and what ideas do we need to command the future? It was to John Dewey's credit that he substituted a living, twentieth-century humanism for an ancient and less relevant one. It is absurd to go back to what Dewey had the sense to discard. What sense was there in learning the names of the Greek and Roman gods and the histories of their silly escapades? And what value is there in a curriculum designed in terms of a Greco-Roman culture? Is it not stupidity to adopt a curriculum which even our humanists had the sense to discard? What pretentious nonsense is it for a church to boast that its *Christian* school is given to a *classical* curriculum?

A curriculum must provide a course, a highway, for life and action. It must relate the faith of the school to the life of its times. If it does not make that connection, its students will in time lapse into the evils of modern popular culture as they encounter it on all sides. Is it happening? A graduate of a large Christian school, attending the twenty-fifth-year reunion, found the faith of most to be marginal. They had received a superior grounding in basic education, but the Christian context was not there except as an altar call at special services. What they had received was at heart a conservative version of Dewey!

288

CLASSICAL LEARNING AND CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

Chalcedon Report No. 348, July 1994

A question being raised from time to time is about the value of including teaching in classical mythology in Christian schools. I strongly question its value on the grade- and high-school levels; many more important subjects deserve more attention and are more relevant to our educational goals. Some, of course, tend to disagree, among them my wife, Dorothy. She loves Milton's *L'Allegro* and *Il Penseroso*; almost every line of both has classical references. Good footnotes can take care of that knowledge; time in school deserves better use than learning about classical mythology. Such learning is, of course, always expurgated also.

The Greco-Roman gods and goddesses were an immoral lot because it was believed that the gods lived beyond morality. For them, incest, adultery, fornication, murder, and general lawlessness meant a way of life. It was a kind of executive privilege. Part of the prerequisites of deity was the right to be beyond the law.

We have an inheritance of this classical belief in the too prevalent idea of *executive privilege*. Its history in the Western world has been an ugly one, especially in our time. With the Roman emperors, it meant that, since with death they would be deified, with their exaltation to imperial power they began to violate, deliberately, all moral laws. Incest, homosexuality, and adultery were common offenses, *imperial privileges* of the budding gods in purple.

Christianity worked against this. Bishops would wash the feet of the very poor on occasion; St. Francis attested to his salvation by caring for lepers; devout kings would demonstrate a like humility at times.

With the Renaissance, the arrogant kings could care less for acts showing kindness to the poor. Most saw themselves as a breed apart, and

the poor became more poor than ever before in the Christian era. There had been immoral kings all too often in preceding centuries, but it was no longer seen as a sometimes defiant sin, but as a royal *privilege*. Step by step, the concept of a royal privilege extended to include homosexuality. The idea of the divine right of kings came to mean more than their right to rule: they were ostensibly above the moral law and censure.

This privileged status has been an implicit assumption since, by presidents, prime ministers, congressmen, and others.

Greco-Roman mythology exempted the gods from the moral law, and this kind of thinking has been deeply embedded in Western humanism. We do not need more of the same.

Classical mythology also stressed a very provincial religious perspective. Every city or country had, often, its own gods. Just as there was no overall moral law, so, too there was no overall God. There were gods many and laws many. This meant there were no universally binding laws. It made possible a tolerant view of the beliefs and practices of other peoples. Herodotus could write of evil alien practices with no more than an interest in freakish ways. Everyone had his or her "lifestyle," and these variations were viewed with curiosity, not with a belief in any universally binding right and wrong.

Without the Greco-Roman myths, we have the same morality today. It is a part of the intellectual air we breathe. Do we want more of the same?

The Greco-Roman mythology was essentially related to imperialism. Because it denied an overall moral law, there was no way of uniting peoples except by force. This meant that peoples were brought under Roman sway, for example, by force of arms because no other bond existed. Imperialism revived with modern humanism. As Christendom's religious and moral bond weakened, the urge to control and dominate others became the method of extending civilization. Armies, not missionaries, became the preferred means of extending culture and civilization, and the results we do not yet fully comprehend.

No more than we should revive and propagate the mythologies of cannibals do we need the classical mythology. Human sacrifices, by the way, were an essential part of classical life: the Romans sacrificed countless peoples. We have enough bents towards evil in our modern humanistic culture without borrowing ideas from the past.

289

EDUCATION AND LAW

Chalcedon Report No. 149, April 1999

THROUGHOUT history, religion, when successful, has best expressed itself in education and law. By means of some form of education, religions transmit themselves to children, to a people's future. By means of law, religion expresses itself in the government of people by defining good and evil.

Religions that fail to dominate and control education and law quickly become fading relics of the past, as was the case in the United States by 1950. The philosophy of John Dewey provided the nontheistic common faith of much of the world, especially the United States, and Deweyism was the humanistic religion of education taught by Dewey and his successors.

Meanwhile, millions of dead churchmen saw themselves as good Christians as they furthered anti-Christianity in education and law. More than a few churches with thousands of members have seen themselves as pillars of the faith while barring all reference to Christian day schools or homeschools, or any favorable stand on God's law.

Christians today thus have a very difficult position: how to save the coming generation from humanistic education and humanistic anti-Biblical law.

By God's providence, since the 1950s, a growing number of Christian and homeschools are in evidence, and more and more pastors are teaching God's law.

The future of a society is its education and law. The number of professing Christians does not have much to do with it because most profession is faith without works.

A culture is a religion in action, governing faith and life; for people to profess a faith means to apply it totally, to live by it in every aspect of

their being. I recall vividly, at the end of World War II, a young veteran, an American Indian, professed his faith in Jesus Christ as his Lord and Savior. His immediate desire was to reorder his total life in terms of the Bible. He began with tithing, a very easy first step, he called it, and continued it across the board. He saw himself as God's property.

Consider how much Christians could accomplish in our world if a considerable number took the same vein! Does our Lord expect anything less?

We have a tremendous task confronting us, a humanistic culture that is destroying Christendom. Here and there, men of God like Paul Lindstrom, Joseph Morecraft, Steve Schlissel, Ellsworth McIntyre, and others are confronting and conquering, but we need many more warriors of the Lord.

A different world requires a different people, and it is our task through Christian schooling to provide that different people. I had the privilege this week of listening to two homeschooled girls give evidence of their faith and learning. There is a splendor and magnificence to what we can accomplish in Christ. Let us, then, do it.

290

THE NECESSITY FOR CHRISTIAN SCHOOLS

Chalcedon Report No. 136, December 1976

"Jesus is Lord!" This is the summation of St. Peter's proclamation on the day of Pentecost (Acts 2:36) and of St. Paul's declaration in Philippians 2:9–11. The demand of Rome on the early Christians, when they were arrested, was to stand before the image of Caesar and declare, "Caesar is Lord." If they did so, they were free to practice their faith minus one ingredient: they could not declare "Jesus is Lord." These three words, however, were the basis of the first baptismal creeds.

What does it mean to declare "Jesus is Lord?" It means that Jesus is very God of very God, ruler over *every* realm, not merely in the future, but now. "All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made" (John 1:3). He *is* Lord now. As He declared, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth" (Matt. 28:18). Every sphere of life is thus under His authority: if it does not serve Him, He will in due time destroy it. This means, not the priority of the church but the priority of Christ the Lord. Both church and state must serve Christ the Lord. So too must the individual, the family, the arts and sciences, the vocations, recreation, all things, and this clearly includes the school.

There is no obligation for the school to be under the church's authority, and good reasons against it. The school does not belong to the state, nor to the teachers, not even to the parents, let alone the pupils. The school must be under the authority of Christ the Lord.

What does this mean educationally? It means that Bible study is not the only religious subject taught in a Christian school. Every subject is inescapably religious. It either sets forth in its premises and implications the Lord who made all things, or it presupposes an ocean of meaninglessness. (For a development of this for various fields of thought, see Gary North, ed., *The*

Foundations of Christian Scholarship [Vallecito, CA: Ross House Books]). The unity of all things is in the fact that Christ is their Creator and Lord.

Humanism seeks to unify all things under man. The result is statism, churchianity, or an educational bureaucracy. The assumption is that some elite men must control things, or trouble ensues. The result is a gradual slide into lukewarmness and fence straddling.

The Christian school, however, must separate itself from humanism in its every form. It must develop its own liberal arts curriculum. The liberal arts are literally the arts of freedom; such a curriculum is an education into freedom. For the orthodox Christian, Christ the Lord is the principle of freedom (John 8:34–36) and of truth (John 14:6). The curriculum premise is the Creator-Lord, who, having made all things, is also the source of all interpretation.

All education defines man's cultural task. For humanistic education, man's cultural task is to build the kingdom of man and to realize himself as a free, autonomous being. For Scripture, man's cultural task is to exercise dominion and to subdue the earth under God (Gen. 1:26–28), and to seek in all things first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness (Matt. 6:33). For humanism, man is sovereign and lord over all things; for Scripture, the triune God alone is Sovereign and Lord. As Christians, we must thus hold, in the words of Dr. Cornelius Van Til, "God is in control of history and all that comes to pass comes to pass because of his ultimate determination. Nothing less than this idea, directly taken from Scripture, will do justice to the unity of culture" (C. Van Til, *The Dilemma of Education*, p. 47).

The Christian school therefore must train youth in the art of freedom, Christian faith and knowledge, so that they may *occupy* (Luke 19:13) every area of life and thought for Christ the Lord.

More than all others, the orthodox Christian stresses education, because he alone has the faith which makes education possible. Unlike all other faiths, Scripture gives us God's infallible word, propositional truth. On any other foundation than propositional truth, meaning wavers and disappears, and education becomes finally impossible as Gunther Stent, a humanist, admits in *The Coming of the Golden Age: A View of the End of Progress* (1969). Only the sovereign Lord who created and totally governs all things can speak a true and infallible word, because His Word alone is total in knowledge and power. As a result, education can only endure if it is Christian. It is not an accident of history that schooling has thrived in Christendom, nor is it an accident that humanistic education is now in chaos and decay.

The Christian school is therefore a necessity. There can be no Christian future without the Christian School *and* a Christian curriculum.

AMERICAN HISTORY

BIBLICAL FAITH AND AMERICAN HISTORY, PART 1: THE PAST

Chalcedon Report No. 435, November 2001

BIBLICAL faith, *first* of all, begins with the sovereign God Who, in His grace and mercy, redeems man through the atoning work of Jesus Christ. Because God is sovereign, His work of salvation is an act of sovereign grace. Anything short of this is not scriptural: it is another religion, whatever its ostensibly Christian form. Jesus Christ cannot be our Savior if He is not Lord.

Second, because God is the total and sovereign God, our faith cannot be only a spiritual concern. The totally sovereign God is Lord over every aspect of life. All things are created, predestined, governed, and judged by Him. As a result, the Bible legislates concerning every area of life, church, state, school, family, science, the arts, economics, vocations, things spiritual, and things material. Neoplatonism, however, regarded the material world as low and irrelevant to religion. As a result, wherever Neoplatonism is in evidence, Christian faith is reduced to a spiritual religion.

Neoplatonism in the Church

St. Augustine, to whom the church owes so much for his emphasis on God's predestination, was inconsistent as he turned from God to the world. His Neoplatonism took over, and he surrendered the world and history to the enemy. The work of the Christian was substantially reduced to soul-saving. As Tuveson wrote of Augustine, "He viewed religion as essentially an individual experience, an immediate transforming contact of the soul with divine truth and grace."[1] This emphasis, in

1. Ernest Lee Tuveson, *Millennium and Utopia* (Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith, [1964] 1972), p. 15.

Augustine and in all his successors to the present, led to a rereading of the Bible as a book of spiritual comfort for the soul. Whether interpreting the laws of Exodus, Leviticus, and Deuteronomy, or the book of Revelation, everything was spiritualized and made a message for the soul. The colors used in the tabernacle, and the numbers cited in prophecies, came to have spiritual messages of great import, whereas the very obvious meanings were bypassed as carnal, and intended for a carnal generation.

Augustine, by his emphasis on God's predestination, was a major influence on the Reformation and a father thereof. However, because of his Neoplatonic elements, he was also the father of the Roman Catholic Church, and of fundamentalism, Lutheranism, and amillennial Calvinism. Because the material world was only a vale of darkness for the soul to pass through, the church came to be the only truly Christian institution and was exalted even as the state, family, and much else were downgraded. We fail to remember that very early the church, under the influence of Neoplatonism, came to regard the family with distrust as a law and carnal domain.

Augustine's influence on eschatology prevailed for a thousand years, and is again with us. With the decline of Neoplatonism, there was a revival of postmillennialism. One of its consequences was the great age of exploration. There are many indications that the Americas were repeatedly "discovered" over the centuries, by Europeans and Asiatics, by Phoenicians and Arabs from the Middle East, by Chinese, Norsemen, and perhaps other Europeans. Nothing came of these "discoveries." The thinking of the times did not make a new land significant. Only as postmillennialism began to emerge, and with it a new sense of the Great Commission, did men set out to explore and to exercise dominion. Most of the explorers, from Columbus on, whatever their faults, did have a postmillennial and missionary motivation as well as an economic one. The economic concern, in fact, was an aspect of a renewed sense of the creation mandate to exercise dominion and to subdue the earth.

Every area of life began to be viewed in Biblical terms. Early in church history, the very strongly Hellenic Origen had castrated himself to escape the flesh, only to find that lust begins in the mind and heart of man. In the Middle Ages, the Song of Solomon was spiritualized and turned into nonsense. Puritan divines like William Gouge and others referred to it as a source of instruction in perfect married love. A favorite Puritan text was Genesis 26:8, which tells of Isaac "sporting" with his wife Rebekah. The Puritans used this text to attack stoical abstinence and sacerdotal celibacy, of which Gouge said that it was, "A disposition no way warranted by the Word." Thomas Gataker, in a marriage sermon of 1620, attacked

the idea that Biblical faith is indifferent to things physical or disinterested in marital joys. This false picture of Biblical faith, he declared, is:

> An illusion of Sathan, whereby he usually perswades the merry Greekes of the world; That if they should once devote themselves to the Service of Jesus Christ, that then they must bid an everlasting farewell to all mirth and delight; that then all their merry dayes are gone; that in the kingdome of Christ, there is nothing, but sighing and groning, and fasting and prayer. But see here the contrary: even in the kingdome of Christ, and in his House, there is marrying and giving in marriage, drinking of wine, feasting, and rejoicing even in the very face of Christ.[2]

Erasmus had spoken of marriage as being perfected in abstinence from sexual intercourse. The prominent Elizabethan Puritan Henry Smith declared that 1 Corinthians 7:3 is "[A] commandment to yield this duty [sexual intercourse], that which is commanded is lawful; and not to doe it, is a breach of the commandment." William Whately said that neither husband nor wife can "without grievous sinne deny it" when the other wishes intercourse. Gouge spoke of marital sex as "one of the most proper and essential acts of marriage." In Massachusetts, in the Middlesex County Court in 1666, Edmund Pinson complained that Richard Dexter had slandered him by stating that Pinson had broken his wife's heart with grief because "that he wold be absent from her 3 weeks together when he was at home, and wold never come nere her, and such like."[3]

Only a few generations previously, it was a mark of saintliness to be abstinent in marriage; now it was slander to be charged with it! The change was great and dramatic. The change, however, was not limited to marriage. In every area of life, man was to delight himself in God's salvation, the joys of covenant life, physical and spiritual, and to move forward confidently to exercise dominion and to subdue the earth. The material world was now important because God created it, and because God required man to subdue it, exercise dominion over it, and to rejoice therein before the Lord.

The Mission of American Puritans

American Puritanism thus self-consciously set out to establish God's New Zion on earth, and to make America the base from whence the

2. Thomas Gataker and William Bradshaw, *Two Marriage Sermons* (London, 1620), p. 14, cited by Roland M. Frye, "The Teaching of Classical Puritanism on Conjugal Love," in Arnold Stein, ed., *On Milton's Poetry* (Greenwich, CT: Fawcett Publications, 1970), p. 104.

3. ibid., pp. 105–106.

world was to be conquered. The great missionary movement of the nineteenth century and the early twentieth century was one result. In 1654, Captain Edward Johnson published in London his *A History of New England, or Wonder-Working Providence of Sion's Saviour in New England* in order to enlist Christians to colonize the new world, declaring:

> Christ Jesus intending to manifest his Kingly Office toward his Churches far more fully than every yet the Sons of men saw stirres up his servants as the Heralds of a King to make this Proclamation for Voluntiers as followeth.
>
> Oh yes! Oh yes! All you the people of Christ that are here Oppressed, imprisoned and scurrilously derided, gather yourselves together, your wives and little ones, in answer to your several Names as you shall be shipped for his service, in the Westerne World, and more especially for planting the united Collonies of new England; Where you are to attend the service of the King of Kings, upon the divulging of this Proclamation by his Heralds at Armes.
>
> Could Casar so suddenly fetch over fresh forces from Europe to Asia, Pumpy to foyle? How much more shall Christ who created all power, call over this 900 league Ocean at his pleasure, such instruments as he thinks meete to make use of this place. Know this is the place where the Lord will create a new Heaven, and a new Earth, in new Churches, and a new Commonwealth together.[4]

The Puritans had a blueprint for the "new Heaven, and a New Earth, in new Churches, and a new Commonwealth" which the Lord planned to build in America. This blueprint was the Bible. Tuveson has observed:

> The English, it has been truly said, are the people of a book the Bible. Not the least important result of their pre-occupation with the Word was that they, as well as their fellow Protestants in other countries, came into close contact with a philosophy of history far more sophisticated, far more universal and yet more flexible than any the great classical tradition provided.[5]

Even more, Americans became the people of the book, and the tremendous expansive energy of both English and Americans. The eschatological vitality of both came from the postmillennial faith which for a time dominated thinking in both countries.

The New Model

It was not surprising, therefore, in view of the Puritan dedication to Scripture, that they looked to the Bible not only for a new model for the church but also for the state. From the very beginning, the colonies,

4. Albert Bushnell Hart, *American History Told by Contemporaries*, vol. 1 (New York: Macmillan, 1898), pp. 366–367.

5. Tuveson, *Millennium and Utopia*, p. 4.

especially in New England, looked to the Bible for their laws. Because of the royal overlordship where colonial charters were concerned, a certain amount of English royal law was also retained to avoid conflicts with the Crown. But the Puritans essentially wanted a new model, one based on Scripture, for every area of life; we have Cromwell's New Model Army; we have new model churches; in one case after another, things were refashioned in terms of Scripture.

According to a modern fallacy, begotten of antinomianism, Scripture is only partially law, and that law can be divided into ceremonial, civil, and moral. Such a distinction, *first* of all, leaves very little of the Bible as law. *Second*, the division is artificial. The so-called ceremonial law is intensely moral: it deals with the fact of sin and God's plan of atonement; civil law is as moral as any law can be, since it deals with theft, murder, false witness, adultery, crime, and punishment in every form.

This fallacy does have roots in some antinomian Puritans, but the more common view of the Puritans was to view all of Scripture as the law of God. The *only* kind of word the sovereign God can speak, they assumed rightly, is a sovereign word, a law-word because it is a binding word. A sovereign God cannot speak an uncertain or a tentative word. As a result, Puritans searched Scripture for guidance in every area of life, because Scripture to them was indeed God's binding and infallible Word.

It should thus not surprise us that they turned to and used Biblical law. Not until the Cambridge Platonists introduced Neoplatonism into Puritanism, and thereby hamstrung it, did they cease to show an interest in Biblical law. It was God's ordained means of building His New Zion in America and using America as a means of conquering the whole world.

The medieval preacher looked for allegories in Scripture and for non-historical and spiritual meanings. The Puritan looked for laws of living, for mandates in personal, family, church, school, state, vocational, and social living. His purpose was both practical and theological, to establish God's New Zion in America.

As a result, a characteristic complaint began to mark the American pulpit from the second generation in New England to all of America today, the jeremiad. The jeremiad is a lamentation that the nation is faithless to its covenant God. It assumes a particular responsibility by the American people to be faithful to the Lord because they have been particularly blessed by Him. Whereas in France the appeal to national renewal is humanistic and cites "the glory of France" as the impetus, in America the impetus is religious very commonly, and is theological in its concern and emphasis.

The framework of American life, thus, has been theological. We may

find fault with the developments of that theology, and the departures from it, but America's theological context is very real. Thus, whatever else we may say about "The Battle Hymn of the Republic," it clearly sees America's mission, even with, if not emphatically with, its armies to be a manifestation of God's justice and judgment. The coming of the armies is identified with the coming of the Lord in judgment. Its chorus is a triumphant hymn of praise, a doxology: "Glory, glory, Hallelujah, Our God is marching on!" In the twentieth century, even non-Christians spoke readily and freely on "the mission of America." The Puritan current is still strong, even among those who reject it.

BIBLICAL FAITH AND AMERICAN HISTORY, PART 2: THE PRESENT

Chalcedon Report No. 436, December 2001

We cannot begin to understand the present condition of the United States apart from the decline of the Reformed faith. The War of Independence was a triumph for Puritan postmillennialism, but it was also a major factor in its decline. The Puritan faith suffered on two counts. *First*, because the war was so closely identified with Puritanism, and especially with Scotch-Irish Presbyterians, all Puritan pastors, of whatever church affiliation, were very active in the chaplainry. The churches suffered to a degree from this loss. *Second*, and more important, many of their churches were destroyed, deliberately burned by the British forces. This constituted a major and devastating loss to an already sometimes impoverished people. From this setback, Puritanism never fully recovered. Instead of facing people in a time of peace with a commanding position, Puritanism came through the war with disastrous losses and disorganization.

At the same time as the Augustinian faith in God's decree was declining, an Augustinian despair was flourishing. Instead of the confident hope that Christ's Kingdom would prevail, there was now a belief, strengthened by the French Revolution, that man, godless man, rather than Christ, would command the nations. As a result, the medieval idea that the church is man's only hope in this world, and that the church must be a convent or monastery for Christians to retreat into, captured America. The result was *revivalism*.

The Scourge of Revivalism

With revivalism, dramatic changes took place. Alexander Hamilton, seeing the drift away from a Christian emphasis, had planned before his

death to start a new political entity called the Christian Constitutional Society. With the new monastic spirit, such an idea was impossible. Politics was left to the politicians; Christians were intent upon secularizing the political order. Election sermons and the old Puritan concern with civil government now became obsolete, and even seen as evidence of *worldliness*.

The very term *worldliness* took on a monastic meaning. It did not mean an *ungodly* concern with the world, but *any* genuine concern with the world.

A similar and far-reaching change took place in education. Earlier, *all* education had been Christian; only Christian schools and colleges existed. Within a few years after revivalism began, the move for state control of education was underway. Some revivalists denounced Christian schools as ungodly. It was held that Christian schools substituted knowledge for the revival experience, and nurture for regeneration. A more clean-cut conversion experience could take place, it was held, if a person's mind were not cluttered with knowledge of the Scriptures. We should remember that, in the revival movement inaugurated by Charles G. Finney, even Bible reading in revival meetings was held to have a bad and cooling or cold-water effect on those present.

The key term and emphasis was *soul-saving*. But this is not all. The revivalists acted as though there had been virtually no souls saved until they came along, as though all who had preceded them were not pastors or shepherds, but rather wolves. Moreover, the very term *soul-saving* took on a new meaning. *Soul* in Scripture means very commonly *the life of a man*, so that Biblical soul-saving is concerned with the total life and being of a man, and soul-saving means the regeneration of the whole man. Salvation now was by implication limited to one side of a man, his soul or spirit, and salvation had an inner meaning rather than a total and cosmic meaning.

The result was a retreat from the world, and from the whole life of man, into this redefined soul. Jesus Christ as Savior was now limited in His function to being simply a soul-savior. Not surprisingly, by the twentieth century, Rev. Carl McIntire logically insisted on denying the creation mandate, and Bob Jones University denied the Lordship of Jesus prior to the premillennial kingdom. The logic of Arminianism required a surrender of Christ's kingship and a reduction of His role to that of a Savior. Even this role was a diminished one because of the denial of sovereign grace. Man was in effect the savior; man chose or denied Christ; man made the decision and the decree. Predestination was transferred from God to man.

The Scourge of Arminianism

Arminianism thus transferred the government from Christ's shoulders to man's. This means that there is no *Biblical* gospel for society, but only a humanistic or *social* gospel. Modernism was a product of revivalism, and some *Arminian scholars are happy to point out that revivalism gave birth to the social gospel. Arminian fundamentalism and the modernistic social gospel are twins born of a common parentage, the denial of sovereign grace*. Not surprisingly, there is an increasing receptivity of Arminian fundamentalism to the social gospel.

When Pilate told Jesus that His "own nation and chief priests" had delivered Him, their King (John 18:33–35), Jesus made it clear that He was not a King whose kingship came from men: "My kingdom is not of this world" (John 18:36), i.e., it is not derived *from* this world, but is *over* this world, and it is "My kingdom."

Arminianism places Christ's Kingdom either in the future (the millennium) or outside this world. The Barthians, for example, insist on working for a socialist order, but they are emphatic on declaring God to be "the wholly Other," totally beyond and outside this world, so that it has no real relevancy to our world today. The revivalist sees the Kingdom as only in the millennium, or in the world beyond the Second Coming.

The results of such a theology are very much with us. In a country where more than half of the people are church members, this convent or monastic attitude with respect to Christ's rule has led to a surrender of the world to man. The real problem in the United States is Arminianism, which is a form of *modified unbelief. Arminianism proposes belief in Jesus Christ, but acts on belief in man*. The result of such a profession is exactly what we have in the United States today.

Our *central* problem is thus not open atheism nor open humanism, serious problems though both clearly are. It is false theology, Arminianism. In most Western countries, open humanism is operative, or nominal religion with tacit humanism. In the United States, it is Arminianism; while Arminianism is akin to and of the family of humanism, it is still different, and it presents a Christian façade. It is significant that from the 1950s into the 1970s, the one man in the United States who has continued to be the most significant and highly regarded public figure is the revivalist, the Reverend Billy Graham. During those same years, when a minister received the highest national status in Washington, D.C. ever accorded to any minister, the United States also suffered the most serious moral disintegration. Abortion became legal, the death penalty virtually abolished, the sexual revolution under way, socialism in rapid control,

welfarism rampant, and hedonism commonplace.

The coincidence of these two factors is *not* accidental. Where men adopt so organized a surrender of the crown rights of King Jesus over the world, of necessity it must have practical consequences. The surrender of the world coincides with the growth of a false spirituality.

The United States Constitution, in its monetary clauses, shows clearly the influence of the Reverend John Witherspoon, whose hard-money, gold-standard principles have left their mark on America. Today, some pastors *denounce* interest in gold or silver, in economics, as unspiritual. The gap between Witherspoon and the present is very great, and the reason for that gap is Arminianism.

The only remedy, therefore, is the Reformed faith, the proclamation of the sovereign God, His sovereign grace, and His sovereign law.

BIBLICAL FAITH AND AMERICAN HISTORY, PART 3: THE FUTURE

Chalcedon Report No. 437, January 2002

Early in the twentieth century, American radicals, sharply aware of the irrelevance of the church, caricatured its role and message savagely and sometimes blasphemously. The most popular such caricature was the hymn, "In the Sweet By and By," which became, "Pies in the Sky, By and By." The fundamentalists only became more monastic, whereas the modernists adopted all the more the socialism of the radicals.

The net result was that Biblical faith was denied by both, and the faith made unreal. The churches grew numerically, but meanwhile declined in strength and in effectiveness. The change between even the late 1940s and the 1970s was dramatically illustrated by a nurse, who after some years of absence from nursing, returned to the hospital where she began her career. It was in a Southern city, deep in the Bible Belt, where almost everyone attends church, and most churches are fundamentalist. Earlier, emergency patients coming to the hospital prayed and asked for their pastor. In the 1970s, after two years of experience, she found only one person who even mentioned the Lord at the time of crisis. The rest were pleased the next day when their pastor called, but their professed faith was not essential to them. Because God is sovereign and absolute, our faith in Him will either govern every area of life, thought, and being, or finally He will be rejected in all. We cannot have half a God: Biblical religion is an all-or-nothing proposition. But men want the form of godliness, but not God. They attempt to use the church as a hiding place from God. St. Paul warned Timothy against all such, who are men "having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away" (2 Tim. 3:5). The modern church, however, modernist and fundamentalist, is bent on pleasing all such rather than turning away from them.

The result is cheap religion, very popular religion, because it promises heaven without any cost to man. It is antinomian religion: it requires no fruit-bearing to the Lord, no tithing, no growth, only a "decision" for Christ, who is expected then to be grateful and mindful of man the sovereign. Such religion is like the seed sown on stony ground, which tribulation or persecution quickly destroys (Matt. 13:18–22). It has a very promising present, but no future.

What, then, is the future for the Christian faith in America? The growing crisis in the United States, an aspect of world crisis greater than the world has ever known, is the crisis of humanism and its sister, Arminianism. The crisis created by humanism and Arminianism is now threatening to destroy them. Men are working to postpone the reckoning, to create stopgap solutions, and to put Band-Aids on the cancer of civilization, but it will not work.

Either the world will settle miserably into a dark age of savage character, or it will be captured by Biblical faith. There are no other alternatives.

This crisis places a great responsibility on the champions of sovereign grace. Their faith must be more than churchianity: it must rather be the declaration of the crown rights of King Jesus in every area of life. Christ the King must command the person, church, state, school, family, vocations, the arts and sciences, and all things else. He must be served by man wherever he is and with all his heart, mind, and being.

Is this possible? Can the small numbers of sovereign-grace men triumph in the face of so great an enemy? The answer is simply this: it is impossible for the sovereign God not to conquer. His purpose in all these things is to shake all things which can be shaken, so that alone will stand that which cannot be shaken (Heb. 12:25–29).

The Scriptures are clear, moreover, that the power of evil, however seemingly great and entrenched, is a short-term matter. David, who saw the wicked flourish and hunt him like a wild animal, still could declare, "Many sorrows shall be to the wicked: but he that trusteth in the Lord, mercy shall compass him about" (Ps. 32:10). Again, he declares, "For the arms of the wicked shall be broken: but the Lord upholdeth the righteous" (Ps. 37:17). Indeed, "The meek shall inherit the earth; and shall delight themselves in the abundance of peace" (Ps. 37:11, cf. v. 10).

Asaph declares, "For, lo, they that are far from thee shall perish: thou hast destroyed all them that go a whoring from thee" (Ps. 73:27). Solomon makes clear God's purpose:

> For the upright shall dwell in the land, and the perfect shall remain in it, But the wicked shall be cut off from the earth, and the transgressors shall be rooted out of it. (Prov. 2:21–22)

Our Lord concludes His Sermon on the Mount by declaring that every "house," i.e., person, life, institution, church, or nation, which is built upon sand shall perish in the judgments which God regularly sends upon earth, whereas only the persons, institutions, and nations which are established upon the Rock, Jesus Christ Himself, shall stand the shakings and testings (Matt. 7:24–27).

We are approaching such a time of judgment. All other houses shall fall and be swept away by the winds of history and the floods of judgment. Only those who build upon Christ the Lord will endure.

This, then, is *a time for building*, for building on the foundation of Jesus Christ. Christian schools, churches, seminaries, political agencies, economic enterprises, vocational ventures, and much, much more must be started, wisely and carefully, but also eagerly as an opportunity for setting forth the crown rights of Christ the King.

This has already begun. In one area alone, the world is startled by our success. Christian schools are growing steadily and commanding even the children of the unbelieving. Those who a few years ago believed that the Reformed faith was dead are now being challenged by it on all sides. New churches are appearing, and the cause of sovereign grace is rapidly expanding. We are on the verge of the greatest growth in scope and power of truly Biblical faith which the world has ever seen.

The motto of the state of Nevada is an apt one for our cause: "Battle Born." In the parable of the sower, the heat of the sun, adversity, causes the false seed to perish, because of the stony ground of their being. Adversity only strengthens the godly. Battle born, they grow in adversity and become strong men in Christ. The future thus is ours in Christ, because "the earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof; the world, and they that dwell therein" (Ps. 24:1). We are fighting on home ground under the Sovereign Lord of all creation. We are battle born, fighting on home ground, under Christ the King. With St. Paul we must say, "If God be for us, who can be against us?" (Rom. 8:31).

POLITICS & GOVERNMENT

294

UNCONDITIONAL LOVE, ETC.

Chalcedon Report No. 30, February 1, 1968

WANT to subvert a social order and sound noble and beautiful doing it? It's easy: demand love and forgiveness for everybody and everything. With "love and forgiveness" on a total basis, you can destroy all laws, empty prisons, handcuff justice, and make evil triumphant.

Unconditional love is a more revolutionary concept than any other doctrine of revolution. Unconditional love means the end of all discrimination between good and evil, right and wrong, better and worse, friend and enemy, and all things else. Whenever anyone asks you to love unconditionally, they are asking you to surrender unconditionally to the enemy.

Unconditional love is contrary to the Bible. The charge of the young prophet Jehu, the son of Hanani, to King Jehoshaphat was blunt: "Shouldest thou help the ungodly, and love them that hate the LORD? therefore is wrath upon thee from before the LORD" (2 Chron. 19:2). The commandment is, "Ye that love the LORD, hate evil" (Ps. 97:10), and the prophet Amos repeated it: "Hate the evil, and love the good, and establish judgment in the gate [i.e., in the city council]" (Amos 5:15). David could therefore say of himself, in speaking of his obedience, "Do not I hate them, O LORD, that hate thee? and am not I grieved with those that rise up against thee? I hate them with a perfect hatred: I count them mine enemies" (Ps. 139:21–22).

We are told to love *our* enemies, that is, those who offend us personally on nonreligious and nonmoral issues. When the cause of division is petty and personal, we must rise above it with an attitude of law and justice; we must continue to extend to all such persons the full protection of the law from injustice, malice, and false witness. But the enemies of God's justice and God's law, of fundamental law and order, must not be loved. To love them is to condone their evil. The accusation of the

psalmist is to the point: "When you see a thief, you delight to associate with him, and you take part with adulterers" (Ps. 50:18, Berkeley Version). What we condone morally, we also approve of or delight in. St. John forbad hospitality to those who were trying to subvert the faith: "If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed: For he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds" (2 John 10–11).

Those who preach unconditional love are simply trying to disarm godly people in order that evil may triumph.

The same is true of the idea of unconditional forgiveness. Forgiveness in the Bible is always conditional upon true repentance. Unconditional forgiveness is simply the total, unconditional toleration of and acceptance of evil. It demands that we accept the criminal, the pervert, the degenerate, the subversive *as they are*. But to do so means that *we must change*. We must surrender our laws, faith, religious standards, and all godly order. The demands for unconditional love and unconditional forgiveness are demands for total change on our part, total revolution in society. They are in reality demands that we commit suicide in order that evil may live.

Anyone who subscribes to the doctrines of unconditional love and unconditional forgiveness is either a fool or a knave and very probably both. These doctrines demand a love of evil and a hatred of good, and they are aimed at the destruction of godly law and order.

This anarchistic, anti-Christian doctrine of love erodes law and brings in a breed of sentimental, antinomian (i.e., anti-law) preachers, and a breed of lawless rulers, politicians, and bureaucrats who have no regard for law and cater to feelings, and mob feelings increasingly govern them.

There are basically four kinds of politicians. *First*, there are the professional, practical politicians who are men without principles and who are basically interested in staying in office. There are many such men today. They respond basically to pressure and to money. Principles do not move them: self-interest does. The less godly law and order there is in an age, the more these practical politicians respond like weathervanes to pressure. They are the creatures of the establishment, of the mob, and of any and every force that blows their way: they are weathervanes.

Second, there are the idealists in politics, and I here use the word idea and idealist in its original meaning. An idealist is a man who has an idea, ideal, pattern, or goal to which he tries to push humanity. The ancient Greeks, especially Plato, were great idealists, and their legends also contain the best satire on idealism in the myth of the robber Procrustes, who either stretched his victims to fit his standard bed, or else amputated them

if they were too long. This is the technique of the idealist, whether he be Marxist, Fabian, or democratic; the idealist will sacrifice man and God to achieve his ideal communist, socialist, or democratic order. The idealist, whether Plato, Rousseau, Marx, or a contemporary liberal, believes that it is the environment which is evil and man who is good. Since man is good, who is better and more trustworthy than the elite man, namely, himself, the idealist? The idealist is thus a moral monster who confuses himself with God and seeks to destroy the world in order to remake it in terms of his ideal. Since he sees no evil in himself, he is intensely dangerous. And the first step towards remaking the world is for him the destruction of God's world, which means a dedication to revolution. Our politics today is saturated with idealism.

Third, some men enter politics in anger at the knaves who predominate in it, at the weathervanes and at the procrustean idealists. These men lack faith; they are governed by nostalgia for the past, or love of the past, *not* by a systematic body of principles, by a religious philosophy and faith, which guides their whole being. The longer they remain in politics, the more they become *cynics*. They begin with a love of country and a love of their follow citizens; they end with a contempt for their stupid fellow men. The *cynic* thinks of man as a pig and a dog, a fool to be conned. The next step, which he often takes unconsciously, is to become himself the con man who takes the greedy fools for everything they have. The purpose of the cynic in politics becomes, then, *power*, naked power, although in the early stages he does not always recognize it. Abe Ruef, the most notorious politician in California history, began as an idealist bent on reforming society and ended as a cynic who organized his powerful "System" to control the state. Napoleon, too, began as an idealist, an earnest believer in the revolution, but he changed his mind during the Egyptian campaign. He decided that men were little better than dogs, governed basically by lust, hunger, and greed, and he began to move in terms of exploiting that situation. The *cynic* in politics is thus a dangerous man also, and we have them with us.

Fourth, the Christian in politics is governed not by his dreams or by man's sin, but by God's law. His perspective is not man but God. He moves in terms of objective law, in terms of fundamental justice. His purpose is to place himself, man, and society under God, and under godly law and order. Because he believes in the sovereignty of God, he refuses to accept the sovereignty of either man or the state. He believes in limited powers and limited liberties for both man and the state, a principle early established in America by the Reverend John Cotton and basic to American constitutionalism. This, then, is the Christian in politics, a rare man these days.

In the churches, we have similar men, and the Christian is almost as rare as in politics. Some years ago, I heard a churchman, holding now one of the highest positions in a major branch of the church, describe in my presence the ideal symbol of a true church: a weathervane! (There was one on top of the very large church where he was speaking.) The weathervane, he said, meant *sensitivity*, and a church should be sensitive to the people and to "revolutionary ferment." I asked him later if the weathervane did not suggest to him a symbol of spinelessness and no personal standards, no caliber of resistance to evil. He answered that he had never thought of it in that way.

But to return to love. Modern doctrines of love are simply doctrines of anarchism, of total receptivity to evil. Their purpose is to break down the differentiation between good and evil and to produce lawlessness. Modern sensitivity training has this function. It is a part of the love religion: it demands total receptivity to the world and a submission to it rather than a resistance to evil in terms of God's law. Its goal is to teach a love of evil and a hatred of good.

The love religionists and love politicians are also strong advocates of equalitarianism and of equal rights causes. Total equality means that good and evil are on the same level and without differentiation. Evil must then have equal rights with good, and the criminal must have equal rights with the good citizen. This means that the criminal must have the same freedom to rob and kill that you want in order to support your family and worship God. Strict champions of equal rights like the Marquis de Sade (whose works are now being translated and published) demand precisely this, equal rights for the criminal, which means simply that the criminal has a right to rob and kill you, and you have a duty to submit to him, or else you will violate his rights.

The goal is total revolution. The language is love, forgiveness, and sensitivity: its function is subversion and destruction.

Solomon said it wisely long ago: "To every thing there is a season . . . A time to love, and a time to hate; a time of war, and a time of peace" (Eccles. 3:1, 8). We had better know it.

295

THE COLLAPSING RIGHT WING

Chalcedon Report No. 408, July 1999

The centuries between the fall of Rome and the Renaissance were named the "medieval era" or the "Dark Ages" by the historians of the later Middle Ages because they were seen as a lapse in the culture of Greco-Roman humanism. Earlier, that era was also called the "Dark Ages," but the witness of the cathedrals and the church's scholarship made that term ridiculous, and it was in the main dropped. What was retained was the view of the modern age as a resumption of true civilization, i.e., humanistic statism.

This statism early revealed itself in the high role given to kings, who supposedly had "divine rights." A portrait of Louis XIV depicts him as a god. Palaces such as Versailles were the cathedrals of the new culture.

In the early years of humanistic statism, the powers of the state did not extend into such spheres as education and economics as was later the case, but, from the beginning, the overruling power of the state was apparent.

As against all of this, the American War of Independence was a conservative counterrevolution. The people retained for some time a Christian character, but the leaders, after circa 1825, were increasingly lawyers and very much in the Enlightenment tradition. After the two Roosevelts, political thought was increasingly humanistic.

As a result, while the Left in politics steadily pursued its quest for the ancient pagan state as portrayed in Plato's *Republic*, the Right lost its roots in Christianity and became a conservative version of the Left's agenda. The Bible and the name of God could be used by the Right, but with less and less meaning. John Locke, very much a humanist, was cited oftener than John Calvin. American culture was being remade in terms of humanism, and the "public" school became the holy house of many.

The results favored the Left, which was faithful to its humanistic presupposition, whereas the Right was either rootless or grounded in the premises of the opposition. As a result, America faces the twenty-first century with a philosophy alien to its origins.

Salvation in the twentieth century has been by political action or military force. Any reading of the Bible makes it clear that war is never seen as the way of salvation, but the American presidents of the twentieth century have acted as military saviors. Since World War II, American troops have been in action all over the world, as though ancient wrongs can be righted with more killing. Political assassinations all over the world reflect this humanistic faith in salvation by killings. Not atonement, but murder, is seen as the saving force.

Now, because military action and revolution have become so popular a means of social salvation does not alter the fact that they usually compound existing evils.

In the beginning of the twentieth century, America's major world role was as a Christian missionary power. All over the world, Americans built missions, orphanages, and Christian schools and colleges. All over the world, also, Christian charity met crises with redeeming grace and action. American intervention then meant godly help and relief. Now, while the missionary action is still important, some of it is modernistic, and our political and military intervention has been hated and resented. The nineteenth-century plan of a world commission to bring salvation through Christ to all men and nations has been replaced by humanism and its plan to save the world with interference, military action, and a rejection of the Christian faith. No wonder these United States, once seen as the land of faith and freedom, is now hated and resented.

The American Right has little to offer the people except a slower-paced leftism.

"The Land of the Free" has become the home of would-be tyrants with ever-expanding dreams of control.

What is required is the recognition that salvation is not the work of the states, nor a superstate, but of Jesus Christ, that the only valid law is God's law, and that God does not bless men and nations who invoke His name but neglect or despise His Word. Such actions are pharisaical and hypocritical. It is time to leave such a stance to the Left.

296

THE FALLACY OF POLITICS

Chalcedon Report No. 357, April 1995

In different eras of history, different groups and institutions have dominated the scene. Certainly, the modern age has been a *political* era, and men have tried to solve human problems by political means. For many people, if not most, politics is the determinative force of our time.

How true is this? The statistical approach is not conclusive, but it can give us a sense of direction. In the United States, most people do not vote. They are either indifferent to or skeptical of politics. Of those who vote, *normally* anything over 50 percent of the vote gives victory. This means that a minority of the total population exerts primary control over the United States.

But is it really minority rule? Although many will be skeptical of this statement, most politicians have a very *practical* (not ideological) conservatism. For them, survival means having a solid following. A cause, however good in their eyes, is "unwise" unless it has a substantial amount of support. I recall vividly, at a national meeting, hearing some important people express respect for Howard Phillips, but a strong dissent because he fought for causes they saw as "losing" ones, i.e., pro-life, South Africa, the Panama Canal, and so on and on. Their attitude was that one should simply "go on record" for such causes and then forget about them, not fight for them, because they are "losers," and the name of the game is to win.

Normally, men in politics espouse and adopt causes *only* when they have a sufficient support to make them winners. Then politics takes the credit!

A good example of this was the civil rights issue. It was fought and won before Martin Luther King Jr. and President L. B. Johnson became involved. The men responsible for it were Branch Rickey of the Brooklyn

Dodgers baseball team and Jackie Robinson; they integrated baseball, and this began desegregation. After those men, discrimination began to collapse. It is Rickey and Robinson who should have a day in their honor rather than King. Politics takes the credit for what others do.

Political measures, whether good or bad, triumph when a high percentage of the people favor them and when their practical implementation may already be under way. It is a fallacy to see politics as the determining force.

This does not mean that politics is not important: it is, but it is not the initiating force. Political measures are preceded by the hard work of reformers, sometimes generations in advance. Politics in a sense gives assent to a change made in public opinion, whether good or bad. Since circa 1850, public opinion has become a powerful force. The Crimean War, and Tennyson's poem, "The Charge of the Light Brigade," brought into focus in Great Britain the power of public opinion.

The political fallacy is a belief in top-down motivation and government. One of its articles of faith is, "You can't fight city hall." But most of our great victories have come from fighting city hall, and our defeats are a result of our failure to fight.

One of the truly great evils of this century has been the growth of a belief, both on the left and the right, that "somebody has done this to us." We are the victims, it is held, of a great plot to do us in. There are no ends of groups trying to control or manipulate peoples, but God has made men the primary agent of government. Only man's failure to exercise responsible self-government can destroy him. It is childish, then, to wail that somebody has done this to us. Our Lord on Judgment Day will accept no such excuse. He has made us a new creation and allied Himself to us. What more do we want? See things handed to us? The only one in the Bible who offers to do so is Satan, in his temptation of our Lord (Matt. 4:1–11).

Our problem is not the controllers but the willful and whining losers. The primary area of determination on the human scene is the self-government of man, and for redeemed men to abdicate self-government and to hand over determination to church, state, or any other agency is to invite God's judgment.

The Christian man can do much in every sphere, politics, the church, education, the sciences, and more, only by assuming responsible self-government. Otherwise, he will conspire in his own destruction.

297

POLITICS AND FAITH

Chalcedon Report No. 423, October 2000

I was born in April 1916; my parents had arrived in the United States in late November 1915. When I was about eleven years old, a friend of my father's who had arrived well before World War I was visiting us. He questioned me about my faith and my patriotism and was critical of uncritical patriotism. When he had arrived in the United States, friends took him to their home. The next morning after breakfast, a police paddy wagon came by and ordered him in with many other immigrants. He was taken to a courthouse filled with other like immigrants. They were herded into a crowded courtroom where the judge proceeded to swear them into citizenship. He started to protest that after only one day in the United States, he was not eligible. The judge warned him to shut up or go to jail. As each and all were returned home, they were told that on the morrow they would be picked up to vote for "Teddy Roosevelt, a grand American"!

Since then, I have heard other like stories. Politics is not all evil, nor is it all good. Salvation comes not by politics, but by the Lord.

Today, too often the common assumption is salvation by politics. Politicians are too often not reformers, but would-be saviors. We need to vote, not for likely winners, but for godly men whose first task as candidates is to teach us.

Can such men win? Not as long as winners are most important to us.

The state should be a part of the Kingdom of God, but it is usually at best the kingdom of man and is hostile to Christ.

At present, elections give their victories to the kingdom of man, not the Kingdom of God. We have separated law and the political order from God. How can we expect God to approve?

298

SELF-GOVERNMENT UNDER GOD

Chalcedon Report No. 364, November 1995

Very often, intellectual discourse is hamstrung because the problem has an already given framework because of antiquity's concerns. This is true of the subject of *government*. The Greeks saw the state as the highest community and the highest good; the end of the state they held to be the good life. They saw government as either a monarchy, an oligarchy, or a democracy. Ever since, the academic world has been thinking in Hellenic terms.

But a Christian approach to government must be different. Government is, *first* of all, the self-government of the Christian man. This is the basic government. *Second*, the family is the basic governmental institution under God and according to His Word. *Third*, the church is a government, as is also, *fourth*, the school. *Fifth*, our vocations govern us. *Sixth*, our society, with its rules and expectations, also governs us. *Seventh*, one form of government among many, civil government, exercises rule over us, but it cannot rightly be *the* government.

If self-government be lacking, no good government can prevail in any sphere. Charles Glass, in *Tribes with Flags*, gives a vivid picture of areas without religious or civil unity, and ruled only by strong men. He cites one such man, controlling 200 militia men, exacting protection money, and providing a semblance of good order. Yet this man pointed to someone on a dance floor he intended to kill because of his "disrespectful dancing"!

When a culture has no sound basis in a religious faith that governs all, then personal whims prevail, and there is no valid law. Our culture is humanistic. It has denied God's law, and the churches have in the main agreed to setting God's law aside. In the 1790s, Timothy Dwight's preaching strongly stressed the necessity for God's law, and the unity of

law and grace. The churches, under the influences of Unitarianism and Arminianism, worked to discard God's law, with the moral breakdown we now see.

What premise is there for self-government, the most basic government, if self-will prevails? The state schools, in their "values clarification" courses, emphasize the need to choose one's own values without reference to family or church, let alone God. This in essence means without reference to an objective moral standard or law. It is amazing that our crime rate is not greater.

Friedrich Nietzsche wrote, in *The Antichrist*, "What is good? — All that heightens the feeling of power, the will to power, power itself in man." One of the first books written to praise Nietzsche came from an American seminary professor! If the church abandons Christ and His law, it will affirm power. If men deny grace, they will affirm self-will, "my will be done." In church circles, there is often a recourse to threats rather than to law and grace.

If men do not submit to God's law, they will not submit to man's law, and they are routinely contemptuous of it. If rulers lack the authority of God's law, their authority is a frail one.

Since about 1960, the courts have been stripping the United States of Biblical law, Christian character, and of public prayer. The disintegration of the country since then has been a rapid one. We are regularly told that crime has diminished, but we see its increase. The statisticians are good at conjuring good reports to please the bureaucrats.

The basic government is self-government, and only the Christian who submits to God's law-word will consistently manifest self-government and good character. The moral dereliction of church members is a common problem in our time; their ignorance of God's law is amazing. And why not, when some churches forbid the use of even the Ten Commandments!

In 1965, a professor of art, Jesse Reichek, published a wordless book of meaningless drawings entitled *etcetera*. Saul Bellow said of Reichek's drawings, "The universe rests very briefly in our perceptions and . . . we must not think we can fix it for any considerable time." In other words, there is neither meaning nor law in all creation. About the same time, a "Christian" writer in the arts insisted that every work of art is totally self-existent and must not be judged by any standard outside itself.

In other words, God is dead, and no law can govern any sphere of life or thought. If you agree with the enemies of theonomy, you have implicitly affirmed the supposed death of God.

299

A CHRISTIAN MANIFESTO

Chalcedon Report No. 225, April 1984

1. Sovereignty is an attribute of God alone, not of man nor the state. God alone is Lord or Sovereign over all things; over state, school, family, vocations, society, and all things else.

2. The Bible is given as the common law of men and nations and was for most of United States history the common law, as Justice Story declared.

3. Salvation is not by politics, education, the church, or any agency or person other than Jesus Christ our Lord.

4. The myth of Machiavelli, that, by state control at the top, bad men can make a good society, is at the root of our cultural crisis and growing collapse. A good omelet cannot be made with bad eggs. Truly redeemed men are necessary for a good society.

5. Civil rulers who rule without the Lord and His law-word are, as Augustine said, no different than a mafia, only more powerful.

6. The state is not the government, but one form of government among many, others being the self-government of the Christian man, the family, the school, the church, vocations, and society. The state is civil government, a ministry of justice.

7. For the state to equate itself with government is tyranny and evil.

8. The Christian man is the only truly free man in all the world, and he is called to exercise dominion over all the earth.

9. Humanism is the way of death and is the essence of original sin, or man trying to be his own god.

10. All men, things, and institutions must serve God, or be judged by Him.

THE STATE & STATISM

300

THE TEN FUNDAMENTALS OF MODERN STATISM

Chalcedon Report No. 237 April 1985

1. The first duty of every state is to protect the state, not the people.

2. Other states are occasional enemies; the people are the continual enemies.

3. The purpose of taxation is confiscation, control, the redistribution of wealth, control, the support of civil government, and control.

4. All steps to increase state power must be done in the name of the people, but the people are to used and stripped of freedom in the process.

5. Freedom is dangerous, controls are good.

6. Freedom must be redefined; it is the right to be morally loose and irresponsible, but Christian morality is social slavery.

7. Children are the property of the state.

8. The two great sources of evil are the church and the family.

9. The only world is the world; there is no God, no heaven, nor hell.

10. Anything the state operates or does is good, in any and all spheres, education, war, peace, spending, and so on. What is "public" or statist is good; what is "private" is bad.

301

DESPOTISM

Chalcedon Report No. 255, October 1986

In 1767, the French physiocrat, Mercier de la Riviere, defined despotism, and he defined it favorably, because he was a believer in enlightened despotism. The enlightened despot, he said, is one whose laws are the true expression of the needs of society.

But who determines what those needs are? Who gives "true expression" to man's real needs? The view of Enlightenment thinkers and their heirs, the Romantics who created the age of revolutions, was a simple one. They, the elite intellectuals, the true philosopher-kings, know best what men truly need.

You and I may have our ideas as to what we need, but the elite will determine for us what we truly need, which may be our removal and execution.

Despotism has many forms. It can emerge as a dictatorship of the proletariat, a fascist dictatorship, or the majority rule in a democracy. In our case, it is Congress and the courts. In every case, some men determine the needs and lives of other men. They play God over men's lives, properties, and freedoms.

Such a usurpation of powers is basic to the course of history, and especially our time. When men will not have God to rule over them, they will have human despots. When they reject God's law, they are made slaves to the will of other men.

The modern state was the creation of the theoreticians of enlightened despotism and their despots. With the decline of the Reformation and Counter-Reformation after 1660, the modern state as man's hope of salvation began to develop. Man's hopes and expectations shifted from Christianity to politics.

Before long, these theoreticians had located the source of all man's

problems in Christianity, in the Roman Catholic Church, in Calvin, and in orthodox Christianity generally. (A thinker could hardly qualify for intellectual respectability without attacking the papacy and John Calvin!)

The glory of God, so important earlier, was now replaced with the glory of the state. In Austria, Joseph II once wrote, "Do everything to the glory of the State!" Although a professing Catholic, Joseph II felt that the church had to submit to the state and serve his purposes. His goal was an absolute secular state, and he pursued that end as zealously as the French revolutionists were to do in a few years. He wrote to Cardinal Herzan in 1781, "As I myself detest superstition and the Sadducean doctrines, I will free my people of them; with this view, I will dismiss the monks, I will suppress their monasteries, and will subject them to the bishops of their diocese."

We live today in the world begun by the theoreticians of despotism, and developed now by their heirs. We see the planned de-Christianization of state and society, and the growing insistence that man and his needs are to be defined, not by God and His law-word, but by elitist man.

Only by returning to the whole Word of God, and its relevance to every sphere of life and thought, can Christians combat and triumph over despotism and create a godly society.

302

WHY WE AID RUSSIA

Chalcedon Report No. 201, May 1982

The major recipient of U.S. foreign aid, credit, loans, and technology in the twentieth century has been the Soviet Union. It is very likely the most massive assistance ever rendered by one state to another in all of history. The nearest rival to this condition of aid is possibly Turkey, which for a few centuries has been propped up and maintained by world powers, because none will trust the Dardanelles to any but a totally unprincipled state, one without any loyalties except to itself. Without U.S. aid, the Soviet Union could neither feed itself nor maintain any technology. Dr. Antony C. Sutton, while at the Hoover Institution, documented the technological factor in the three volumes of *Western Technology and Soviet Economic Development*.

The Soviet Empire, the United States, and the European states have at times had their differences, and they will have more. On the whole, however, they have been working allies, and with good reason. All have a common goal, the control of man by means of humanistic statism. All are agreed, in varying degrees of openness, in their contempt for God and His law.

Their essential differences are not with respect to principles, but methodology. The Soviet Union seeks the total control of man directly and openly, using terror readily, from its earliest years, to compel conformity. The United States, the United Kingdom, Sweden, and the other Western powers use education, humanistic education, as the primary means to a goal shared with the Soviet Union Of course, if Christians, as in the United States, seek to establish Christian schools uncontrolled by humanistic statism, the iron fist of statism moves against them. Pastors like Levi Whisner, Lester Roloff, and Everett Siliven have gone to jail because of this.

All these states, Western, East European, African, and Asiatic, have a common enemy, God and His rule of the people. Modern statism is a war against the God of Scripture, and against man, Christian man. In the twentieth century, the various powers have at times had their differences, and even gone to war against one another, but they have in the main been allies against God and man. Through taxation, legislation, and controls, the modern state wages unceasing war against its own people. It regards its citizenry as the major enemy to the state apparatus. In the United States, we see presidents keeping their word to the Soviet Union (in detente, etc.), but not to the American people. Promises are made to gain votes, only to be broken with impunity upon election.

Psalm 2 is right: the nations take counsel or conspire together against the Lord, and against His Anointed, saying, "Let us break their bands or laws asunder, and cast away their cords or restraints from us." Still, as of old, "He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh: the LORD shall have them in derision." Either the nations will serve the Lord, or they shall be broken with a rod of iron. Unless we now stand with the Lord, we too shall be broken. God allows no neutrality.

303

PREDESTINATION

Chalcedon Report No. 81, May 1, 1972

PREDESTINATION is very much a political issue today, and a very central one. The churches have little to say on the subject these days; they either do not believe in it, or are often embarrassed by the entire question. Predestination is simply the doctrine of total law, total government, and total planning. The important question is not, do we believe in it, but rather, whose predestination do we believe in? The alternative to predestination is a universe of meaningless and brute factuality, a world of chance.

Predestination goes by a number of other terms in its humanistic and anti-Christian versions. It is called scientific determinism, dialectical materialism, scientific socialist planning, and a number of other names. Modern humanistic predestination is total planning and control by the state and its elite planners; it has a concept of an electing decree, but not by God, but rather by man, statist man. Moreover, because predestination is an inescapable concept, as men have denied predestination by God, they have affirmed predestination by the state. Predestination is an unavoidable concept, not only because it is a God-ordained category of thought, but also because the alternative to a purpose and plan is chance and meaninglessness, and man requires meaning. Without meaning and direction to life, man perishes. Today, in our existentialist age, even seven-year-old boys are committing suicide. Man requires a meaning and a plan to life, an assured and certain direction. The problem enters in when he chooses to find that meaning and plan in man or the state rather than in God. Man is then courting the world of George Orwell's *1984*: he is asking for a totalitarian humanistic order as his preferred alternative to a totalitarian government by the sovereign God.

The origins of our present crisis are important to understand. In pagan antiquity, religion was an aspect of political order. Man's basic hope

was in political salvation. Man was regarded as a political animal, the creature of the state, and therefore entirely subject to the government and power of the state.

With the coming of Christianity, a long battle began between statism and Biblical faith (see R. J. Rushdoony, *The Foundations of Social Order* [Nutley, NJ: Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Co., 1968). Throughout the centuries, the predominance has gone back and forth, but, in the now dying modern era, the age of the state, men have looked to the state rather than to God for their salvation. Previously, in Christian eras, men looked to the sovereign God for government and law. With the Enlightenment, however, predestination by God was replaced with predestination by "Nature." The idea that such a thing as "Nature" exists is, of course, a myth; *nature* is a collective noun for a universe of particular facts. It is not nominalism to deny the reality of nature as a governing being or entity. Enlightenment thinkers, however, saw "Nature" as a governing, predestinating entity which so perfectly ordained all things that, in the words of Alexander Pope, in his *Essay on Man*,

> All nature is but art, unknown to thee;
> All chance, direction, which thou canst not see;
> All discord, harmony not understood;
> A partial evil, universal good:
> And, spite of pride, in erring reason's spite,
> One truth is clear, WHATEVER IS, IS RIGHT.

Pope and other Enlightenment thinkers clearly held to a doctrine of infallibility by "Nature" and the predestination of all things in terms of "Nature's" perfect and "universal good." At the same time, they denied vehemently the sovereignty and predestination of God.

When Darwin published his *Origin of Species* in 1859, this Enlightenment doctrine of Nature rapidly crumbled. Darwin himself showed traces of the old belief, but the new view of nature which appeared in Darwin was one of blind, meaningless, directionless chance. Moreover, as Darwinism developed, more than a few thinkers drew the logical conclusion. Not only was life without meaning and purpose, but man and the universe were only accidents in a meaningless ocean of being. They were products, as Lucretius had ages before held, of the fortuitous concourse of atoms, arising out of emptiness and destined to return to nothingness.

Another logical conclusion followed. Since God was supposedly dead, and since the old idea of Nature was a myth, if meaning and direction exist at all, man must supply them. Man must take control and issue his own law and predestinating plan against the hovering darkness of chaos.

Man must make his future, creating, planning, and governing it as surely as he controls and governs a machine. Predestination by man was the answer to the now obsolete predestination by Nature.

The perverse and twisted mind of Karl Marx here revealed its calibre. Marx had earlier grasped, together with others, that the next step in humanism was predestination by man. He read that step back into nature, after Hegel, seeing man, and in particular scientific planning man, as the incarnation of a struggling mind in the universe, as man's elite mind working out a plan of predestination to impose upon history and nature. The emerging force would incarnate itself in the communist world order.

Marx realized that Darwin, by destroying the Enlightenment view of Nature, had made scientific socialist predestination the next step in history. The publication and immediate acceptance of Darwin's thesis was thus hailed by both Marx and Engels as the assurance of their victory.

Since their day, a third of the world has become Marxist and subscribes to their version of predestinarianism, or, at least, bows down before it. The rest of the world almost entirely follows other versions of the same humanistic predestinarianism, Fabian Socialism, democratic socialism, fascism, and like faiths.

Predestination is thus very much a live issue. More than that, it is now a politico-religious issue. Men daily look to the predestination of the state. An unplanned life is to them anathema; the gods of the state must govern all things.

Two very popular and best-selling books have set forth this doctrine of radical humanistic predestination, Alvin Toffler's *Future Shock* (1970), and John McHale's *The Future of the Future* (1971). Both portray a future in which a scientific elite predestines all things: the future of the future is to be made by man. Man shall predestine all our tomorrows.

An ominous cloud, however, appears in both books. Planners are always having trouble with man. A machine can be totally controlled: it is man's creation. A computer can be programmed to do exactly what the programmer requires, within the limitations of the computer's ability. But man is God's creature, not man's. Man cannot be programmed in the radical and total way man wants. In every society, man is the stumbling block towards realizing the plan. Man still moves in terms of God's plan and purpose, not man's.

In this respect, as far as humanistic planners go, B. F. Skinner, in *Beyond Freedom and Dignity* (1971), is still a conservative one. He still believes that by conditioning and/or controls (whether by brain implants or other means is for the moment immaterial), man can be controlled. Others are less hopeful, and they look for an artificial man to replace

God's man in their humanistic earth or hell. Toffler tells us that humanoids ("carefully wired" robots) will begin to replace people, and we will be unable to "determine whether the smiling, assured humanoid behind the airline reservation counter is a pretty girl or a carefully wired robot." He reports also that "Professor Block at Cornell speculates that man-machine sexual relationships may not be too far distant" (p. 211). President Nixon has established a National Goals Research Staff of scientific and other experts to plan "the projection of social trends." All of this is a modern jargon for predestination.

In this humanistic plan, man is increasingly obsolete. In God's plan man is either a God-ordained heir of all creation, created to exercise dominion under God, or a reprobate and rebel. His every act is a part of a cosmic meaning. In man's idea of predestination, only a robot or an artificial man can meet the specifications.

In various ways, man is beginning to recognize this. Among the first to see it were the disillusioned, humanistic, and rebellious students of the early 1960s. The motto of one of the earliest student demonstrations, carried on badges and banners, was "Do not fold, staple, or mutilate." This was a bitter resentment against a controlled humanism which was trying to turn man himself into a machine. The revolt declined into sullen and meaningless protest and violence, because the students had no answer to the question, "What is man?" Their only answer to statist predestination was to demand either more action from the state or to turn to a sterile anarchism. The students had sensed the issue, but they had not answered it. The liberals, conservatives, and Marxists still looked to the state, and to control of the state and its machinery, for their answer.

A great hero of the Enlightenment radicals, as well as of the twentieth-century conservatives, was Cicero, a champion of salvation by the state. Cicero regarded religion as a convenient means of keeping the masses obedient; for him, salvation was political and statist. He championed racial levelling, especially in his oration defending Lucius Balbus, as a means of strengthening the power of the state. He spoke of Rome in religious terms and furthered the cult of the City of Rome. He called Rome "the light of the world," but within a century, Jesus Christ answered Cicero and Rome, declaring, "I am the light of the world" (John 8:12). Cicero saw the philosopher-king as the earthly incarnation of the divine mind; he hailed Augustus as savior, saying, "In him we place our hopes of liberty; from him we have already received salvation." In 61 B.C., Cicero, who knew more than a little about the God of Israel and the Old Testament Scriptures, rejected all of it as "barbarian superstition"; his hope was in politics and in political leaders, and he was glad to see Israel

conquered and its ideas ostensibly defeated. But Cicero died at the hands of his political leaders, and Rome became not a savior but a corrupt empire. The Ciceros of our day may not do as well, and they have less excuse than Cicero to hope in political salvation and political predestination.

In 1959, the late Wilhelm Ropke wrote, "The ultimate source of all mistakes in our dealings with communism is intellectual and moral. In fact, it is our inability or unwillingness to comprehend the full substance and nature of this conflict between communism and the free world, its tremendous implacability and deeply moral and intellectual implications. Again and again, we fall into the error of conceiving this conflict to be an old-fashioned diplomatic power struggle. In reality it is a collision of two irreconcilable systems that are intellectually and morally diametrically opposed" (Wilhelm Ropke, "How to Deal with the Communists," *Individualist*, January–February 1963). Since then, the free world has moved closer to communism, and the basic cause of its decline has been its growing humanism, its preference for the predestination of man rather than of God.

But here we can borrow the language of an eloquent champion of humanistic and statist predestination, Chairman Mao Tse-tung. Mao is confident that all his enemies, domestic and foreign, are "merely paper tigers." He is not impressed by the power of any nation in the world, because, in terms of Marxist predestination, they are doomed, and they are therefore ultimately only "paper tigers." But Mao is wrong: it is not Marx's plan which governs all men, nations, and history, but God's plan, for God only is absolute Lord and Sovereign of the universe. Thus, for all their momentary power, it is Marx and Mao who are "paper tigers" before God.

We must see ourselves and all things as God ordains it. We are told emphatically, "Behold, the nations are as a drop of a bucket, and are counted as the small dust of the balance: behold, he taketh up the isles as a very little thing" (Isa. 40:15). It is God whom we must fear and revere, not man. It is God who shall create the future, and already has, and it is His purpose and plan we must serve, not His enemy's. The Scriptures are an announcement to men on a battlefield of the certainty of God's victory, and it is a summons to prepare for victory and to act on it.

Those whom you fear, you will bend before and serve. "The fear of man bringeth a snare: but whoso putteth his trust in the Lord shall be safe" (Prov. 29:25). We have been called to victory: we must expect it, fight for it, and act on it. It is God's purpose for us.

304

TOTALITARIANISM

Chalcedon Report No. 83, July 1, 1972

Webster's New International Dictionary, in its supposedly conservative second edition, defined totalitarian thus: "Of or pertaining to a highly centralized government under the control of a political group which allows no recognition of or representation to other political parties, as in Fascist Italy or in Germany under the Nazi regime." Several things are wrong with this definition, which is a good example of the fact that even good dictionaries do not always define either too honestly or too well. *First* of all, the definition is slanted when it comes to citing examples, in that it omits the major totalitarian state, the Soviet Union. *Second*, and more important, the definition is purely political. Is it of the essence of totalitarianism that it allows no representation or freedom for other political parties, or is it not rather that it allows no freedom for any element of society at all? *Third*, and closely related to this, the definition simply ignores the word defined: totalitarian. The word means that the totality of life, men, property, religion, education, and all else, are controlled by the state. Just as God as sovereign Lord and Creator absolutely governs and ordains all things by His omnipotent counsel and decree, so the totalitarian state plays god, and by its total plan seeks to govern every aspect of life and to conform it to its purposes.

Totalitarianism is not new in history. What is new is the added potential for total power which modern communications and transportation media give to the totalitarian state. Ancient Egypt and many states since have been totalitarian. The sovereign and absolute government of God over all things is one that institutions and aspects of the created order have again and again claimed and sought to arrogate to themselves. It is important to analyze some of these totalitarian claims and attempts in order to understand the issue more clearly. Very clearly, the church in the

"medieval" era did declare itself to be the Kingdom of God and the umbrella over all society and all things therein, so that some have referred to the church then as having been totalitarian. It is easy to see the faults of another era, less easy sometimes to see our own in perspective. The twentieth century has already seen, it is said, the death of 100 million people by torture, famine, war, and forced labor. The "medieval" church at its worst was not totalitarian in the strict sense of the word because its faith required a denial of any such claim, in that God alone is sovereign lord and governor of all things. The creed of the church was a witness against every false churchman. It asserted the transcendental, supernatural nature and origin of God's absolute government, so that there was always a built-in judgment against false churchmen.

This is very important. True totalitarianism must deny God's transcendental government, law, and counsel. The origin of all things must be here and now, in the universe, within the grasp of man. Totalitarianism and immanence go hand in hand. A philosophy of immanence holds that all essence, being, and power are fully present in the world, and exclusively in the world, so that the world is fully governed by its own inherent nature and potentiality. From Hegel through Marx and Darwin, the modern philosophy of immanence received its great expression and made possible modern totalitarianism.

Earlier, many areas of science had been totalitarian in their philosophies. Thus, physicists sought and some still seek to reduce all reality to physics. Mathematicians of an earlier day would only allow a God who was the Great Mathematician, that is, the built-in cosmic computer of the universe. Reality, in brief, was reduced to a particular institution or discipline of which men were the governors or interpreters.

This same fallacy has marked economics, in that all too many free-market advocates under the influence of a philosophy of immanentism have taken this one sphere of law and absolutized it as the *only* law. We do agree with classical economics as *economics*, but not as a religious philosophy. When it is converted into a religious philosophy of immanence, it denies validity to any transcendental law of God and to all other institutions and orders of life unless they pass the test of the free market. Free-market economics then becomes totalitarian and absolutist: it becomes idolatry. Some hold that the family and prostitution, and normal and perverted sexuality, must compete on a free-market basis. Narcotics and good food are reduced to the same free-market test. In brief, anything and everything goes, because there is only one law, the free market, and only one value, the free market. (One person contends that there should be no title to property, but only the right of access by everyone

who is able to command the power and money to take the property, in other words, a free market for power and violence as well.) Any value derived from any other sphere, or any principled judgment derived from a transcendental order, from God, must compete on a free-market basis, it is held. This is simply saying that the free market is god, and that it is the absolute and sole value in the universe. It assumes that there is no God beyond the market, no other law, no other value, than the free market. Moreover, because the free market has its truth in the economic sphere, they sit back smugly, satisfied that they have the key to life. The Marxists no less than other totalitarians stress one or two partial "truths," which they use to exclude all truth and God, and the same is true of those who reduce the world to matter. *The free-market religionists* are really great enemies of free-market economics, in that they pervert an instrument of freedom into a form of totalitarianism. It is not surprising that many free-market religionists have in recent years been very congenial to the New Left: both are alike in their strident totalitarianism.

The political religionists, however, are far more numerous. They believe in salvation by the state, and, even when democratic or republican in their governmental forms, they are essentially totalitarian. Contrary to Webster's *Dictionary*, a state can have many political parties and still be totalitarian. Let us examine how this is possible. *First*, a totalitarian state either denies God or ignores Him because it is, to all practical intent, the ultimate power in its universe. By denying or ignoring the transcendental and sovereign God, a state makes a major and decisive step into totalitarianism. It says in effect, "I am god, and beside me there is no other power in my realm." *Second*, a totalitarian state, having denied God, assumes the role of God by taking control over every area of life, education, health, welfare, the family, the church, private associations, and all things else. As the predestinating god, the state insists on working out a plan for every area of life, and it progressively requires strict obedience to that plan. The plan represents the godlike wisdom of the state in its concern for its creatures, and to oppose the plan is to be seen as a devil and an enemy of the state.

Third, this means, of course, that for political religionists all the problems of life can be solved by political action, by and through the state. This requires the control of science, medicine, property, money, education, and everything so that the state can marshal all its powers to overcome the obstacle at hand. Not surprisingly, politicians speak of the conquest of war, ignorance, poverty, disease, and even death as legitimate objects of statist action. If all power is of this world, not of God, then all answers are of this world and from man organized as the state. Because

it is believed that total power is in man, total power is sought in and through man's great agency, the state.

Fourth, as long as the people of the state are largely political religionists, people who believe in salvation by politics, all their political parties will share this faith. In virtually every country today, political parties, whatever their differences on methods and measures, do believe in salvation by politics. Theirs is a statist totalitarianism (as against the free-market religionists' totalitarianism of the marketplace). Quite rightly, therefore, Huntford speaks of Sweden, which has more than one political party, as totalitarian, and he sees the same elements of totalitarianism in varying degrees in other Western nations. In his very important study, he sees Sweden as an approximation of Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*, and the rest of the West as nations in quest of the same goal (Roland Huntford, *The New Totalitarians* [New York, NY: Stein and Day, 1971]).

The only valid answer to totalitarianism of every variety is a Biblical faith which denies all philosophies of immanence and holds to the sovereignty of the triune God. The ultimate standard, power, and authority in the universe resides, not in the state, nor the marketplace, nor in physics, mathematics, nor in anything else which pertains to the created order. To God alone belongs dominion, power, and authority. There is no ultimacy in the created universe, only change, the possibilities of change, either to grow or to decline, and sin, a transgression of God's law and order. There is also obedience, the possibility of progress towards God's purpose for us, purposeful growth toward an established goal. There is, moreover, freedom; since ultimacy belongs to God, only God can bind man by His decree. Man has no right to bind his fellow man by any man-made concept or law. Only God's law is binding. Man is thus freed from his worst oppressor, man.

A philosophy of immanence leads to totalitarianism, because it places all power and authority in the present order of things, and it gives man no supreme court of appeals in God against the world. Wherever and whenever a philosophy of immanence has governed men to any degree, to that degree totalitarian tyranny has also governed men.

The power of the modern state is very great, and it is totalitarian, but it rests on a false faith. That faith is crumbling now, but it is not enough for men to become bitter at a particular form of totalitarianism. They must reject the faith which undergirds it, which means that they must reject it first in themselves.

It also means more than a humanistic and pietistic return to religion. Men have often looked to God as a life raft, a spare tire and an insurance policy in case of trouble, or as an aid to life. In a very humanistic

bit of advertising, we are told that "the family that prays together stays together." True enough, but is that the purpose of praying? And is it not an offense to the sovereign God to see the purpose of prayer merely as family togetherness? The triune God must above all else be for us the sovereign lord, authority, and power, whom we serve and obey because it is the essence and requirement of life to do so. "Man's chief end is to glorify God and to enjoy Him forever."

The power of the God with whom we have to do is not the blundering, brutal power of man and the state but an all-wise, all-holy government which is mindful of every hair of our head (Matt. 10:30), and whose victory and purpose are assured.

Life has always been a time of testing, and it is no less so now. It is also a time of choosing, a time when men choose and are chosen, when men reveal what they are and then move in terms of it. If we are governed by our fears of men, then we are governed by men, and if we are governed by our humanistic love of man, then we are governed by man. "The fear of man bringeth a snare: but whoso putteth his trust in the LORD shall be safe" (Prov. 29:25). How safe are you?

There is nothing in our creeds about defeat. Rather, in the glorious words of the Benedictus, God "hath raised up an horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David; . . . that we should be saved from our enemies, and from the hand of all that hate us . . . that we being delivered out of the hand of our enemies *might serve him without fear, in holiness and righteousness before him*, all the days of our life" (Luke 1:71, 74–75). Having this assurance, St. Paul declared, "Rejoice in the Lord always: and again I say, Rejoice" (Phil. 4:4).

305

EXECUTIVE PRIVILEGE; OR, THE RIGHT TO STEAL

Chalcedon Report No. 199, March 1982

One of the acts of the Puritan Commonwealth in England was to try and to behead King Charles I. For this act, many historians to this day seem to bear a grudge against Cromwell and the Puritans. With the Restoration in 1660, and the reign of Charles II, the men associated with Charles I's trial were themselves tried and executed. The presiding judge at this trial was Sir Orlando Bridgeman, who, in his charge to the jury, declared that kings were subject to none but God, and could do no wrong; even if they could do wrong, they were beyond punishment. This "legal" position made a guilty verdict inescapable. The Church of England added to its liturgy a service for that noble "martyr" of the faith, Charles I, a liturgy used for generations.

The fact is that, apart from being a stupid and very unconstitutional monarch, King Charles I was also a thief. At one point, Charles marched off with 130,000 English pounds of other people's money, expropriated from London's goldsmiths, who stored their deposits in the Tower of London. It was a theft that failed, like everything Charles did, but at least he tried! Somehow, historians often gloss over this aspect of Charles's reign. This is not unusual. When Otto J. Scott, in *James I*, noted in passing that monarch's homosexuality, one historical journal disapproved and spoke of that vice as a royal privilege!

Such thinking is all too prevalent. In the 1960s, a prominent pastor, deeply involved in sin, was confronted with the facts thereof by a church officer. The pastor defended himself by holding that, as "the Lord's anointed," he was above criticism. More than a few people agreed; all that man's numerous congregation did. And everywhere people will say that we are only to pray for, never to criticize, those in authority over

us. Somehow, the prophets of Scripture missed that doctrine when they listened to God!

We have a modern name for King Charles's "right to steal." It is called executive privilege. It means that we can supposedly be legally robbed of money, information, and self-government in the name of executive privilege. Make no mistake about it: theft can be of more than money. The courts have in fact held that possession of certain types of exclusive and "inside" information about a company and its stocks can constitute a form of theft and a means of gaining an unfair advantage in the market. In the Old West, people paid a price for dishonest means of knowing what another man's poker hand was, such as by means of marked cards. Federal regulations which legislate and limit our freedom outside the elective and representative process are certainly forms of theft. Then, too, inflation is a form of theft, a means of counterfeiting available only to civil government.

Charles I thus should be the patron saint of the modern state, but, of course, he was an amateur, and he paid the price for his bungling. But the modern state, too, will pay the price; God's day of reckoning awaits all sinners. The "right to steal" becomes the right to perish.

306

MILLERS AND MONOPOLY

Chalcedon Report No. 120, August 1975

One of the more important people in medieval life was the miller. Then, far more than now, bread was basic to man's diet and life. In terms of estate and calling, the miller should have been one of the more highly esteemed men in the community, because his was a most necessary function. In reality, he was one of the most hated of men.

Chaucer's Canterbury pilgrims delighted in hearing a ribald story about a miller, because all shared the common dislike for millers. A medieval riddle asked, "What is the boldest thing in the world?" Answer: "A miller's shirt, for it clasps a thief by the throat daily." All kinds of laws were passed to try to control millers, but they failed, because the heart of the problem was not dealt with.

The problem was monopoly. The millers, working under a lord, an abbot or bishop, or the Knights Templars, were granted a monopoly on all milling in their area. No man could go to another miller, or use a hand mill, except on severe penalty and serious trouble. This monopoly, very profitable to the miller and his overlord, also meant no competition and, as a result, high and exorbitant profits as well as great inefficiency. The fee for milling was more than a fee: it was a harsh and brutal tax on the people. Chaucer said of his miller that the man knew how to steal grain and to charge thrice over for milling it, and yet was reasonably honest as millers go!

The miller was a necessary member of society, but, because his position had been used to gain a stranglehold over the people, men did everything possible to avoid using his services, to gain other means of food, and to undercut the prestige and position of the miller. From a social necessity, the miller had descended to the level of a social plague.

There was nothing in milling as such to make millers evil men, any

more than there is anything in church or state as such to make either by nature and necessity evil. In fact millers, despite their disrepute in medieval England, were obviously superior people, because their descendants, who today bear the name Miller, have a long and demonstrable record of superiority. Criminals and welfare recipients bearing that name are uncommon.

The problem was that, what should have been an honorable estate and calling was turned into a vicious monopoly and a social plague. Millers were problems, not mainstays, to medieval man.

The analogy to the modern state is an obvious one. Instead of confining itself to the realm of civil justice, the modern humanistic state has extended a monopolistic power over one area of life after another. As the central means of protection against criminals and against foreign invaders, it has a necessary function, and the loyalty and patriotism it once inspired was great. As the monopolistic oppressor, it has become a feared and hated enemy, an oppressive taxing power whose exactions are beginning to destroy society. The most elementary function of the state is policing, but Americans are now spending more money on private forms of policing than the state does. This is a clear indication that the state, in its quest for power, is failing to discharge its most elementary and basic service. The failure of the modern state is thus far greater than the failure of the medieval miller, or, for that matter, the medieval church. The monopoly enjoyed by church and miller led to their rejection, and today there are on all sides signs of a growing disillusionment and incipient rejection of the modern humanistic state.

The matter has been very aptly summed up in the title of an excellent article in the February 1975 number of the *California Real Estate* magazine, written by a friend of Chalcedon, Frank J. Walton, "Government: It's the Problem, Not the Solution." Men have been asking the problem to give the answers.

It has been man's faith in the state, his humanism, which has led him into his present crisis, and disillusionment is not enough to take him out of it. Some of the best analyses of the decay of Rome, written by Romans of the day, were also the most impotent of statements. Problems do grow so great that awareness of them is finally inescapable for most men, but we have too long labored under the silly idea that knowing the problem is half the answer. Knowing the problem is simply knowing the problem.

The Bible gives us God's answer. It rests *first* of all in His regenerating power, and, *second*, in the application of His law to the problems of life. The answer is not in man's hatred, nor in man's love, nor is it a new combination of men and organizations. Scripture gives us God's plan of

action for victory, for the godly reconstruction of all things according to His law and under the authority of His Son.

There is no greater sign of hope today than our world crises: they witness to the collapse of the enemy's power and the impossibility of his world plan. If all were going well today, then we would indeed have cause to tremble and to be afraid, because it would mean the decay of justice, judgment, and mercy. It would mean that God's mercy had been withdrawn from us. But our crises are evidences of God's judgment against the present world order, and we had better see them as such; they are evidences of the decay and approaching collapse of world humanism and its dreams.

Look to your foundations: if they are being shaken, you are in the wrong camp, or else you are placing your trust in what must pass away.

307

WHO IS THE LORD?

Chalcedon Report No. 156, August 1978

The July 1978 edition of *Yankee* magazine carries a very interesting article about one of the last Connecticut small farmers, John Ludorf. The author, Georgia Sheron, a neighbor, describes Ludorf at work, as he cuts timber for firewood: "The final log, weighing 150 pounds, resists splitting completely and he lifts it in one swift, clean swing to lay atop the waiting pile. John Ludorf is 81 years old today."

Ludorf has a problem. His family cannot afford to inherit his farm: "I never made more than $3,800 a year in my life from my farm but by my dying on it the government gets to make $70,000!" The inheritance tax will wipe out the family farm.

If this sounds familiar, it is, *first*, because it is happening to 75 percent of all farms, businesses, and properties in the United States. The inheritance tax wipes out the family. Scripture repeatedly speaks of the treatment of widows and orphans as revelatory of a people's righteousness. Today, virtually all nations are found wanting in this respect; widows lose their homes, and young men find they are working for a new owner of the family business.

Second, there is a clear echo here of the Naboth story. Ahab, however, was crude. The modern state confiscates by means of taxation and disinherits widows and children.

Such a condition is a product of our contempt for God's law. Men refuse to believe that God's righteousness or law is an unchanging one, like the Lord, the same in every age. They turn away from God's righteousness for a self-generated holiness which is no holiness at all.

In the Christian schools trials, the church trials, we see these self-holy men turn savagely against persecuted pastors, schoolmen, and parents, because the stand of these men against humanistic statism troubles their

conscience. These compromisers seem to feel that holiness comes, not by faith with works, but by faith with criticism, and they thereby manifest their faithfulness to Phariseeism.

On almost any given day, Monday through Friday, somewhere in the United States, Christians are in court for their faith. Our Lord makes it clear that He is there also: "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me" (Matt. 25:40). What is our Lord's word to you?

Where the freedom of the faith to be under Christ's lordship alone is gone, then the basic theft has taken place. Then, too, our inheritance in faith, land, and goods is also gone.

Either Jesus Christ is Lord, or the state is. The question of our time is this: who is your Lord, Christ, or Caesar? Will you say, with the false priests of old, "We have no king but Caesar"? (John 19:15).

308

POWER OVER THE PEOPLE

Chalcedon Report No. 203, July 1982

In a recent (May 1982) trial of a church (in Texas), a four-page complaint was filed against the church by the Department of Human Resources (or welfare department). One of the charges or complaints was with respect to a goldfish bowl in the nursery:

> If there are animals on the premises the facility shall have a licensed veterinarian evaluate animals annually to determine which ones need to be examined and vaccinated. Examinations, vaccinations, and treatment shall be given as the veterinarian recommends.
>
> Non-Compliance: It was observed that the veterinarian's statement for the fish was not on file.

Another item: A retired Army colonel, a good friend of Chalcedon, reported on a problem faced by one of his sons. A young photographer, he is currently working supermarket and shopping center parking lots. He photographs children mounted on his pony. He was arrested for operating without a license. Since he covers eighty-two different city jurisdictions in a metropolitan area, eighty-two licenses would put him out of business. All that a license does is to provide each city with revenue. When arrested, he was called "worse than a criminal" by the judge, fined $350, given a suspended sentence of one year, and told that he would get a year in jail if picked up again. (Many rapists are less severely treated.) The state is more a threat to this young photographer than it is to most criminals.

The modern state is failing to provide justice. Its main goal is increasing *power over the people*. The cry of our statists is "power to the people," but their goal is the tyranny of power over the people.

Rome fell, not because of the barbarians, but because of its own evils. The tens of thousands of barbarians could not have defeated the millions

of Romans, if the Romans had defended Rome. After generations of tyranny and oppressive taxation, the people of Rome no longer felt Rome was worth fighting for, and they simply refused to defend it.

As the power of the modern state increases all over the world, we are approaching a similar disillusionment. The patriots of Rome loved Rome for its past glories, not for its then current tyrannies. Similarly, the patriots of various modern states are often patriots because they value their past, their heritage and traditions. As the modern state lays waste that inherited capital, it invites on itself the whirlwind of judgment.

309

ARE WE ROBBING WIDOWS?

Chalcedon Report No. 206, October 1982

When is your property not your property? The answer to that question is that, any time the federal and state governments choose to claim, tie up, or regulate your property, they feel free to do so.

The *Farm Journal* (April 1982, p. 10) cited the case of a Missouri farm wife whose husband died. It was harvesttime, but she could not use the farm machinery to proceed with harvesting. For her to have done so was held to be illegal, since they were in her husband's name, and tied up in the estate. With all her grief and the cares of widowhood, there was now added another. She had to hire men and machines for the harvest.

Now, I know that lawyers can give me long reasons why this was so, citing laws, cases, and precedents. The fact remains that the whole thing stinks. Our lawmakers seem to feel that widows are chickens to be plucked, not human beings. I wonder how state and federal legislators can look at the estate, death, and inheritance taxes and regulations they have passed and still look in the mirror without throwing up.

A woman can work alongside her husband to develop a farm or a business. She can be as much a part of it as her husband, and sometimes more so. However, unless they have seen a lawyer or accountant and prepared for death, she is likely to see the tax man rob her of much that she spent years working for. Even seeing a lawyer or accountant is not enough. The laws are changed almost every year, so that a good legal provision of last year may be no safeguard this year.

Isn't anyone ashamed or angry about all this? Are we living in a society where the state and federal governments are so much at war with us that we must retain a lawyer to protect ourselves?

Our Washington politicians scream, every time there is talk of a tax cut, about the harm it will do to the poor. Has it never occurred to them

that maybe taxes are making us all poor? Does it never bother them that they pass laws aimed at robbing widows?

We have several organizations of senior citizens in this country. Why are they not doing more to protect widows and survivors? Death is a sufficiently sad time without being made more so by acts of Congress.

It is high time we told our state and federal representatives to show more consideration for widows and orphans. We have many ugly taxes on the books, but perhaps none of them half so bad as those which tax death. Something is seriously wrong with a society which tolerates such a tax.

Our Lord says, "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayer: therefore ye shall receive the greater damnation" (Matt. 23:14).

310

DO WE NEED A LICENSE TO DIE?

Chalcedon Report No. 201, May 1982

It is not as easy to die these days as it once was. I can remember when dying time meant that family and friends stopped by to say their farewells. On the day of the funeral, friends came from miles around, and everybody brought food for a big potluck banquet. Enough was left over to keep the family from having to cook for days after. It was a big reunion. At the cemetery, some folks would show me their own grave sites and headstones, with everything chiselled in except their death date. Dying was easy then.

What happens now? Well, all kinds of certificates have to be filed, and they cost money. State and federal taxes on the house, farm, or business can tie up a family for almost a year, and they also very often wipe them out financially. It's getting so bad that almost nobody can afford to die these days.

But this is not all. One law, which is catching on in state after state, requires that an autopsy be performed on the deceased if he or she had not been to a doctor within three weeks prior to death. Think of the implications of that. If you and I or anyone else is old and ailing, we must see a doctor, every month approximately, whether it does any good or not, or else an autopsy must be performed.

This means a tidy and steady income for the doctor, or else an income for the coroner. Much of this is taken care of by Medicare, but, of course, our tax money pays for that.

Now, we have all heard of ghoulish people who try to cash in on death. They come around, on reading a death notice, and claim that the deceased ordered something and then try to collect on it. Fortunately, there are not too many such people.

However, what can we say about our ghoulish federal and state governments which make death a time to gouge and rob widows and

orphans? This subject is not a pleasant one, but I submit that any civil government that deliberately plans to make money out of death and the griefs of people has sunk as low as anyone can.

The Bible tells us over and over again that God regards the treatment of widows and orphans as a key test to the character of a people and a nation. God promised judgment on those who exploit widows and orphans.

In other words, God sees it as thoroughly rotten and contemptible for a nation to use the time of bereavement and grief to rob and impoverish a people. We have, however, made this policy into law. One estate planner says that about *75 percent* of all families are economically wiped out by the death of a husband or wife.

People sometimes talk about the high price of funerals, but such costs are a trifle compared to the toll exacted by the federal and by many state governments.

It is time we told the ghouls in Washington that we have had enough of this. The taxation of death is the ultimate insult a civil government can impose upon a people. It is a degrading and an evil tax. The rich can utilize some provisions of the law to protect themselves to a degree, but most of us are the victims of the Washington ghouls.

311

THE "RIGHT" TO ABORTION

Chalcedon Report No. 228, July 1984

In recent years, in one country after another, state courts have granted to individuals so desiring it the "right" to practice abortion medically or to abort one's own child. The rhetoric of pro-abortion forces has strongly emphasized the aspect of personal choice and personal liberty. This note has greatly appealed to libertarians also, who have therefore readily echoed the pro-abortion language of "liberals" and leftists. Some conservatives too have been agreeable to abortion on the same premise, that personal choice is the higher good, whatever else may be in consideration.

Ironically, this assumption is a particularly vulnerable one. Abortion strikes at the Christian premise that God's law-word alone sets the rules whereby life can be taken, and abortion has no place in the law of God. The most obvious fact about abortion is that it is a "personal choice and freedom" established by statist courts or by acts of statist legislators.

The state, by granting to individuals the "right" of abortion, and the "right" to euthanasia or "mercy killings," is thereby asserting the prior "right" of the state over both God and man to take human life. Instead of conferring a new freedom on man, the state is taking away freedom from man. The life of man under God is sacrosanct from conception until death. Man can only take human life under very restricted circumstances, essentially for capital crimes as specified by God's law, in self-defense, and in warfare. Wherever the state or man goes beyond God's law, it establishes a man or the state as lord or sovereign over life. The right to exist then becomes a grant from the state, which has then also the "right" to kill man at will.

Marxist states have been ready to grant the "right" to abortion *when they choose*, but all the while have maintained for themselves the "right"

to take human life whenever it serves the purposes of the state. Socialism and slave labor and death camps have become synonymous.

To allow to the state one iota of power not permitted by God's law is to diminish man's freedom under God. To permit the state to legitimate abortion is to grant to the state the power to take over lives at the will of the state. Abortion decisions and laws have done two things: *first*, they have made legal the "right" of persons to kill human life. *Second*, the state now has a freedom from God's law to take human life at will.

Every power the state gains it uses. As a result, we have now a *third* factor, as Dr. Charles Rice, a professor of law, has pointed out: the state now, according to the courts, can define what constitutes a person. The definition of a person is no longer theological or even medical: it is civil and legal. We can be declared nonpersons by the state or its courts and denied life.

The "right" of abortion thus does not expand personal choice or freedom: it severely restricts it because it establishes the prior "right" of the state to permit or to deny the right to life at will. Such a step, the legalization of abortion, is the beginning of the death of freedom and of man.

312

PRIVILEGE, POWER, AND ENVY

Chalcedon Report No. 324, July 1992

It is a fact of history that some people are privileged and others are not. The privileged status can be earned, inherited, or seized by force; in any case, it conveys power, and, very often, envy. Man being a sinner, he resents the privileges of others, however much deserved. This resentment has often led to revolutions; these have not improved the situation and have usually worsened them.

This fact of privilege has caused man great problems from antiquity to the present. The Greeks of old resented the aristocracies of their city-states and supplanted them with regimes that were only worse. The Roman plebeians rebelled against the old order for generations; what followed the often evil, old, aristocratic republic was the empire and totalitarian tyranny.

Very often, the people in power create a group to be made the target of the popular anger: Congress creates and regulates the Internal Revenue Service to do its will, and the IRS gets the animosity. Medieval emperors (and kings and popes) used *some* Jews as their agents, and *all* the Jews paid the penalty. It was not usually anti-Semitism as much as it was anti-establishment anger. Byzantium never used Jews, and the Jews there never had any problems; it was the Goths, servants of the emperors, who were hated and resented.

Envy usually seeks a close-by target. In old Russia, it was not the tsar and Moscow that were resented as much as the local *kulaks*, rich, successful peasants. Because hatred and envy are personal feelings, their targets are made personal and close: it therefore becomes blacks, whites, and other racial groups, nearby persons who typify all the privilege and power that is resented.

Thus, today, especially since the riots of early May 1992 over the

Rodney King trial, American whites are increasingly resentful of blacks because *some*, a small minority, rioted, looted, and attacked whites and Asiatics. These rioters were not hardworking, gainfully employed Christian blacks, but welfare recipients and people with criminal records. Their refuge has been their color and poverty, and this has given them a "privileged" status of self-pity and immunity to blunt criticism because of their color. The charge of racism has become a convenient refuge from the truth for black hoodlums, and for black and white politicians and media.

If poverty and a nonworking status invoke widespread pity and feelings of guilt among the affluent, they will be used as tools of privilege and power. Wealth then becomes a handicap. One aftermath of the Los Angeles riots was the unwillingness of the successful people in Beverly Hills and elsewhere to use expensive automobiles. Cheaper makes were purchased to conceal their wealth, because wealth had become a liability.

This represents a moral inversion. To work hard, to advance and rightfully gain privileges, is normally seen both as socially necessary and morally sound if done honestly. Now many view it as a liability. I learned a few years back of two clergymen in the Midwest who preached that it was "immoral" to make "too much" money; one man set the limit of morally viable income at $30,000, the other at $40,000. This probably tells us what they made! In one large church, a member asked a friend, a neighbor and a pastor at another church to help her locate the verse, "From each according to his needs, to each according to his abilities." She was outraged when the pastor said the sentence came from Karl Marx, not the Lord; the pastor plainly did not know his Bible! (In the 1950s, a pastor-friend had a like experience, with a like outcome. In this instance, the woman wanted to locate the verse, "Honesty is the best policy," which, of course, comes from Benjamin Franklin, not the Bible.) Such is ignorance in the church.

The rise of envy is destructive of social order because it strikes out against all legitimate, as well as illegitimate, privilege and power. It ensures the victory of the envious over the diligent and working persons in a society. It leads to a conflict society in which hatred replaces neighborliness. It is also a fertile cause of anti-Christianity because Biblical faith stresses the necessity of virtue for privilege and power in a godly society. It is both anti-Biblical and suicidal for a society to war against *godly* privilege and power.

Our Lord makes clear that the ungodly love to lord it over men (Matt. 20:25–27), and ungodly wealth and pride keeps men out of God's Kingdom (Matt. 19:24). On the other hand, we are also told, "The blessing of

the LORD, it maketh rich, and he addeth no sorrow with it" (Prov. 10:22). The Christian goal is not to enthrone envy by abolishing all privilege and power (the pretended goal of Marxism), but to abolish envy and to establish justice, peace, and mercy under God.

In Proverbs 14:30 we are told, "A sound heart is the life of the flesh: but envy the rottenness of the bones." This is true of both men and societies. Nations eaten with envy are rotten to the core. Proverbs 27:4 says, "Wrath is cruel, and anger is outrageous; but who is able to stand before envy?" God promises judgment to peoples according to their envy (Ezek. 35:11), because it is envy which brings on His anger and His vengeance against a people.

Envy begets hatred, and it divides a nation and its peoples; it destroys marriages and families; it splits churches and organizations. Basic to its life is this premise: let no man be better than I am. But envy is now basic to the life of states; it is a constant force and motivation in politics and education. The churches are in silence about it (and others of the deadly sins). Take away the appeal to envy, and most politicians would have no platform left, and many men and women would lose their motivating force.

Envy is basic to theft, whether illegal, or legalized through taxation and expropriation. We are as Christians summoned to abandon envy and theft. As St. Paul states it, "Let him that stole steal no more; but rather let him labour, working with his hands the thing which is good, that he may have to give to him that needeth" (Eph. 4:28). Honesty and work become the motivating forces for godly charity. Elections are coming up soon in the United States. If we vote for the platforms promoting envy, God will judge us.

313

THE DEATH OF JUSTICE

Chalcedon Report No. 322, May 1992

In listening to the newscast, Dorothy heard of a case wherein a man, recently laid off from his job, was reported to the police by a dealer to whom he tried to sell some very expensive new equipment. The police found truckloads of stolen equipment being warehoused by the man, all stolen from his previous employer. The judge threw out the case on the ground that the man was a kleptomaniac and was not responsible for the crimes. A woman told me of a rapist who confronted her on the street to mock her for her attempt to gain justice; she fled from the city.

These are all too familiar stories; too many of us can tell of cases of flagrant injustice.

This should not surprise us. Justice is dying, if not already dead, in many places.

As Robert Baker Girdlestone, in *Synonyms of the Old Testament* (1897), pointed out, in Scripture the words *justice* and *righteousness* are the same; they are both translations of the same Hebrew word; to differentiate between them "tends to create a distinction which has no existence in Scripture" (p. 101).

This is an extremely important point. It tells us that only God is the source of righteousness or justice. Since God is Creator of heaven and earth, and of all things therein, there is no source of truth, justice, law, morality, or virtue other than the Lord. To seek justice anywhere other than in God and His enscriptured law-word is to seek for the impossible. There is no other source for anything in the universe, and to depart from God as the Source and Author of all good is sin; it is original sin, the desire to be one's own god, knowing or determining for oneself what is good and evil, right and wrong, justice and injustice, law, morality, and all things else.

But this is precisely what modern man, both in and out of the church, tries to do. He seeks for some kind of natural or humanistic justice, refusing to acknowledge that, because of the fall, nature is fallen, and man is fallen, and therefore there can be no truth apart from God and His Word. As Cornelius Van Til so often pointed out, whatever scientists discover that is valid, is done on borrowed and theistic premises. They affirm a mindless world of chance in their unbelief while assuming in the laboratory an order in creation which makes knowledge possible.

Kinsey's basic premise was the goodness of nature. Therefore, every kind of sexual perversion was natural and good, whereas chastity went against nature and was bad. This was a reversal of the moral order: for Kinsey, what came from God was bad, and what came from nature was good.

But what shall we say of churchmen who apply the same premise in the sphere of law and justice? One prominent theologian is an Arminian, a Pelagian, and an intense hater of God's law. He preaches everywhere that he "fears" for an America under God's law; true justice is only possible under natural and non-Biblical law! What he is saying in effect is that God's Word is unrighteousness or injustice. What he believes in is Jesus as only a savior from hell, and then only if we ask Him for salvation! Is this Christianity, or is it not rather the religion of the tempter in Genesis 3:1–5? Is he not saying with the tempter, "Yea, hath God said . . . " (Gen. 3:1)?

Justice is dying in the world around us because it is virtually dead in the churches of all kinds of structure and beliefs. If the churches abandon God's law, God's justice, how can we expect the world to honor it? How can we expect the courts to provide justice? Will not thieves and rapists laugh in our faces as they see injustice prevail?

The city was once a place of law and safety, but it is now a place of rampant crime and evil. More now is spent by the people of the United States on private policing (security guards, alarm systems, etc.) than on city, county, state, and national policing. Even this works only as a *protective* device; in cases of crime, the courts are weak and often evil. Justice is dying, if not dead, because the antinomianism of the churches has weakened and is destroying the only true source of justice, God's law.

Meanwhile, President Bush, Republicans, and Democrats continue to work for "a new world order" without Christ. Gorbachev laid down the premises for it in a socialistic United Nations world — a Christless world — and Christians are silent in the face of all this. The slave labor camps of the Soviet Union have not been abolished by the "new" regime, but, somehow, the new regime has miraculously become freedom-loving. A sop has been thrown to the churches, a semblance of freedom, to gain

internal and foreign assent to the notion that a true change has occurred. Stalin went through the same temporary affirmation of religious freedom when World War II began, but it was as pragmatic a course as the present one, and it ended with the end of the war.

There can be no justice nor order apart from Jesus Christ as Lord and Savior, and His law-word as our justice. We are told in Hebrews 7:11, 17, that Jesus Christ is a priest forever after the *order* of Melchisedec. The word translated as *order* is a form of *taxis*, meaning a fixed order, succession, or arrangement. Christ is thus the visible and incarnate presence of God's permanent arrangement or order. In Romans 8:2, St. Paul says, "For the *law* of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the *law* of sin and death." In both instances, the word *law* translates *nomos*, law. Two sets of law are contrasted. On the one hand is the law of sin and death, the tempter's words in Genesis 3:1–5, every man as his own god and lawmaker. The law of life, given by the Holy Spirit through Moses, is now a part of our being, it is written within our hearts so that we delight in God's law when we are in Christ.

There may be a great deal of gush and glow in an antinomian conversion, but it may well be a conversion to the law of sin and death, to a law derived from state, church, or man. It is not "the law of the Spirit of life." Is it any wonder that our churches and our civil governments are purveyors of injustice? Should we be surprised that justice is dead or dying? How can we expect the Lord God to have mercy upon us?

314

JUSTICE AND THE LAW

Chalcedon Report No. 207, November 1982

One of the most disastrous facts of the modern age is the separation of justice from the law. Such a separation has existed before in history, usually as a product of moral corruption, sometimes as a result of cynicism. The modern separation is a product of philosophical and religious skepticism.

Perhaps no other man in this century has had an influence on American law equal to that of Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr. (1841–1935). A 1944 biography of Holmes, *Yankee from Olympus*, by Catherine Drinker Bowen, in effect placed him among the American gods by its title. Holmes's grandfather, Abiel, was a Calvinist, his father Oliver Wendell Holmes a Unitarian, and the man from America's Olympus saw life simply as "action and passion." Like proper Bostonians, he held that men could make their own rules out of human experience and abide by them. As an associate justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, 1902–1932, he held, "I am not here to do justice. I am here to play the game according to the rules."

It was precisely this same separation of justice from the law, and the reduction of law to the will of the state, that created the legal climate which led to German National Socialism and Hitler, as John H. Hallowell demonstrated so ably in *The Decline of Liberalism as an Ideology, with Particular Reference to German Politico-Legal Thought* (1943). More recently, the late Princeton philosopher Walter Kaufmann, in *Without Guilt and Justice* (1973), held that guilt and justice are theological concepts and have reference to accountability to God (and rightly so); hence, a humanistic society should, Kaufmann logically insisted, abandon all concepts of guilt and justice. A more radical legal revolution is impossible to imagine. The fact is, that revolution is now in process. This is the reality of modern statist law in virtually every modern state. It is

also the reality (implicit in most cases) of virtually every law school; the exceptions are there, but they are few in numbers.

As a result, justice has been separated from the state. The people, for the most part, are not aware of this philosophical fact of the separation of justice from law and the state. The appeals of politicians for votes still contain vague references to justice, and then stress mainly special interests. The people go to court expecting justice and are bewildered by the results. As a result, a growing cynicism is in evidence. Ominous, too, is the rise of violence against judges.

The rationale of the state and its reason for being is justice. For the state to forsake justice is to forsake its reason for existing. We have seen, in recent years, the steady decline of all churches which abandon their reason for being. If the church does not proclaim the gospel of salvation and history through Jesus Christ it is like a father who, when his son asks for bread, gives him a stone; or, when the son asks for fish, the father gives him a serpent (Matt. 7:9–10). Those churches which feed men stones and serpents are seeing the departure of their flocks. The bankruptcy of the modern state is similar and perhaps greater.

The modern state replaced the church as man's central institution. Even more, it became a saving institution, offering men the ostensible way to the good life, to brotherhood, peace, and plenty. A religious fervor accrued to patriotism as a result, and flags replaced the cross as the symbol around which men rallied. Man's sense of corporate membership in a mystical body was for many most readily aroused by the sight of the flag than the sight of the cross.

However, as humanism developed its legal rationale, justice had to go. The fundamental premise of humanism is Genesis 3:5, "ye shall be as God [i.e., every man his own god], knowing [determining, or, establishing for yourselves] good and evil." In one country after another, the foundations of the state and of the law were shifted from justice to the will of the state, or the will of the people, or the will of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and so on. The law of the state began to represent less and less justice and more and more a power bloc. The goal of men became the capture of the state machinery to control power in their own behalf, and justice became a façade.

The façade, however, is cracking and crumbling. One result is a growing hostility to politicians, lawyers, and judges. Nothing the state can ever do can educate men out of the expectation of justice from the law, and when men become convinced that there is a radical difference between justice and the state and law, it will be the state and law that will pay the price.

Just as the separation of gold and silver from money is destroying money by inflation, even more so does the separation of justice from the law destroy the state.

In this development, the churches have been asleep to the revolution under way around them. They have failed to see what Kaufmann saw clearly (and Nietzsche, Stirner, and others before him), that, where the God of Scripture is denied, guilt and justice cannot exist. They are theocentric or God-centered facts and are theological through and through. No "return to the Constitution" can restore justice; only a truly Biblical faith can make justice again a reality.

Justice is not a vague idea; it is the righteousness of God expressed in His law-word. If we separate justice from the law of God, we are then left with saying that men as gods issue the articles of justice. The words "justice" and "righteousness" are one and the same; they express the meaning of the Hebrew word *tsdak*. If justice and law are not from the God who created all things, they are then from men who claim to be god, because justice and law declare the basic and inescapable accountability. To whom are we accountable, to God, or to man and the state?

The Bible is emphatic that "the judgment is God's" (Deut. 1:17), because God is the Creator, the Lawgiver, and the all-righteous or all-just one. There can be no justice apart from Him and His law-word. Justice is inescapably a theological fact.

For Kaufmann, the goal of this legal revolution is "Liberation," a word used by a variety of movements in our time. In virtually every case, it means most of all liberation from God. Kaufmann said, "Liberation is a movement toward a goal: autonomy." The word *autonomy* tells it all: *auto*, self, and *nomos*, law; man becomes his own law. Kaufmann held, "Being autonomous and being liberated is the same thing." The classic statement of autonomy and liberation, according to Kaufmann, was Genesis 3:1–5, "The Serpent's Promise." It means that "nobody knows what is good. There is no such knowledge." Therefore humanity should "leave behind guilt and fear" and "be autonomous."

Kaufmann saw the issue clearly. Our problem is that churchmen refuse to do so. They prefer to halt between to opinions. Elijah, faced with a Baal-state like our own, said to the people, "How long halt ye between two opinions? if the LORD be God, follow him: but if Baal, then follow him" (1 Kings 18:21).

The sad fact is that of the too many people, who, as they see the law reduced to a game without justice, are ready to express anger, too few are ready to take the logical step and see that without God, there can be no justice. Paul Hoffman's study of a criminal lawyer sums up that lawyer's

premise in its title, *What the Hell is Justice?* (1974). The man was logical. Without God, there can be neither truth nor justice, nor good and evil.

Until men return to the living and triune God, justice will continue to be separated from law and the state, and from everyday life as well.

315

LAW AS REFORMATION

Chalcedon Report No. 161, January 1979

RESTITUTION is basic to Biblical law. For all offenses, man must make restitution to man. For offenses against God, only Jesus Christ can make restitution, and basic to the doctrine of the cross is the fact of restitution, the satisfaction of God's justice. Thus, the principle of restitution goes hand in hand with justification by faith in Christ's atoning work.

Humanism, however, has other doctrines of law, all of which stress man's salvation by works of law. Whenever in the civil order men adopt a humanistic doctrine of law, they undermine Biblical theology because humanistic law requires another doctrine of salvation.

First among the humanistic doctrines of law is the doctrine of law as a means of reformation, i.e., the salvation of man by legal reformation. A leading figure in this faith was the Quaker, William Penn. Although it was about a century and a half before his ideas were adopted, it was Penn's thinking which gave the rationale.

Penn, as a Quaker, believed that every man has within him an inner light, a spark of divinity, and, by heeding that inner light, a man can be saved. The solution therefore to all problems of crime is simple, from this perspective. Give the criminal an opportunity to develop his inner light and become a new man. This, of course, was not anything but heresy but, with the development of the Enlightenment, and then Romanticism, this doctrine caught on. As Roger Campbell, in *Justice Through Restitution* (Milford, MI: Mott Media, 1977) points out, the Quakers became leaders in "prison reform."

How was the criminal's inner light to save him? The humanistic reformers, in England, Europe, and America, saw salvation in isolation from corrupting influences. Let the criminal be placed in a new kind of monastic cell in order to meditate on his sins and become a new man

through the inner light. As Michel Foucault, in *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (New York, NY: Pantheon Books, 1977), has pointed out, prisons began to be built as a new kind of monastery for a new kind of monk.

Prisons, moreover, began to gain new names to fit their new functions. The term *penitentiary* recalls medieval penitential exercises. *Reformatory* spells out the humanistic doctrine of reform or salvation by law. *Correctional facility* is again a term which witnesses to the salvific purpose of the law as reformation, as does *reform school*.

Conservatives and churchmen who advocate "stiffer" applications of the prison system had better reassess their efforts. They are demanding a humanistic plan of salvation. Biblical law requires restitution, not imprisonment, and with habitual criminals, the death penalty; only such a system means that crime does not pay. The prison system does not solve the problem of crime, and prisons are not reformatories but schools for crime. Men come out worse than they went in.

Of course, the means of reformation by law have changed in recent years. A variety of more modern means of salvation have been proposed and tried. One is work therapy, prison shops, work farms, and the like. Another is psychological and psychiatric help, a very popular but highly ineffective practice. Still another is education, so that both in and out of prison, in dealing with all men, many humanists see the hope of the salvation of man and the reform of society in education. (It was for this reason that I titled my study of the philosophies of statist education, *The Messianic Character of American Education*.) All of these efforts have one thing in common, failure.

But the idea of law as a means of reformation has not been limited to the theory of penology: it has been applied to all of civil society. Statist legislation has today as basic to its motivation the faith that man and society can be saved by works of law. Every time a legislature, parliament, or congress meets, it works to save man by law. Moreover, now, as humanism is in its death throes all over the world, it works more furiously to legislate salvation and to stifle dissent.

What happens to churchmen who live at peace with a civil government whose life and purpose are governed by a humanistic plan of salvation by law rather than by Biblical law? *First*, it is clear that they have failed to understand Scripture or to apply it. They have not seen the ramifications of the atonement, nor that Scripture is a total word for all of life. They try to serve two masters, two plans of salvation (Matt. 6:24), with sorry results. How can men advocate one plan of salvation in the church and another through civil government without schizophrenia and moral paralysis?

Second, the church then recedes from most of the world, which is thus surrendered to another plan of salvation. It limits its concern to man's soul and to heaven, and it surrenders God's Word to the devil. Theology becomes irrelevant to life, and is no longer the queen of the sciences. The Bible becomes a devotional manual, not God's command word for the whole of life and the world.

Clearly, for the church to live at peace with the doctrine of salvation by law in the state means to compromise justification by faith everywhere. Is it any wonder that the church has long been in retreat? This retreat cannot be reversed until the church stands clearly against all doctrines of salvation by works of law and declares that God's Word is the sufficient word for man, in church and state. Only Biblical law is in harmony with the Biblical doctrine of salvation.

(In subsequent months, other humanistic doctrines of salvation by law will be discussed.)

316

LAW AS REGULATION

Chalcedon Report No. 162, February 1979

Biblical law requires restitution; humanistic law has some man-conceived alternatives to God's law. *First*, as we have seen, law is held to be a means of reformation. Man is to be saved by legally compelled reformation.

Second, another humanistic approach to the problem of law is salvation by regulation. The purpose of the state and of law is seen as prevention. By means of a multitude of rules and regulations, the humanistic state proposes to control man so thoroughly that sin will become impossible. Men will be good, because no other option will be open to them.

Superficially, this principle has been with us for centuries, and some aspects of it have been adopted by many Christians. To go beyond God's law is to play god, and to hope for salvation by man-made means. Thus, temperance is clearly required by God's law; law-enforced prohibition is another matter. It is not liquor which turns men into drunkards, in the moral sense, but intemperate men who use liquor to become drunkards. Guns do kill, but gun control does not alter the murderous heart of man. When we stress the legal solution, we underrate or bypass the religious answer. We then give ourselves and society a false emphasis.

But such regulations are superficial when compared with the current trend in legislation. The citizen, the laborer, the industrialist, the farmer, and every producer is surrounded by a vast network of rules and regulations. Moreover, we cannot understand the meaning of this plan of salvation by regulatory laws unless we recognize its religious nature. These humanistic lawmakers believe themselves to be the very soul of benevolence and nobility. They want a good world for all of us, and it pains them that we misunderstand their motives. They are religiously governed, and their faith rests, *first*, on a belief that man can be saved.

Bad as man's plight may be, man can be salvaged, and, even more, perfected. With this salvation and perfection, man can enjoy life and this earth as never before, and a world order with world peace is a very real possibility and a necessary goal. *Second*, the salvation of man can be best or only accomplished by man, and the human agency best suited for this function is the state. The state is thus modern man's true church and savior. Politics becomes dominant in human interest and action whenever men see salvation in humanistic terms. Then the cry is, O Baal, save us. We fail to comprehend the direction of modern politics if we do not see that the state is humanistic man's agency for self-salvation.

Third, for the state to become an effectual savior, it must control every area of life and thought. This means that laws must regulate all human activities and direct them into approved and salvific channels only. Accordingly, regulatory laws govern education, economics, agriculture, production and consumption, health, welfare, and all things else. This means, too, the progressive regulation of the press and of religion. Increasing statist efforts whittle away by regulation at every freedom of the press and of religion, because humanistic salvation by regulation leads step by step to total regulation for total salvation.

In the earlier form of humanistic law, law as the means of reformation, prisons were made into the new monastery for the reformation of lawbreakers. Like the monk, the prisoner faced a totally prescribed life as the regimen of his salvation and sanctification. This concept of law as reformation has been expanded to circumscribe all men: law, salvific law, is now the salvation of man by the total regulation of all men. The monastery was and is a voluntary place, and its roots are in self-regulation, something the humanists forgot. In the "Great Society" of humanistic man, all the world will be turned into a prison, with total regulation by total law. Of course, the humanistic reformer believes that our current protests against these regulations is evidence of sin on our part, but time, and humanistic law, will change us all, and we will rejoice, each of us in our well-regulated nook or cell.

As a result, all over the world, the humanistic legal reformers are working busily for our salvation. Every day, a multitude of new regulatory laws surrounds us to hem us in from sin. In the United States of America, the Federal Register is evidence of this. Not content with the slow-moving pace of Congress with its hundreds of new laws, the administration and the bureaucracy issue new regulations by the thousands through the Federal Register. How great is their concern for us! They plan to save us, come what may.

Like it or not, men will get humanistic salvation unless they find

theocentric salvation through Jesus Christ. Our option is not between God's salvation or none, but between God's plan and man's plan. The Fall originated in the creature's plan for his own salvation (Gen. 3:5), and the pages of history give us the grim struggle between various man-made plans, and also and supremely, the struggle between man-made plans, and God's eternal plan through Jesus Christ. Man, in rejecting God's plan, issued his own. By means of his own law decree, man plans to save himself. If the state is anything but Christian, it will seek to impose on all men a man-made system of law and salvation. The choice is between God's law and man's law; it is between Christ and Caesar.

317

LAW AS REDISTRIBUTION

Chalcedon Report No. 163, March 1979

Biblical law requires restitution and restoration. Humanistic law begins by seeking the reformation of man by law. In *reformatory legislation*, the lawbreaker is the goal of controls. The next step in humanistic law is *regulatory legislation*. Regulations seek to control all men to make crime impossible, or nearly so.

But humanistic law does not stop there. The third step is *redistribution*. The control of all men goes hand in hand with the control of all property. Men, land, and money are redistributed. Law becomes a total plan for the total salvation of men and society by means of total control.

In education, the goal becomes the equalization of all children in every way, so that grading is seen as an evil to be overcome or eliminated. Schooling stresses, instead of the acquisition of knowledge, the acquisition of social attitudes which will enable the child to belong to a levelled, redistributive society. Instead of an emphasis on excellence and individual achievement, there is instead an emphatic demand for socialization and group dynamics.

In religion, humanism seeks by law to eliminate or bring into conformity those churches which deny the "Great Community" as ultimate. All appeals must be to Caesar rather than to God. Ultimacy is held to be in the state, not in God, so that the state is viewed as god walking on earth and as the agency of social salvation. The Christian school is thus seen as a dangerous agency, because it teaches a higher allegiance and trains youth in terms of another faith.

In economics, redistributive legislation in Marxist countries means the open transfer of land and wealth from private ownership to the state as the trustee of all the people. In the democratic nations, the same redistributive goal is achieved by a variety of means, most notably the

inheritance tax and the income tax. In the United States, 75 percent of all farms, businesses, and activities are wiped out by the death of the owner because of the confiscatory nature of the inheritance tax. The income tax works annually to redistribute wealth, as does the property tax, and a variety of other taxes. In fact, the goal of taxation can no longer be said to be the maintenance of civil order and justice; rather, its goal is social revolution by means of taxation. Taxation has indeed become the new and most effective method of revolution; it is the reactionary redistributionists who still think in terms of the armed overthrow of existing orders. The more liberal ones know that taxation is the more efficient means of revolution.

In politics, the redistributive state works to equalize and scatter all independent sectors, whether religious, racial, or economic, which can form pockets of strength and resistance to the saving power of the state. The redistributive state wants no dissident minorities, only an undifferentiated and submissive majority.

In brief, the redistributive state wants a world beyond good and evil. Where there is no good nor evil, there can be no criticism, and no judgment. Doris and David Jonas, an anthropologist-psychiatrist couple, declared, in *Sex and Status* (1975), after discussing a number of obviously warped and sinning relationships, "What, then, constitutes a basis for an harmonious male-female relationship? We are forced to the conclusion that this is not determinable from the outside" (pp. 102–103). For them, there being no good and evil, no God, sin and perversion are merely matters of taste and choice. In a world beyond good and evil, there is no standard for condemning a civil government, and the civil law is thus beyond criticism. Moral judgment disappears, and coercion replaces it. In fact, where there is no moral law, and no God whose court is the source of all law and judgment, then the only binding force in any social order is coercion.

Thus, the more humanistic a state becomes, the more coercive it becomes. The brutal slave labor camps of the Marxist states are not aberrations nor errors of principle on their part: they are the logical outcome of their humanism. The humanistic state replaces God's predestination with man's plan of predestination by total coercion, and it replaces God's moral law with a purely coercive law whose purpose is alien to man's being and destructive to it.

All three forms or stages of humanistic law are very much with us all over the world. The Christian cannot be indifferent to law without denying his faith. Humanistic law is a plan of salvation in terms of Genesis 3:5; its goal is to make man his own god, determining good and evil for

himself. However, when man seeks to affirm himself in defiance of and apart from the triune God, what he actually does is to destroy himself. By his sin, he brings in death; by his rebellion in the name of freedom, he assures his slavery.

God's law, in its every aspect, requires restitution and restoration. "God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap" (Gal. 6:7; cf. 2 Cor. 9:6). What shall *this* generation reap, when churchmen count it a virtue to be hostile to restitution and to God's law?

Law can never be neutral. Law always condemns one kind of practice and protects another. The law can be fair, and in its procedures conscientious, but it is never neutral. Law is always religious: it is an expression of faith concerning the nature of things and a statement of what constitutes righteousness or justice. Historically, and in essence always, law is a theological concern. For churchmen to be indifferent to the triumph of humanistic law means that they are indifferent to the claims and demands of the triune God. Such an indifference is suicidal, and it is sin.

318

FALSE SOLUTIONS

Chalcedon Report No. 181, September 1980

Otto J. Scott, in *The Secret Six*, a study of John Brown of Harper's Ferry, calls attention to a group of Unitarian leaders whose answer to the problem of slavery was apocalyptic warfare. Their answer, in fact, to all problems was conflict and terrorism, not peaceful solutions. Scott has seen a fact which other scholars and historians prefer to ignore. The nineteenth century saw the abolition of private slavery in all the areas under Western control. Except for the United States, the abolition was everywhere peaceful. Autocratic Russia freed its serfs without conflict. Latin American countries with a higher ratio of slaves than the United States also abolished slavery, legally and peacefully. Only the United States chose war.

The Founding Fathers, at the time of the Constitutional Convention, foresaw the essential disappearance of slavery as inevitable. In the early 1800s, in every Southern state save South Carolina, a majority favored the end of slavery; the only question was, how? Instead of a concern for the practical mechanics of such a step, a growing minority chose an all-out assault on the South. Conflict, not solution, was their goal. As a result, the nation was divided over the issue. In his Fourth Annual Message, December 2, 1856, President Franklin Pierce challenged this view of conflict as solution. It presupposed a belief that slave labor is superior to free labor, and that free labor cannot compete with it; it assumed an "irresistibly superior vitality" to slavery which was false. Implicitly, he believed that the means of eliminating slavery was already at hand: freedom. Slavery could not compete with free labor, and would disappear in time.

This was, of course, the problem. Then as now, those who call for conflict (and assume a conflict view of society) may oppose private slavery, but they believe in slavery to the state. The early opponents of serfdom in

Russia were socialists: they wanted all men under the power of the state, with themselves as the elite managers. They did not believe in freedom for any but the power state.

Not surprisingly, the heirs of the abolitionists in the United States (and a few of the original ones in their later years) became strong advocates of centralized and statist power as the solution to all problems. Despite all their talk about liberty, they distrusted freedom — freedom of the individual, or the nonstatist institution, that is. They wanted unlimited freedom for the state.

Their "solution" to problems is still conflict. In the name of peace, they demand war. There is a logic to this. Crises and wars are the best tools of revolution. In the modern age, every war becomes an instrument for enlarging state powers and creating a social revolution. Every modern state is prepared for a national crisis: a series of emergency executive orders are readied long in advance. The effect of these is not to aid the country and economy in a crisis but to control and paralyze it, and to enlarge the powers of the state. In every modern war and crisis, the winner has been statism: the powers of virtually every state are increased, and those of the people decreased.

This means that the modern state has a vested interest in wars and crises. Nothing does more to further its accretion of power: this is the grand solution by the state to all its people's problems, more power to the state.

In *The Journal of the Absurd* (1980), Jules Siegel and Bernard Garfinkel characterize the statist or "official mind" thus: "It hates logic, simplicity, spontaneity, common sense, and people as individuals. It loves power, regulations, duplication, complexity, titles, penalties, and people as categories. Its philosophy: More is better, even if it's worse. Its program: There are no solutions, there are only bigger problems" (p. 113).

As long as men expect statist solutions, they will get bigger problems, more wars, and more crises, as surely as the sun rises and sets. The only valid alternative to this is Jesus Christ. If men are truly Christian, if Christ be their King, they cannot look to Caesar for solutions, hope, or salvation. When we speak of the modern era as the era of humanistic statism (or, statist humanism), we are saying that the world has been in a post-Christian age. That age is now perishing. The Christian must separate himself from it. Alan Stang's book title puts the matter tellingly: God's law is, *Thou Shalt Have No Other Gods Before Me — Including the State.*

We Americans are obviously slow learners. For a century and a half, our leaders have been giving us conflict as the solution to problems. Many countries have an even longer history of failure to learn. As a result the powers of the state increase, and man's freedom wanes. The conflict

society is assumed by some to be a fact of nature, and inevitable. They look to the state and its men, where corruption and venality are at their highest pitch, for solutions to moral problems. All this constitutes moral idiocy.

The God who has turned us over to destruction for our apostasy and rebellion, summons us to faith and obedience: "Return, ye children of men" (Ps. 90:3). In no other way can we enter into a post-statist and a Christian era.

319

WAR

Chalcedon Report No. 418, May 2000

War is inevitable in a fallen, sinful world. The basic form of war in the Bible is God's law. God's law declares war on various forms of sin. A theonomic society will be less likely to have military wars because it will identify the main form of sin as in itself. Restitution, the restoration of God's ordained social order, is basic to this dealing with sin in society. Society is thus in a constant state of war against sin — against internal sin. Law's restorative role is basic; its heart is restitution, reestablishing the broken order.

When we lose the theonomic perspective, law and the courts begin to go astray. Humanism, man's idea of order, then replaces God's law and order. Humanistic law sees as basic man's "order," which, in essence, is rebellion against God and is subversive of society.

Today, too much of the world and the church is in rebellion against God. It is amazing that so many churchmen are antinomian. How dare they disagree with God!

In talking or thinking of war, most people think only of military war. Here the Bible is against offensive war, but is not against defensive warfare. This is not acceptable to many people. What would have happened, they say, if we had not waged war against the Nazis, or prepared to do so against the Marxists? They do not stop to consider that from day one, all such regimes were financed by loans and pacts by us. Why not terminate such orders by withdrawing all support? Or do we want war?

War has become basic to the modern state. In the early 1950s, I heard a man argue that war was basic to prosperity, and that the United States needed wars big and little and would wage them for years to come. We are doing so, and we currently have troops all over the world, in as many as sixty countries, I have heard. Whatever the number, it is considerable.

War is widely condemned, but as long as people like the social and economic results, it will continue.

The "moral" justification for war is interventionism. It is the belief that, as the moral force in the world, a pharisaic faith, we have a moral duty to intervene everywhere. Because of this faith, the twentieth century has moved from one crisis into another.

The church is one of God's basic instruments of warfare. It seeks to get to the root of wars, sin. Yet too often the church has been a rubber stamp for statist policies. Sin is the problem, but an antinomian church has forgotten what sin really is, or how to deal with it. 1 John 3:4 tells us that "sin is the transgression of the law" of God. If you are an antinomian, you have no definition nor knowledge of sin and are a part of the problem.

We must define sin and war Biblically, not politically. We must wage war God's way, not man's. Too many churchmen want peace with both God and the world, an impossibility. When we are at war, we should know who or what the enemy is.

320

THE WARFARE STATE

Chalcedon Report No. 76, December 1, 1971

A few years ago, a writer described the modern American order as "the warfare state." His argument was a faulty one, but his term was a very apt one. The age of the state has led inescapably to the warfare state. An important and central aspect of the life of the state has been war.

Now, St. James makes clear in his epistle (4:1–3) that the source of conflict and war is in the heart of man; it is a product of his sin, and he cannot therefore blame war on the capitalists, a military-industrial complex, other nations, the communists, or anything else. The basic and essential cause of war is the sin of man. This does not rule out secondary causes; it does make it morally necessary to avoid giving primacy to secondary causes, for then we absolutize circumstances over man and man's freedom and responsibility. We must also hold that the secondary cause always rests in the primary cause, sin.

A theorist of the last century said that war is the continuation and extension of diplomacy into military action. A state is continually seeking its advantage by one means or another, so that diplomacy and war are alike instruments to a continuing evil.

The fact of warfare gained prestige when Darwin set forth his theory of evolution. The struggle for survival was widely assumed to mean warfare in one form or another, economic and class warfare, warfare for resources, warfare in every area. When Darwin published his *Origin of Species* on November 24, 1859, a waiting world was delighted with his thesis, and the entire edition sold out on the day of publication. Two of the happiest of the earliest readers were Marx and Engels, who rightly saw in Darwin the confirmation of their beliefs: they correctly held that Darwin's success would ensure the triumph of socialism. The reason is an obvious one. If evolution rather than creation by God is true, then two

things follow: *first*, life is a struggle for survival, and a theory of class warfare is simply a sociological application of evolution, and, *second*, if God is eliminated, nothing morally binding remains to ensure private property, Christian marriage, and religious authority in any realm. Life is then an amoral struggle for survival, and in that amoral struggle mass man has the best chances for victory, supposedly.

The age of the state, already firmly geared to warfare as an instrument of politics, thus turned warfare, with Darwin and Marx, into the holy crusade of humanism on its march to utopia. Much is said about "holy wars" in past history, and most of it is nonsense. The true holy wars in the fullest sense of the word are after Darwin and Marx. World Wars I and II were holy crusades "to make the world safe for democracy," and to "end war and ensure peace," and so on. The terminology of communist warfare is the most intense example of holy warfare in all history.

Since accepting the necessity of struggle for survival, our humanism of today has in it the grounds for the holy war of our evolutionary faith. The established humanistic religion of modern states sees conflict as always the means of progress; every struggle against a reactionary, racist, or fascist enemy is by definition an act of faith and a step towards peace and freedom. The evil is war by the enemies of a particular socialist state, or by any who oppose the religion of statism.

Thus, despite all the pious bleatings about a love of peace, ours is an age of warfare, and of holy wars. These wars serve two purposes: *First*, a war always consolidates greater power over the citizenry in the hands of the state, so that a victorious state emerges not only victorious over its enemies, but over its own people as well. Thus, whatever losses the Germans, Japanese, North Koreans, and Vietcong or North Vietnamese may have suffered at American hands, this much is certain, that, since 1917, the major and consistent losers have been the American people. By their sinful propensity for the cult of the state, they have seen their freedom diminished and economic slavery emerge: the state has been the consistent winner. A huge bureaucracy has developed in Washington and in every city and state; from a standing army of a few thousand, we now have an army of millions; from almost inconsequential taxes, the citizens now pay taxes which are almost equal to a rent on their property and a permit to live. *Second*, warfare is more and more a way of life, and a basic philosophy of progress. The result is class warfare.

How does labor see progress for itself? The answer is clearly by means of warfare, war against management, and against the consumer. It is unthinkable for labor negotiators to assume that anything but conflict can assure progress, and benefits for the working man. As a result, labor is

committed, by virtue of its religious faith in the evolutionary humanism of our day, to a warfare philosophy.

This is no less true of capital. Very early, in men like Carnegie, industry committed itself to social Darwinianism, and the result was a growing breach between capital and labor. In this grim warfare, having a religion of conflict, concession is sin, and even elementary decencies must be fought for by both sides, since both maintain a hostility to concessions. There have been notable exceptions on both sides, but, basically, the philosophy of warfare governs them. We have thus, in every area, a warfare state.

In all this, of course, the state is the gainer. Warfare works to the disadvantage of industry and labor; it is destructive of the economy and of society, since progress rests on a harmony of interests. For the state, however, progress in its march to power rests on warfare, which greatly increases its power. The greater the hostility between capital and labor, the more both will turn to the state for an ally, so that the real victor in all cases is the state, which gains steadily in its power over both capital and labor. The state emerges as the victor, and capital and labor as the chained and controlled servants of the state.

The state thus has an advantage in promoting class warfare, and statism inevitably promotes it, because its interference furthers conflict. Progress in race relations in America was real, until statist legislation turned it into class warfare and riots in the streets. Neither blacks nor whites have been the gainers, but the state's powers over both, and over labor and industry, are greatly increased.

But the state cannot profit by its victories. When the state steps beyond its God-appointed realm as the ministry of justice, the state begins to fail in its ability to function effectively. The state is not a producer. For the state to gain vast powers over society is about as fruitful of good as for a mule to gain power over a corral full of mares: it is a sterile victory which can only embarrass the victor. The result is even greater tension and conflict.

The greatest powers for the state are just ahead of us, and its greatest defeats, its inability to keep its promises and a consequent disillusionment of peoples. Already, everywhere, the state is failing in its ability to maintain an elementary and basic need of the people, security in their homes and safety in the streets; failure here will only increase in the days ahead. Already, a sum equal to 50 percent of all federal, state, county, and local police costs is spent for varying forms of private protection, and this sum will only increase. As controls over the police increase, and public morality declines, lawlessness will become more open and extensive.

The more power and money an individual or an enterprise gains, the more effectively it functions, because, normally, people and businesses have a productive function which thrives on further capitalization. However, this is not true of the state. The more power and money a state gains, the less effectively it functions, because it feeds on power and money, not to function in terms of a productive end, but to enhance its power and wealth. Power and money give muscles to men, businesses, and organizations, but they feed a cancer in the state.

The modern state is thus a sick enterprise which resents health in its midst and penalizes it. It grows in wealth, but regards wealth in others as an evil. Its senators vote for busing for the masses and send their own children to private schools to avoid busing. The state has a double standard of morality, one for itself, and another for the people.

A deepening disillusionment with the state is ahead of us, and a growing decline in its authority. However, because the warfare state rests firmly on the foundation of the warfaring man, *disillusionment will not change the world*. As long as men believe, after Darwin and Marx, in a warfare world as the way for progress, they will create and perpetuate a warfare state. A man spent some time recently telling me how bad socialism, controls, and statism generally are. Then he concluded his random remarks by saying, "Well, it's a dog-eat-dog world." His perspective ensures precisely the kind of world he has. It is not a dog-eat-dog world: it is God's world, and His law prevails. All who violate it will sooner or later suffer the consequences. Those who insist that it is a dog-eat-dog world are debasing life, the world, and themselves, and they are the losers. *To live on the foundation that this is God's world* may not give us as many bones as this man has, but, instead of a dog's life, *we live a rich life under God*.

Jesus Christ is declared to be "the Prince of Peace" (Isa. 9:6), but this does not mean surrender. He came to bring a sword (Matt. 10:25ff.) of moral division in terms of Himself and His law-word, but an offer of peace to all men of all classes. His peace is more than a cessation of warfare: it is a way of life and a relationship to Himself. Progress is not through a struggle for survival or warfare but by means of obedience to His law-word and its application to every sphere of life.

The warfare state sees progress through the destruction of its enemies or their subjection to the state; it sees conflict as the essence of progress. The Biblical perspective is radically different: there is no progress unless there is, first of all, *regeneration, a change of heart, life, and nature through Jesus Christ, and then obedience to His law-word*. Men may hope for peace through other means, but they will instead feed the forces of war.

Conflict, instead of being a force for progress, is an aspect of man's fall and a product of his sin. It is unfortunately sometimes necessary in a fallen world, but it is not the norm, nor is it the means of progress. Sometimes good very definitely does come out of conflict, and sometimes conflict is morally necessary, but this still does not mean that conflict is the way to progress. A man who lost his sight in an accident was led, step by step, to a forsaking of a reprobate way of life and to a useful and godly existence. This does not mean that we should all blind ourselves in order to make progress! Neither the source of change, nor the thing changed, are in the environment or in accidents, but in the relationship of God and man. Man's basic war is with God and God's law order, and man's true peace begins with peace with God.

In all of this, the state is futile. To hope for political salvation is like hoping for a colt from a mule. The state will change when men change. The warfare state will give way to a godly state when men are godly men, not the warfaring men St. James described (James 4:1–3). Meanwhile, the age of the state is what we deserve. In fact, it is better than this generation deserves.

321

THE WAR THREAT

Chalcedon Report No. 330, January 1993

LENIN favored any and all kinds of wars because he recognized the revolutionary nature of warfare. During a war, the respect for life and property give way to an urge to smash and destroy. Moral standards in one sphere after another, including the sexual, are surrendered to the demands of the moment. All the stabilizing routines of everyday life give way to the demand for victory. In the process of dehumanizing the enemy, we dehumanize ourselves. Names given to the enemy peoples during a war are expressive of contempt and hatred.

Not surprisingly, war accomplishes some sorry things. *First*, it erodes religious faith and morality. *Second*, it centralizes power in the hands of the state, so the prewar freedoms do not return. *Third*, it centralizes the economy and weakens the middle and lower classes, who also do virtually all the fighting. More can be said, but this is enough.

R. E. McMaster, Jr. has predicted (from the 1970s) the likelihood of war by the mid-1990s. John Ralston Saul, in *Voltaire's Bastards: The Dictatorship of Reason in the West* (1992), has called attention to the fact that we have everywhere a permanent wartime economy which is devouring the countries. It began when men like Robert McNamara in the United States, and others elsewhere, put their national governments in the business of overproducing armaments and selling the surplus to other countries. To enable third-world countries to buy the weaponry, foreign loans were given; these countries are now unable to pay even the interest on the loans, but the buying continues. On top of that, twenty-seven third-world countries are now arms producers. As a result, there are now more than forty conflicts around the world, and an average of one thousand soldiers killed daily.

Various figures are given as to the extent of the government of the

economy by the arms business and associated research and development (involving our major universities and scientists: 40 percent of all U.S. scientists, 75 percent of the Russian) which control the economy beyond the armament plants and universities. From 25 to 80 percent of modern economies is directly or indirectly war-oriented. (This was not a goal of military leaders but of businessmen placed in charge of the military, men such as McNamara.)

Our "solutions" now, in every sphere, are wrong, and they seek "resolutions" in terms of a Roman "peace" such as Carthage experienced. As the economic crisis deepens, the *political* answer may well again be war. And war leads in one way or another to revolutions.

There will be no changing this evil course of events without a return to Christ and to Christendom. The political answers have given us the most disastrous century in all of history. Our course as Christians must be to oppose interference in foreign conflicts, as George Washington counseled, and to proclaim the gospel of Jesus Christ and His peace to all the world.

322

THE LAWS OF WAR

Chalcedon Report No. 324, July 1992

The Biblical laws of war are very unpopular in our time because they require a religious and moral standard. *Some* of the laws important for our present concern include the following: The enemy had to be given a notice, and an opportunity to seek peaceful solutions (Deut. 20:10–11). An "alarm" was then sounded (Num. 10:9). In waging the war, while on special occasions God required, because of His, not man's, judgment on that people, their total destruction, this was not a law for man to apply. According to Deuteronomy 20:19–20, not even the fruit trees of the enemy could be destroyed; this was a case law which held that, if even the fruit trees are spared, how much more the innocent peoples.

Some have held these laws to be "unrealistic." Warfare then, however, did not lack savagery. Ripping open an enemy's pregnant womenfolk was one of the many common evils practiced (2 Kings 15:16; Amos 1:13). Wars in those days of old were not gentlemanly forays; they were brutal and savage. The Lord God had and has the right to execute men and nations with a finality of judgment, but He does not give this right to the nations.

Beginning with the French Revolution, men and nations began to indulge in a ferocity and barbarism not known in Christendom for some time. In the United States, between 1861–1864, total war was routinely practiced on *both* sides, mostly by Union forces, and not by Robert E. Lee. World War I saw the beginning of modern total war with civilians as the main target. Both sides aimed at starving the enemy, Germany with the U-boats (submarine warfare), and the Allies with a blockade.

Worse yet, when the war ended, the blockade was not ended. German troops were deep into France; its armies did not fail. The shortage of food

ended the war because of radical hunger.[1] Starvation left a stunted generation, intense bitterness, and the seeds of World War II, when the same tactics were used. Both sides were guilty of war crimes, but only the losers were punished.

More recently, the United States forced a war with a country which was, for better or worse, an ally a few days earlier, Iraq! Iraq was blockaded, and the blockade continues. The civilian death toll, especially children, has been enormous. Few have bothered to wonder why Iraq did not resist or fight back. It raises grim questions. Did the United States (and Israel) plan to broaden the war, if resisted, to invade Syria, Jordan, Lebanon, and Iraq? Why did Iraq fire missiles into Israel which some say lacked warheads? To go back to 1918, why was Arabia divided by the Allies instead of being allowed to unite under its Hashemite leadership?

There are a host of unanswered questions, but one thing is clear. Because our age is godless, its conduct of courts, civil government, war, and all things else, is *lawless and immoral*. We must separate ourselves from the world system because it is our *calling* and our Lord's *command* that we seek first the Kingdom of God, and His righteousness or justice (Matt. 6:33).

Our hope is not *political* but theological. Apart from the resurrected King over all kings and rulers of the earth, there is neither hope nor peace. Our reconstruction of all things must be in terms of our Redeemer-King and His law-word. The pragmatism and practicalities of the ungodly men and nations are evil and suicidal (Prov. 8:36). The laws of our warfare against the darkness of this world require knowledge, holiness, righteousness or justice, and holy dominion.

We are in a war very different from any imagined by the ungodly. Because we are Christ's new human race, we have a different agenda from the sons of Adam. We have a duty to reclaim all men and nations for Jesus Christ. Any solution to the world's problems other than Jesus Christ and His ruling word is as unrealistic as the wayward and evil course of the nations.

Whom, then, shall we serve?

1. C. Paul Vincent, *The Politics of Hunger: The Allied Blockade of Germany, 1915–1919* (Columbus, OH: Ohio University Press, 1985).

323

THE CASE OF THE MIRED HORSE

Chalcedon Report No. 166, June 1979

To understand the modern age, it is important to understand the case of the mired horse. In 1825, Robert Owen came to the United States "like a god from a machine," according to one scholar, to recruit converts to form his first socialist community, the Community of Equality at New Harmony, Indiana. His was the humanistic gospel of salvation. Children were to be taken at birth and trained as "blank paper" into the true way of life. The colony began with a declaration of mental independence from the "social evils" which plagued mankind: *"Private, or Individual Property*—absurd and irrational *Systems of Religion*—and *Marriage*, founded on individual property combined with some of these irrational systems of religion."

In 1826, a visiting Frenchman, Gabriel Rey, interested in joining the colony, found some discouraging signs of trouble and left later. He arrived on April 5 at supper time but had to go to bed supperless, on a short, creaking bed. At dawn, Rey took a walk to see this humanistic paradise at firsthand. He found a mired horse, groaning, with none to help him. Nine days later, when Rey left, the horse was still mired and helpless, with none making any effort to rescue it. While Rey was there, necessary work went undone, *but a new constitution was announced*.

Here we have in classic form, in the case of the mired horse, a telling aspect of the modern age insofar as its intellectuals and leaders are concerned. Hegel declared, in a sentence which sums up modern thought from Descartes to the present, that "the rational is the real." Reality being equated with thought, the key to the future became, not the worker or the producer, the laborer or the capitalist, but the intellectual. The key to dominating the world and creating a new reality became the intellectual. Biblical faith, by setting forth the absolute sovereignty of God, and the

necessary response of faith on the part of man, was the great enemy of the intellectuals, because it denied their version of reality. Biblical faith sets forth the sovereign God whose government is total. Because God is the Creator of all things, His eternal decree establishes the necessary bounds and framework of all life and thought. Predestination, that is, total planning and control, is thus an inescapable concept and fact. If it be denied to God, it accrues to man. As a result, the intellectuals have seen a new locale for sovereignty and predestination, in either the "autonomous" intellectual, or in the scientific socialist state. In man's hands, this means confusion. If the rational is the real, if what the intellectual determines is a necessary "fact," then it is either *ipso facto* reality, or some hostile force is frustrating and destroying the coming into being of reality.

This leads, *first*, to the case of the mired horse. Whenever any congress, parliament, politburo, or like agency meets, it majestically outlaws the possibility of mired horses. This is the nature of modern politics, the abolition by fiat decree of mired horses. Man's problems are legislated out of existence whenever such bodies meet.

Second, because these mired horses do not disappear, we then see attacks launched against the evil element which destroys the rational order. In the Soviet Union, this means slave labor camps. In the United States, for example, the economy is a mired horse, mired by the federal government itself, and by its monetary and fiscal policies. However, war is waged by the federal government against capital and labor, and also against consumers — against everyone else as the real offenders. Stern warnings are issued, and speculators attacked. All the while, more horses are mired by the federal government, and more people are blamed for it.

The men of New Harmony framed a new constitution while the mired horse remained mired and died apparently. The apostles of the new world order are killing more than mired horses. The key for them is not faith and work but more noble pronouncements and laws.

As long as men in high places and low have the same outlook and hope as the men of New Harmony, we will continue to have mired horses. At New Harmony, all men were required to put all their capital into the colony, except the leaders, Robert Owen, his son Robert Dale Owen, William Maclure, William S. Phiquepal d'Arusmont, Marie Duclos Fretageot, and other leaders. Apparently contributing their presence and "ideas" was more than enough capital!

Now, if we put any faith or hope in men who mire horses, we ourselves will be mired at the very least. We and our society will perish most assuredly. Yet modern man's hope has been in men who mire horses!

Even worse, the church too often denies the lordship of Jesus Christ

by limiting His kingship to the church only, or to the future, and thereby turns the world over to men who mire horses. Some will even argue that to assert the crown rights of Christ over every realm is "the social gospel"! But the social gospel is humanism: it asserts human autonomy and sovereignty and the satisfaction of human needs as the gospel. It is an appalling blindness to confuse Christ's kingship over all things with its opposite, and it is an open invitation for the judgment of God. Such men are fools who say in their hearts, there is no god outside the church. And this is a greater evil than miring horses.

324

REFLECTIONS AT THE CLOSE OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

Chalcedon Report No. 371, June 1996

The twentieth century has been an era of dramatic and worldwide changes, revolutions, and upheavals. The world is always changing, but the changes made in the twentieth century have been particularly great.

Let us examine the powerful influence of two men, perhaps the most revolutionary in their work, and in their evil impact. These two men were Benito Mussolini and John Dewey, the one in politics and the state, the other in education and the state.

Mussolini made socialism palatable and even attractive to millions of peoples. A Marxist, he recognized that the abolition of private property did not appeal to the vast majority of peoples. His solution was a system, *fascism*, which gave the appearance of private property, the "entitlements" of socialism, and the façade of a free country. The appearance of private ownership and capitalism was retained, but, by taxation, the properties became state owned, with the taxes virtually equal to a rent paid for living in one's home, or for operating a farm or business. To cite an example of this, a house built in 1960 (in California) was taxed in the years 1971–1975 for an amount slightly more than its original cost. Things like this led in California to Proposition 13, a tax revolt now being slowly eroded.

People were allowed to retain the dream of private ownership while becoming in effect renters from the state. The situation in business has become worse.

What Mussolini did was to provide a means whereby socialism could be made acceptable to modern man. It has become routine for our statists to use the term "fascist" as an abusive title for others while retaining or advocating it in practice.

In education, John Dewey was the high point in the belief in statist education as salvation. Horace Mann had introduced this idea into American thinking, looking to German socialist models. It was Mann's belief that statist education would abolish poverty and crime. Dewey saw it as the key to the building of the "Great Community," or, the "Great Society."

The best application of this hope was in Sweden. In 1971, Roland Huntford's remarkable work, *The New Totalitarians*, first appeared. As against the Soviet Russian model, socialism by means of a total terror, the Swedish model was the creation of a new totalitarianism by means of education and mind control. Sven Moberg, then deputy minister of education in Sweden, said, "We are aware of the abuses of this system, as in Fascist Italy, and we intend to avoid them. But corporatism has succeeded on the Labour Market, and we believe that it is the solution for the whole society. Technology demands the collective" (Huntsford, p. 121). Moberg was unusually honest. Most fascists use the term to abuse their critics.

In the thinking of Mussolini and Dewey, salvation is by man through statist action and statist education. Dewey used the term "democracy" and "democratic" freely, but, in *A Common Faith* (1934), he described Biblical Christianity as radically incompatible with democracy because Christianity divides man between the saved and the lost, between good and evil. For Dewey, democracy allows no division of any kind among men. For Dewey, apparently, the only evil was to affirm that there is such a thing as sin, or to believe that some men and some acts are evil. We see the development of Dewey's implications all around us.

The world of Mussolini and Dewey, the world of fascism, is all around us, and it prevails in most of the world. The old totalitarianism of Lenin, Stalin, and Brezhnev is giving way to the new totalitarianism of Mussolini and Dewey, which is more insidious and dangerous.

Sadly, the many churches are oblivious to this menace all too often. The Christian school and homeschool movements are major reactions to John Dewey and his humanism, but the political threat of fascism is not recognized. The major political parties of the Western world are in most cases fascist, and the term applies to the Left and the Right usually.

Christians should be providing the direction for the future, and there are major signs that this is beginning to happen. It is necessary for Christians to recognize that their faith involves more than salvation from hell but is the application of the whole counsel of God for the establishment of God's Kingdom. None who are truly saved will be simply waiting for their eventide commuter train to heaven! They will be obedient to the Lord's order, "Occupy till I come" (Luke 19:13). The position of our

humanistic world order is simply this: "We will not have this man to reign over us" (Luke 19:14). The issue for us is a simple one: "Does He reign over us, and are we obeying Him?"

325

THE FREEDOM TO SIN

Chalcedon Report No. 377, December 1996

SOMETHING rarely acknowledged but which is basic to a Biblical understanding is the fact that God gives man the *freedom to sin*. This is something the modern state increasingly denies to us. In one area after another, we are being denied the freedom to do whatever the state sees as sin. At one time, the United States by a constitutional amendment denied people the right to drink intoxicating liquors, and we are now nearing a like view of tobacco.

Now, I have never tried smoking (or chewing) tobacco; even when I was an infant, it was well known that its effects on health were bad. Those who now go to court against tobacco firms for damages to their health could never have been in ignorance as to its consequences.

The point is this, do we want a nanny state to protect us from whatever it defines as sin? God did no such thing. In the very center of the Garden of Eden, He gave to man an option of sinning or obeying. He gave His law because He had not closed the door to sinning but left it as an option for man.

By giving man the freedom to sin, God gave to man the privilege of growth, or the refusal to grow. He gave to man the options of heaven and hell, something many dislike.

The nanny state *and the nanny church*, by trying to deny man the freedom to sin, are denying him the privilege of manhood and maturity. Where man is denied the freedom to sin, the result is not heaven on earth but hell, because man becomes less a man.

The modern state's road to paradise is by way of prohibitions, by the denial of freedom to man in one sphere after another. The modern state tries to do what God will not do, force men to be good. The nanny state (and nanny church) can only produce permanent children, warped and retarded beings.

The more the nanny state (and nanny church) work to create an enforced goodness with no freedom to sin, the less moral the people are. As the state has increased its controls over the people, the people have become less moral and less responsible. This process is leading to the obliteration of man and of manhood.

Am I saying that people should be encouraged to sin? Only a fool (and there are too many of them today) would conclude so. I am saying that freedom to grow morally and to exercise moral self-discipline is more productive of godly morality than all of the rules and regulations of the nanny state and the nanny church.

We need to challenge these oppressors. Very plainly, God did not see paradise, the Garden of Eden, as complete without the possibility of temptation, sin, and the fall. Think about the implications of that. It is a basic fact of godly theology.

326

THE GRAND INQUISITOR

Chalcedon Report No. 157, September 1978

The Russian nineteenth-century novelist, Dostoyevsky, in *The Brothers Karamazov*, had an important section often printed separately as *The Grand Inquisitor.* Dostoyevsky portrayed powerfully the dereliction of the church when it sees itself as man's hope rather than Christ Himself. His account is both sympathetic and devastating. The church begins by becoming more the friend of man than the servant of the Lord. Its tender concern for man leads to a more "humane" application of Scripture. The "hard" laws and sayings of Scripture, and its heavy requirement of responsibility, impose too great a burden on men. The church thus begins with a benevolent concern for human welfare and ends up as the Grand Inquisitor, all the while still professing to be Christian and to be truly concerned about human welfare. The reason for the transition from disciple to Grand Inquisitor is that the church has moved from God's way for God's goals to man's way as wiser and more expedient.

In all sectors of the church, the mentality of the Grand Inquisitor still remains, dedicated, earnest, and hardworking, but still ready to burn Christ at the stake in the name of Christ. But, to all practical intent, the church is the discredited Grand Inquisitor, and its efforts are futile and bypassed.

A new and successful Grand Inquisitor is now on the scene, not the church but the modern state. The goal of the state is the salvation of man, not in God's declared way, but in man's wiser and more scientific manner. The modern state is messianic in all its being. It wants man saved, paradise restored, sin and death abolished, and its own New Jerusalem, the "Great Community," established from pole to pole. We cannot begin to understand the grand missionary passion of the modern state if we fail to see its zeal to save man. Man must be saved from God and from

himself. Man must be born again, remade, into a new humanity of his own creation. Through its great missionary agency, the state schools, "the children of the state" are to be given the new life of freedom from God and the past into self-realization. The rebirth of humanity is from God into an existentialist, lawless freedom wherein man is his own god and his own law.

Obviously, many do not agree. They continue to believe in the old God and His Bible, and they form Christian schools and churches to perpetuate their outmoded and unmodern faith. They resist attempts by the state to control what belongs to Christ and must be governed by God's law, not man's.

The state views these efforts with dismay. As the great, modern Grand Inquisitor, the state regards all doubts about itself as misguided. To believe that the state and its controls are evil is for the state the modern form of blasphemy. How can there be a good society, when the working god of that society is resisted, blasphemed, and rejected?

Remember, the essence of the Grand Inquisitor is his belief that his actions are for the true welfare of mankind. To fight against him is to wage war against truth and man's best welfare, and against man's hope and future. For the Grand Inquisitor, false religions bring salvation to the elect alone, whereas the Grand Inquisitor brings it to all men, it is held. The state affirms total democracy increasingly, and world brotherhood. All men everywhere will be saved, because all men will be declared acceptable as is.

The modern Grand Inquisitor is the most powerful oppressor in all history, because he has the powers of state in his hand. He holds the knife and the gun, the courts, and the funds. Law is what he declares it to be.

The Grand Inquisitor emerges in history in one form or another, and in one institution after another, whenever and wherever men deny God's law-word. Man cannot live without law. If, as antinomians, they deny God's law, they do not thereby live without law: rather, they substitute man's law for God's law. It is then that the Grand Inquisitor emerges. If law and a truly moral concern for human welfare are defined by man, then the defining man or institution emerges as the god of that social order. Men will have a law; it may be their own law, in which case they deny God the King, and every man does that which is right in his own eyes (Judg. 21:25). It may be statist law, in which case the state is God walking on earth. If it is any kind of law other than God's law, then that lawmaking body has usurped God's prerogative and is declaring itself to be man's lord and savior.

The Grand Inquisitor cannot be voted out; he reappears in the new

rulers in a new guise. He can only be destroyed by the only wise God, our Savior, whose grace redeems us, and whose law is our way of sanctification in His Spirit.

327

THE NEW INQUISITION

Chalcedon Report No. 216, July 1983

Our history books are quite extensively the product of humanistic scholarship and reflect an anti-Christian bias. As these historians view the past, they see it as a struggle out of the darkness of Christianity into the light of humanism. Their version of the past is governed by this premise. As a result, we get a twisted version of history.

One example of this is with reference to the Inquisition. We are rarely told that the Inquisition was begun by the Hohenstaufen emperor, Frederick II. While Pope Innocent III played his part in the matter, the legal revolution was Frederick's. The premise of law in Christendom had been that a criminal prosecution required or implied a plaintiff. Without an accuser, there was no trial or judgement. Frederick II introduced the new element: the state as the plaintiff as well as the prosecutor and the judge. By this means, Frederick II moved against dissent.

One civil government after another adopted this procedure and the Inquisition. An advantage to the state in condemning dissenters was that their properties were then seized by the state, which gave incentive to finding men guilty of treason and heresy. To a degree, the church was bribed to be silent or to cooperate in the process by being given something like a tithe of the seized properties. In spite of this, the church often opposed the process. Richard Kieckhefer, in *Repression of Heresy in Medieval Germany* (University of Pennsylvania Press, 1979), showed that Germany had no true Inquisition, and the bishops tended to oppose such activities. The work of the French crown in furthering the Inquisition of the Knights Templar was in spite of the pope. In Spain, no victim of the Inquisition was allowed to appeal to the pope; the Spanish Inquisition was fully a state operation.

What, then, was the purpose of the medieval Inquisition? The answer

is an obvious and simple one: to stifle dissent and to create a unified and totalitarian civil order. Because most subjects were Catholic, the unity was framed in Catholic terms, but the goal was a unified state in which no dissent could exist. We should remember that sometimes high-ranking and independent-minded churchmen were targets of the Inquisition.

It is important for us to understand this, because we live in the century of the most evil uses of the theory and practice of inquisitions. Frederick II's legal revolution is now a part of the law of all modern states. Agencies of the state now act as the plaintiff against the people, their prosecutors, and their judges. The goal more than ever is uniformity, now in terms of humanism.

The doctrine of public policy holds that nothing contrary to the policy of the state has a right to exist. The U.S. Supreme Court, in the *Bob Jones University* case, has plainly affirmed this evil doctrine. Step by step, this doctrine will be used to eliminate all right of dissent. Uniformity will be the law.

The legal revolution begun by Frederick II (not a Christian, and probably a secret Muslim, although his ideas were his own) has resulted in Marxist law, National Socialist and Fascist law, and in totalitarian democracy. The difference between the Soviet Union, Nazi Germany, and the United States has been reduced by the U.S. Supreme Court to one of degree, not of kind. Unless Christians work quickly to change this situation by legislation, the days of freedom are numbered.

The New Inquisition of the state and federal governments is now in power. The question which will determine our future is which government we will serve and obey with all our heart, mind, and being, the governments of men who seek to cast off all the restraints of God's rule (Ps. 2), or the government of Jesus Christ, who is King of kings and Lord of lords? Only the Lord controls all things, and we have no future apart from Him.

328

FREEDOM VERSUS SECURITY

Chalcedon Report No. 110, October 1974

One reason why man has rarely been free in his long history is his fear and hatred of freedom. Over and over again, men have paid lip service to freedom while constructing instead social orders which allowed no room for freedom.

Historically, one of the major functions of the state has been to protect man and society from the dangers of freedom. In the ancient world, stateless man was regarded as worse off than the dead. Egyptians, Sumerians, Babylonians, and others regarded the state as the true life of man.

The Greeks, who despite modern mythology, had no love of freedom, defined man as a political animal. Man could not be truly man apart from the state. Plato's *Republic* is a blueprint for totalitarian communism, and Aristotle's *Politics* saw man as the property of the state. Aristotle espoused state control of education, because "[t]he citizen should be molded to suit the form of government under which he lives." Moreover, "Neither must we suppose that any one of the citizens belongs to himself, for they all belong to the state, and are each of them a part of the state" (*Politics*, bk. 8, chap. 1). He held also that "the state is by nature clearly prior to the family and to the individual, since the whole is of necessity prior to the parts" (bk. 1, chap. 2).

For most of history, this pagan view of the state has governed men. Men have found freedom to be a threat, and they have readily turned over their lives to the claims of the state.

But this is not all. Salvation has been defined in terms of the state, and the state seen as man's savior. For the Romans, salvation was security under Caesar. According to the archaeologist, Sir William M. Ramsay, "The paternal government was 'salvation'" for those who live on imperial estates. Ramsay concluded, "The 'Salvation' of Jesus and Paul was

freedom: the 'Salvation' of the Imperial system was serfdom" (Sir W. M. Ramsay, *The Bearing of Recent Discovery on the Trustworthiness of the New Testament* [London, England: Hodder & Stoughton, 1920], pp. 197–198).

This faith in salvation by the state was basic to the Renaissance and is essential to an understanding of modern man. Except for the partial but profound countermovement of early American developments, especially between 1750 and 1850, the basic belief of modern man is that the good life and salvation can only be attained by means of the state. This means increasing state powers, because, in order to save man, the state must be stronger. Thus, the more serious man's plight, the more the state must increase its power in order to save men.

The Biblical doctrine of salvation holds that because the triune God is the sovereign and omnipotent Lord, salvation is possible. Only a sovereign God can save, because He alone determines all things, and He alone cannot be overthrown in all His ways. Man's salvation is only assured where his savior is omnipotent and his salvation cannot be annulled or overruled by any other force. Man in relation to God cannot have a primary freedom; man has only a secondary freedom, the freedom of a creature, to be what God has ordained him to be.

Quite logically, the salvation of the state mimics this pattern. In order to give man an assured salvation, one which cannot be set aside, the state must set aside man's freedom and work towards its own omnipotence. The state must be sovereign, and it must be beyond challenge. Man must be simply what the state ordains him to be, and nothing more. For the state to plan or predestinate man's salvation requires totalitarian powers for the state, and this the state constantly aspires to gain.

In this quest, the state has the active support of modern man. Having turned away from the triune God, he looks religiously to the modern state for salvation, for womb-to-tomb security, and for the fatherhood he once attributed to God. Thus, although at times the modern state has gained its powers by legal usurpation, it has generally been with the active or passive consent of the people.

Man, said Jesus Christ, is by virtue of the fall a slave, a slave to sin, and therefore partial to slavery, until He makes man free by His grace (John 8:33–36). Modern man has still enough of the trappings of his religious and cultural past, so that he feels that lip service must be paid to freedom. He honors it at every turn, and every day works to diminish it. The one assured fact today about any convening legislative body is that it sits, not to increase man's freedom, but to limit it. Freedom to slaves is a dangerous thing, and, in the heart of his being, modern man is a slave. He

has converted church, state, and school into schools for slavery. He has waged war against the threat of freedom at every turn in order to assure the free flow of statist salvation. Men who are by nature slaves will only tolerate slavery, and, as a result, freedom is under fire and on the wane.

The battleground is not the state. The state is the echo chamber, reflecting man's real desires. The problem is in the minds and hearts of men. "If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed" (John 8:36). There is no other way.

329

WHAT IS FREEDOM?

Chalcedon Report No. 374, September 1996

The last two centuries have seen a radical divergence in the doctrine of freedom. The thinking of Jean-Jacques Rousseau and the Marquis de Sade departed sharply from Christian thinking. Freedom for them was in individuality, in a radical independence from God and man. It required for Sade a defiance of public opinion and morality. The free man "did his own thing" in contempt for others and in a sharp departure from accepted standards. The student rebels of the 1960s, and the writers of film and television scripts, reflect this perspective. Freedom in this sense requires rebellion. However ridiculous the rebellion, the proponents of this modern doctrine of freedom pursue it rigorously. In the process, reason is sacrificed to this ideal of lawless and rebellious freedom. The past is seen as a chain because nothing other than his anarchic freedom should necessitate the free man.

As against this, the Christian doctrine of freedom begins with the fact that sin is slavery, and Christ gives us freedom by His regenerating power. The fall (Gen. 3:5) made man a sinner and a slave because of his evil delusion that he can be his own god and know or determine for himself what is good and evil, right or wrong, law and morality. Our Lord tells us that it is by knowing Him as Lord and as the truth of being that we are free (John 8:32–36; 14:6).

Essential to this Christian doctrine of freedom is the premise that freedom is God's way, not ours, and God's law-word is the way to freedom when we are regenerated. His saving act sets us free from sin, and His law then provides the path of freedom.

The anti-Christian concept of freedom began with man's assertion of freedom from God, not freedom under God. To be free from God means then freedom from His law. Sin is antinomianism to its core. It requires

a religious dedication to immoralism, which it sees as freedom when it is in fact the way of death.

The premises of Rousseau and Sade are now the premises of our courts of law, and the drift into legal positivism has been a steady departure from any religious and moral foundation for law. The technicalities of the law have replaced justice as the basis of more and more court decisions, and manufactured rights and entitlements have supplanted justice.

The foundations of our civilization are thus being destroyed, and the churches, by their modernism and antinomianism, are too often on the side of Christ's enemies.

One aspect of the revolution created by Rousseau and Sade is the worship of nature. But this is another way of exalting the fall of man because nature is also fallen. Before Christian man began his redemptive work, building dikes and reclaiming the sea in the Netherlands, and turning desert places into productive farm lands in France and elsewhere, Europe was a very different place.

America, too, was becoming a buffalo-created wasteland as the many great herds of over 100,000 bisons destroyed trees and churned the ground into blowing dust. It was Christian settlers who reclaimed the land and nursed it back to health. It took capital to settle the West, or, earlier, the East, because it took time to make the soil productive.

Free men are workers, productive and future-oriented. Fallen men are slaves to sin, and, because they see themselves as gods (Gen. 3:5), they gravitate to political answers in preference to work. By their fiat word, they seek to legislate wealth and freedom while actually destroying them.

Thus, the question, "What is freedom?" must be faced. We cannot accept the answer of fallen men without destroying ourselves and civilization. Only if the Son of Man make us free are we free indeed (John 8:36).

330

EQUALITY AND FREEDOM

Chalcedon Report No. 156, August 1978

The two great motive forces of the modern age are equality and freedom. The two contradict each other, in that a demand for equality means a radical curtailment of freedom. Few moderns see any contradiction, however, because the meaning of freedom has been redefined.

Very simply defined, freedom means an absence of constraint, or deliverance from the restraint of another person or power. But such a definition makes it clear that freedom is relative to our basic faith and standards. For me, to be married is freedom; for another man, it may mean slavery. For me, a family and children mean freedom and godly wealth; for another, it may mean bondage and a financial liability. The serfs of the Roman emperors regarded their status as salvation because it gave them security, and freedom, because as serfs they were no longer faced with the problems of personal responsibility and self-government. Thus, talk about freedom is meaningless, unless we understand what is meant by freedom. Freedom from what, and for what? The communists believe that what they offer is true freedom; Socialist Sweden believes the same of itself, as does Britain and the United States.

Moreover, all of them give us definitions of freedom, which, while often in bitter contradiction, are in some essentials agreed. They are modern, humanistic, and statist definitions of freedom.

For statism, freedom means above all else freedom from God. However important the French and Russian revolutions are, they are also only the more dramatic moments of a long, and now modern revolution against God. Above all else, for man the sinner, freedom means freedom from God. The fall of man is from freedom under God into the quest for freedom from God. The Christian prays, "Deliver us from evil," or, from the evil one; the implicit prayer of fallen man is, "Deliver us from God

the Lord." For fallen man, God is the great oppressor, and His law is the great shackle on man's freedom. As a dedicated antinomian, the fallen man is emphatic that God's law is slavery and tyranny. Thus, he wants freedom from God, from God's law, and from Christ and His church.

But this is not all. Fallen man wants freedom also from the family. We are seeing a flood of propaganda concerning "children's rights," the essence of which is to free the child from the family. Humanistic man has long since regarded the family and strict familial responsibility as nonsense. Women have been working for "liberation" from the family, and the goal is now to "liberate" the children also. Some have proposed state subsidies and independent incomes for every child in order to separate the child from the family.

In numerous other ways, modern man seeks liberation from a variety of things, from work, responsibility, society, duty, and even from death itself. But this is not all. He seeks freedom from these things through statist action, so that for him the state is the agency of liberation. This is the heart of the state's claims and power over man: the state presents itself as the savior of man, as the agency of liberation. The state, however, has a better record throughout history as the oppressor and enslaver of man. It is easy for men to laugh at the idea of Stalin or Hitler as liberators, but they are no less gullible than those enslaved by Stalin and Hitler when it comes to their own state. Each preserves the illusion that their state, whatever its faults, is different and is the source of their freedoms. They are thus faithful followers of the cult of Molech, of state worship.

For the Christian, however, trust cannot be in the state but in the Lord. Freedom is from sin to Christ and to self-government under God and His law.

Freedom is a theological concept. It is concerned with liberation, or salvation. The great religious battle of history, and especially of our time, is thus: does salvation mean freedom from God, or freedom through God's grace and to God's purposes? Freedom from God, or under God? Our politics is thus theological. Our education is also, and education either sets forth salvation or liberation from God, or under God.

We cannot separate salvation off to a narrow corner of our neighborhood, or of the universe, labelled the church. Salvation, whether called by its more secular names of freedom and liberation, still is a total thing. It involves all of our lives, our church, school, family, politics, economics, arts, sciences, and all things else. Christ being totally Lord, King over all kings and Lord over all lords, is totally our Savior, redeemer of our whole lives and of the whole of our world and activities.

Thus, when the statist (or humanist) and the faithful Christian talk of

freedom, they are talking of two radically different things, and there can be no reconciliation between the two: they are rival plans of salvation. The modern state sees the issue: if its plan of salvation or liberation is to prevail, then the Christian plan must be suppressed. Christian churches, schools, and agencies which refuse to compromise must be suppressed. No man can serve two masters or have two lords. This is the issue of our time, and all men will be pushed to a decision by God's providential government of history. Who is the Savior, Christ or the state?

331

SLAVERY AND HUMAN NATURE

Chalcedon Report No. 145, September 1977

We are very often told that men everywhere have a natural love of freedom and justice. Again, it is held by many that no slave really loves slavery. I have read several savage attacks on a liberal historian's study of slavery which upset critics greatly, because it seemed to imply that many slaves in the Old South were content with slavery; I have heard scholars say flatly that this is impossible and contrary to human nature.

This is the key: are slavery, tyranny, and injustice contrary to human nature? To believe that they are is to believe that men are naturally good and naturally just and free. This is, of course, at the heart of the liberal faith, but it is contrary to the Biblical view of man's sin and depravity. Men have rarely loved freedom and justice, and, very often, when claiming to love freedom and justice, they are in fact working against it. Many slaves were very content with slavery, while objecting to some aspects of it. Most people in the Soviet Union, while ready to grumble about various particular conditions, are, according to some observers, very much content with the basic aspects of life under socialism. In the Western democracies, we have the steady loss of freedom because people prefer other things to freedom. True, here as elsewhere, people would best like to have their cake and to eat it too. They would like the advantages of both freedom and slavery, of both justice and injustice, but in the final analysis, they talk of freedom and justice and choose the opposite.

In fact, as George Orwell saw, the new slavery comes in the name of freedom. People talk of freedom, equality, social justice, and brotherhood while busily voting in their opposites.

I have known some scholars who became irate at the suggestion that slaves could love their masters, and yet these same men could idolize some of our recent presidents, who have been ushering in the new slavery.

For more than a generation at least, U.S. presidents, all put into office by a majority vote, have been actively furthering the new slavery to the usual applause of the majority. The new master gains more adulation at times than the Old Massa ever did! When a president asks the people to tighten their belts, it is in order to enable the federal government to untighten its belt and get fatter, but the slaves, despite regular grumblings, basically ask for more slavery.

As Christians, we cannot begin to cope with the problems of our time unless we recognize that man as a fallen creature is, whatever his profession outwardly, a person who prefers slavery and injustice. He is more at home in such a world. Freedom means responsibility, and the sinner is in flight from his basic responsibility, to the sovereign God. Justice means our own condemnation, and what sinner wants that? As a result, men, in the name of freedom and justice, work to suppress the substance of these things.

The impotence of modern politics rests on the inability of so many liberals and conservatives to recognize the nature of the problem. The success of one great humanist, Napoleon, was based on his recognition that his earlier views of man as naturally good, just, and free were false. The Reign of Terror and the Egyptian campaign brought home to Napoleon the depravity of man. Accordingly, he did what others have since done; he used the façade of the revolutionary movement as a means to power.

Freedom and justice will rise and fall in terms of man's faith. Where men are regenerate and live in terms of God's law, freedom and justice quickly become imperatives. Where men are reprobate, the façade of freedom and justice becomes basic to the new slavery. A faith without consequences is no faith at all.

The prevalence today of myths of consent and equality provides a façade for less and less consent and more and more inequality. This should not surprise us. The remedies men seek, political and social action, organization, legal battles, and more, are all impotent unless at the same time we recognize that the basic problem, the sin of man, must be also and first dealt with. The foundation is the sovereign and regenerating grace of God. Man is the problem, not his circumstances. Man's circumstances are a consequence and product of his slavery and injustice.

The redemptive purpose of God is a total one, and all our activities must be seen in the perspective of God's purpose. As Dr. Cornelius Van Til has pointed out, the redemptive revelation of God had to be as comprehensive as the sweep of sin. Redemption must, in the nature of the case, be for the whole world. This does not mean that it must save every individual sinner in the world. It does mean, however, that "the created

universe which has been created as a unit must also be saved as a unit" (C. Van Til, *An Introduction to Systematic Theology*, p. 133).

Our faith thus gets to the root of the problem, the nature of man, and it has a total solution for man and the world. It does not declare that men are free, but rather that they are slaves, and that only the truth can make them free (John 8:31–34), and the truth is Jesus Christ (John 14:6). Only then are men turned from loving and believing a lie (Rom. 1:25; Rev. 22:15) into men whose lives are founded upon the truth. All our problems, political, personal, or otherwise, are at their root theological. Until we recognize the essential problem, man's revolt against God, and the answer, faith, and obedience to God's law, we will be providing only façades for the New Slavery. And we will ourselves be whited sepulchres.

332

FREEDOM OR SLAVERY?

Chalcedon Report No. 203, July 1982

One of the interesting facts about the United States is the amount of land owned by the federal government. In Alaska, 90 percent of the state is federally owned; in Nevada, it is 87 percent, Utah, 65 percent; Idaho, 64 percent; Oregon, 52 percent; Arizona, 45 percent; California, 44 percent, and so on down the line. Supposedly, these lands are kept in trust for the people, but in reality private conservation groups and corporations have done and can do a better job of it.

But this is not all. We need to ask the question, how much of us do the federal, state, and local agencies of civil government own? About five to ten years ago, we were told that between 40 percent to 45 percent of our income went for direct or hidden taxes; some now place that estimate at 50 percent to 60 percent. Whichever figure is right, it constitutes a very big share of our income.

Slavery is defined as a property right in the labor of other men. If you own a slave, it means that he must work for you. Very obviously, through taxation, civil government now owns about half of us, and this means that we are half slaves, whatever else we may call ourselves.

When the federal government, more than a century ago, abolished slavery, it abolished only the private ownership of slaves, not public ownership. If fact, all over the world, slavery is more common than ever before. In the communist bloc, all the people are slaves of the state. In the democracies, we are half slaves and half free.

What we need is an emancipation proclamation from slavery to the modern state. You can be sure that neither Washington, D.C., nor the state house will issue any such charter of freedom on its own. Only if we, the people, compel them to do so will the various branches of civil government disgorge their powers over us.

We may think we belong to ourselves, our family, our church, or our community, but, with every paycheck, we are reminded that we belong to Washington, D.C., and, before we see our paycheck, Big Brother has put the bite on us.

The plain fact is that the modern state owns too much of us. Instead of being our servant, it has become our master, and we have steadily been stripped of our assets and our freedom. Very definitely, it is time for a change.

To gain that change, we must be changed. As Paul says, "where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty" (2 Cor. 3:17).

333

THE FEAR OF FREEDOM

Chalcedon Report No. 212, March 1983

One of the great fears of the twentieth century is of freedom. Freedom is honored in name but not in fact. Modern man today wants what Dr. Elgin Groseclose has so aptly termed the *riskless society,* a society in which failure is impossible, poverty and problems are abolished, and causality and consequences never prevail.

In the trials of Christian schools and churches at which I am regularly a court witness, I find that implicit in the position of state and federal officials is the belief that the unregulated society is capable of producing only chaos. An imaginary scenario is often cited in conversation about the abuses which could ensue.

What is the answer to that question? Very simply, it is true that abuses can ensue. In one state, where a large number of homeschools exist, one family has done little to educate their two children. However, all other homeschools are producing superior to very superior students, whereas, given the same number of children in a public-school sampling, the results are usually very bad, and the illiteracy rate growing. Likewise, I have encountered weak Christian schools, but, compared to the state schools, the Christian schools are dramatically superior.

Clearly, educational freedom has produced superiority in the Christian schools, whereas regulation has led to inferiority and incompetence in the state schools. Moreover, as the regulations have increased, the quality has decreased.

In striving for a problem-free answer, the statists have relied on regulations, and these have only increased the problems. The same applies to other realms, including the economic.

Recently, as oil prices began to fall, alarm was expressed by one scholar in the press. Failing oil prices would create serious dangers. Automobile

manufacturers have borrowed billions of dollars from the banks to retool their plants to produce small, fuel-efficient cars. Now that investment is threatened; it may spell trouble for both the banks and the automobile manufacturers. New companies have arisen to make coal and wood stoves for homes; their future may now be uncertain. Our foreign policy will be affected if, for example, Mexico and Saudi Arabia, to name only two countries, find their oil income cut. The fear was expressed in America's major daily paper that widespread bankruptcies could follow our oil glut and a collapsing oil price, not a stimulus to the economy.

The regulators thus see disaster when prices go up, and disaster when prices go down. In fact, they see only disaster where the free market prevails. Their only confidence is in their own regulations.

They have a religious fear of freedom. A philosophy or faith which sees the state as god will fear any and all diminutions of the state's controlling and regulating power. It will fear freedom as the obvious road to hell.

Those, however, who believe that this is God's creation, and that freedom allows God's ordained laws for every realm to prevail more readily, will welcome freedom and change as necessary to progress and as the surest defense against the tyranny of man.

Where man plays god and seeks to predestine each and every realm in terms of his own counsel and plan, disaster ensues. Man's plan runs counter to God's plan, and only God's order can prevail.

The world is moving into the greatest economic crisis of history. It is a religious crisis, the product of man's efforts to play god and to control all things. For humanistic man, freedom is anathema, because it runs counter to scientific planning and control. The growing crisis is thus a religious one, and we must see it as God's judgment on a false and rival order. The crisis must be seen as good news, as evidence that God is at war, that the wages of sin in any sphere are always death, and that every tower of Babel man erects has a common destiny, disaster and confusion. The Lord is at work; let the people rejoice.

334

THE MEANING OF FREEDOM

Chalcedon Report No. 323, June 1992

Freedom can mean different things to different people in different cultures. Just as the god of the Greeks and Romans, Zeus-Jupiter, is not the same as the God of Scripture, so, too, freedom means different things in different contexts. It can mean freedom *from* God, and freedom *under* God.

Two radically different concepts are subsumed under the same word. Freedom *from* God means the "right" to practice abortion, homosexuality, euthanasia, and more. In some cultures, it has meant cannibalism (now reviving in our midst), and the burning of widows, and other evils. To champion freedom as such is meaningless: freedom for what? Those who idealize freedom in the abstract are talking nonsense. Do they believe in freedom for prostitution and slavery as basic "rights?" The moral meaning of freedom is determined by its purpose. Those who talk about freedom as such can be very dangerous men, as were the French Revolution's leaders. Later, it was Lenin who observed that freedom was so precious it had to be rationed, with himself as the official rationer, of course.

Freedom *under* God means freedom to develop the meaning and implications of the image of God in us. We are created in the communicable attributes of God's being, in knowledge, righteousness, holiness, and dominion (Gen. 1:26–28; Eph. 4:24; Col. 3:10). Freedom *from* God warps and destroys these things in us. A culture which is anti-Christian will demolish knowledge, righteousness or justice, holiness and dominion, and our state schools are doing this systematically in the name of an anti-Christian doctrine of freedom.

We have a very serious crisis which threatens the future of civilization, in that our schools, from the lowest level through graduate schools, are teaching a false doctrine of freedom. Theology having in most cases left

the university, or become humanistic, is no longer teaching the meaning of freedom under God. As a result, the various key professions, lawyers, doctors, and the clergy, and others as well, work with false premises and evil presuppositions. We should not therefore be surprised that lawyers are commonly champions of evil freedoms, as are doctors, nor should we be amazed at clergymen who are homosexuals, pro-abortion, and champions of ungodly practices. Freedom abstracted from its context is meaningless, and it becomes a "cause" which evil men can champion for evil causes.

Law schools teach nothing on the meaning of freedom. To teach law without the context of God's justice, and without the qualification of freedom *under* God, is to warp a society.

This means, too, that civil liberty can be made to mean anything. If the civil order denies Christ, then its idea of civil freedom means freedom *from* God and His law, freedom *from* the death penalty for capital offenses, freedom, in brief, from God's justice. Civil and religious liberty *can* be one and the same if the civil order is Christian. Religious liberty means not only the freedom to worship God, but also to live a life of freedom under God in terms of His law, His justice. Civil liberty can be made to mean, as it has been, freedom *from* God and His law and justice. It can mean, then, freedom to do evil, to permit child molestation as some groups advocate, and so on. Then the criminal prospers, and godly men suffer.

But freedom is viewed without consideration of the fact of man's fall and his slavery to sin. Thus, *Ideas*, edited by Geoffrey Grigson and Charles Harvard Gibbs-Smith (1957), in its article on "Freedom," said that it "is an essential attribute of human nature and a reflection of its rational character. Man appears to be a slave to necessity: he is born and he dies, he must wash and dress and eat and drink and move from place to place. He cannot escape a thousand obligations that nature imposes upon him. Yet he is essentially a free being because he can rise above these necessities" (p. 151).

How can man rise above the "necessities" of eating and drinking, being born and dying, without ceasing to be human, i.e., a creature? This definition smacks more than a little of Karl Marx's demand that man move from the kingdom of necessity to the kingdom of freedom by means of communism. He was never able to explain how his economics could deliver man from mortality.

Marx's idiocy here is revelatory of most thinking on the subject. The theoreticians of freedom see the answer in economics, politics, education, or some like humanistic solution.

They all fail alike to see freedom's moral dimension. This is why all the talk and writing about freedom is nonsense when it disregards the Biblical

account. God made man, and He created him with the option of obeying or disobeying his Creator (Gen. 2:7–17). At the heart of all freedom is this moral decision, to obey or to disobey God. Man chose to disobey God, and, in so doing, submitted to the tempter's idea that he could be his own god, determining or knowing good and evil for himself (Gen. 3:1–5). Instead of moral choices being predetermined by God's law, they were now man's options, and freedom was now *from* God; man by his rebellion insisted that all morality was now what man decreed it to be. In time, with Nietzsche, this was stated more openly as meaning that freedom is living beyond good and evil, not as God's creature, but as superman.

George Orwell, in *1984*, saw Newspeak as marking the humanistic society, so that meanings become inverted. Slavery becomes freedom, and evil becomes good.

The Marxists, on seizing power in Russia, denied the validity of Christian civilization and order. Society was now to be beyond good and evil. All they did was to redefine morality, so that evil was opposition to the Marxist regime. They had to create a hell for all opponents, slave labor camps, and the humanistic states all over the world were silent, because their position was closer in fact to Lenin than to Jesus Christ.

Law is inescapable in any but the most "primitive" society; only wandering bands of men can exist in terms of bare survival and apart from a developed law order. Only broken groups like the African Iks described by Trumbull are without law. All law represents moral concerns; laws define evils, crimes, which work against society. The issue, therefore, in any social order is simply a religious one: the morality of a particular religious faith must prevail, or there is no law.

And this takes us to the heart of the modern crisis. Modern man professes passionately to believe in freedom, and yet he is turning the world into a slave culture. The state daily grows more powerful, and man less free. Man claims to want freedom, but, in turning his back on God and His law, man is denying freedom.

Only in knowing the truth, Jesus Christ (John 8:32; 14:6), can man be free. "If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed" (John 8:36). Free in Christ to do what? "If ye love me, keep my commandments" (John 14:15). Freedom is a moral fact, and only the regenerate man in Christ can be truly free. Freedom wanes where antinomianism prevails, because the moral and religious premise thereof is denied. Antinomians, by denying God's law in favor of statist, humanistic law, are in effect seeking morality and salvation under the banner of the state, whose freedom is slavery and death, not life.

335

CONTROLS

Chalcedon Report No. 32, April 10, 1968

The economics of the world are *out of control*. The various civil governments, all socialist in varying degrees, have long experimented with controlled economics, that is, with socialism in its various forms. They have favored a controlled economics over a free economy because it means more power to the state. But now, with the inevitable economic chaos of socialism beginning to appear, both power and economic productivity are going down the drain. The *immediate* result will be *more* controls.

How can two such assertions be made: "out of control" and "more controls?" Simply this: the reaction to the loss of power and control over the economy is to grab for more power and more control, as though this were the answer. The controls put the economy into a disastrous course; more controls will only increase the disaster. But frightened men react dangerously and hysterically. When a man's car begins to go out of control, the reaction is to grab the wheel more tightly, not to act sensibly. I have seen men, sliding on an icy road, do the very worst possible things; hit the brakes hard and grab the wheel sharply, and only *increase* the loss of control by their actions.

Thus, we shall have controls, but the controls will aggravate the disaster. The controls are already there, all over the world. Some in use. Some ready to use. Consider, for example, some of the controls which exist, ready for use, in the United States. *First*, the federal government has the legal right now to enter all safety deposit boxes when it deems that an emergency warrants it. *Second*, *all* checks are subject to and routinely processed by microphotographing so that a complete file of every check written is available for federal inspection. *Third*, all large withdrawals of cash must be recorded for reporting. *Fourth*, all money sent abroad by

check is carefully recorded, and so on. The vast data files accumulate, to give us as nearly total a picture of every man's economic life as possible. Banks are a key to this information, and, through the Federal Reserve System, banking is today virtually socialized.

This all sounds frightening, and, in one sense, it is. But let's examine it from another perspective. The federal government, like all civil governments virtually, is drowning in an ocean of data. The more the data accumulates, the less manageable it becomes, and the less usable it becomes, because there is too much to handle, assimilate, and use. You can find a needle in a pin tray, but not very readily in a haystack.

Take, for example, the Internal Revenue Service, one of the most efficient and best managed branches of the Federal Government. Criticize the Internal Revenue Service as much as you will on other grounds, but grant this fact: it has to collect and deliver funds to the federal government regularly. It has to produce, in other words, something not required of most federal agencies. It functions successfully because it has a core of able and effective administrators, officers, clerks, and workers. But the Internal Revenue Service is increasingly plagued with internal problems: lost files, misplaced records of receipts, and so on: problems connected with missing data. The reason is twofold: massive volumes of data, and the human factor, i.e., inefficient help. One man who misplaces data can create months and years of work for efficient men, and considerable trouble for the citizens whose files are missing. Increase the number of inefficient workers, and the situation is out of hand, and an agency breaks down.

In some countries, this breakdown is appearing. Luigi Barzini has written: "The late Luigi Einaudi, Italy's foremost economist and ex-president of the Republic, calculated that, if every tax on the statute books was fully collected, the State would absorb 110 per cent of the national income" (Luigi Barzini, *The Italians*, p. 108). In many countries, there is a growing inability to collect taxes because of the breakdown of a huge bureaucracy which is drowning in its own files and processes.

But this is only a small part of the breakdown which controls bring on. The attempt at total control is essentially religious: the state usurps the prerogative of God. It plays at being god, and like God, it aims at total knowledge. God, having created and determined all things, knows all things. The aim of the state is total knowledge for total controls. The state cannot possibly attain either, and the result is a collapse.

In the Soviet Union, the failure of data came early, and it came thoroughly. The result was a loss of control over the economic facts of the country. Practically, this meant famine in the early twenties, again in the thirties, and a continuing economic and agricultural crisis. The Soviet

Union's planning is a radical failure, because its knowledge is ignorance, and its controls are a joke: it cannot control the economy. Without foreign aid in the form of credit, and without imperialism, it could not survive. For knowledge and controls, the Soviet Union substitutes *force and brutality*. Its data is a mess, and its controls a jumble of ineffective contradiction. Its answer to its self-created crisis from the beginning has been to seek control by brutal force.

But brutal force is not an instrument so much of control as it is of open warfare. The first and last war of Communism is against its own people, because they are really out of control. The state's planning cannot move the people; it only cripples them. And the socialist state reacts with savage hatred: it wages war against the people.

How far will we go in a world out of control, a world reverting to jungle warfare in the streets of America, South America, Africa, Asia, Europe, and behind the Iron and Bamboo curtains? Much of the jungle warfare, if not almost all, in the United States is subsidized by a federal government *already at war with the people*.

But a socialist world is an impossibility; it is a consumption economy, not a production economy. Without outside help, it quickly perishes. That death is in the offing, and it will be an ugly, hard death, but die it will. The economic tailspin, devaluation followed by devaluation, inflation and more inflation, all this and more, followed by and accompanied by plague and epidemic, will mark the end of an age. The era of the Enlightenment, the age of humanism, will perish. In its place will come a Christian Reconstruction, a free economy and true law and order. "It shall come to pass, that at evening time it shall be light" (Zech. 14:7). At the moment when total darkness seems about to overwhelm, the light of God's liberty shall blaze forth afresh.

336

FAILURE OF STATISM

Chalcedon Report No. 92, April 1973

The failure of statism, whether in ancient Rome or today, usually centers on two areas, religion and economics. The two, moreover, are very closely related. In fact, economics was once taught as a branch of Christian ethics, because sound economics is simply the application of the principle, "Thou shalt not steal." Monetary policies and welfare economics have historically been very common means of robbing the middle class and redistributing a nation's wealth and resources.

There are two basic premises to a sound social order, both of which are strongly emphasized in the Bible. *First*, "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God" (Matt. 4:4; see also Deut. 8:3). Food alone cannot satisfy man. Man requires a purpose and meaning to life, and the absence of meaning renders life impossible. Wordsworth in October of 1803 did not suffer materially, but, his hopes in the French Revolution having been destroyed, he could, with the rise of Napoleon, feel only despair. He wrote, in *Poems Dedicated to National Independence and Liberty*, part 1, number 22,

> I find nothing great:
> Nothing is left which I can venerate;
> So that a doubt almost within me springs
> Of Providence, such emptiness at length
> Seems at the heart of all things...
> I tremble at the sorrow of the time.

A year earlier, Wordsworth wrote (1802, ibid., pt. 1, no. 15) of man's plight in his day as one of

> Perpetual emptiness! unceasing change!
> No single volume paramount, no code,

No master spirit, no determined road.

Wordsworth experienced some of the earlier anguish which ushered in the era of revolutions. We are now deeper in that crisis and despair. "What's there to live for?" asked a youth of twenty recently, who had tried every kind of experience, felt burned out, and was seriously considering suicide. Time and again, generations of men who have been materially rich have turned on their culture and destroyed it, because it failed to provide them with a reason for living.

Second, while man cannot live by bread alone, neither can he live without bread. Man can no more neglect the material necessities of life than he can the religious. Food is basic to life, and economics deals with the necessities and the amenities of life, their supply and demand, and their flow. Men require a sense of security with respect to their ultimate goals, with regard to the meaning of life, *and* with respect to the economic realm. A man can take a great deal of hardship and difficulty, if he feels that what he earns is sure, that his work pays off and that his property is not subject to confiscation by decree or by taxation. To feel insecure in one's possessions is unsettling and destructive: it erodes the value of man's work and purpose. As a result, while inflationary economics brings, for a time, more than a little wealth to the debtor classes, it also brings an unsettling fear of confiscation.

Consider, for example, what Orton reported in 1950 concerning Britain. "A steeply graduated income tax has long been the backbone of British fiscal policy. The standard rate is now (1949–1950) 45 percent. On this was superimposed, in 1948–1949, a special tax on investment income which in effect was, and was acknowledged to be, a capital levy. On higher income brackets the total tax ran well over 100 percent of gross income. A man with wife and two children, getting an investment income of $36,000, was liable for a tax of $37,500. A bachelor with $100,000 of such income had to find $130,000. This of course meant throwing all kinds of property — land, houses, cottages, farms, furniture, books, art collections onto a buyers' market. That was done. But it also meant, as it was intended to mean, the transfer of innumerable personal and private social responsibilities to the state. That was done too. Now the state has them. The Inland Revenue Commissioners, in their report for the year ended March 31, 1949, officially state that there are only seventy people left in Britain with incomes after taxes of more than $24,000. Quietly as this result has been accomplished, one would have to look back to the French or Russian revolutions for a comparable precedent" (William Aylott Orton, *The Economic Role of the State* [Chicago, IL: University

of Chicago Press, 1950], pp. 101–102). After such a confiscation, wealth is still possible, but it is at the sufferance of the state and subject to its confiscation.

The modern state is in crisis both religiously and economically, and it has created both crises. Since the French Revolution, the modern state has worked against Biblical religion steadily. This has been under the guise of a separation of church and state, a worthy goal, but in reality what has been done is to disestablish Christianity and to establish humanism as the religion of the state. Every state or political order is a religious establishment. All law is enacted morality or procedural thereto, and morality is the relational aspect of religion. The January 22, 1973, U.S. Supreme Court decision on abortion (*Jane Roe et al. v. Henry Wade* 41 LW 4213) specifically cited as precedent and authority for abortion "ancient religion." By this it plainly meant, not the Old Testament faith, but the religion of Greece and Rome, paganism. The court rendered a religious decision in terms of modern and ancient humanism.

The major offensive against Biblical faith began with the statist takeover of education and its conversion from a Biblical to a humanistic orientation. Modern statist education is intensely religious, but its religion is humanism, and its goal is the conversion of youth to the faith of the state and faith in the humanistic state.

The power of the state has been greatly enhanced by the takeover of education. The child was reshaped in terms of statist premises and statist loyalties and expected to be a ready martyr for the state and its warfare. Nothing has contributed more to the rise of the state and its power than the statist school, and nothing is now more destructive to it. Whether in the Soviet Union or the Western world, the product of the state school is increasingly a lawless moral and political anarchist who is as hostile to his country as to God.

The result is a growth of lawlessness which the state cannot check. Oscar Newman, in *Defensible Space* (New York, NY: Macmillan, 1972), points out that we are witnessing the breakdown of the social mechanisms which once checked crime and supported police activity because few neighbors share beliefs and values. The sense of community is gone, and also the sense of security in one's own home. As Newman points out, "The home and its environs must be felt to be secure or the very fabric of society comes under threat."

In the economic sphere, the policy of theft has led to the progressive decline of economic morale. The attitude is that being economically successful is somehow a sin that must be atoned for by paying off the failures. As a result, the tax structure is designed to redistribute the wealth

in terms of this principle. The U.S. foreign aid program is also an application of this same idea, and money has been readily appropriated to the "underdeveloped" countries as a compensation for their backwardness. In the past year, the same policy has been used by the United States in dealing with the European dollar crisis. John Connally, Peter Peterson, Arthur Burns, and President Nixon have all, in various ways, attacked the idea of surpluses as immoral. The establishment economist, Paul Samuelson, stated, "Even if the dollar should turn out to be somewhat overvalued, this primarily puts the onus on the surplus countries to appreciate their currencies unilaterally — particularly the mark and the yen. Or else they should swallow our dollars of deficit without complaining" (*Morgan Guaranty Survey* [New York, NY, July 1972]). Success and enterprise, in other words, must be punished as somehow *immoral*.

Here is the key. Over and over again, it is insinuated that somehow success, enterprise, and profits are per se immoral. The U.S. Supreme Court cites pagan religion for its authority, and statists the world over cite a thief's morality to vindicate their principles. Economics cannot escape from moral fundamentals: either "Thou shalt not steal" is true, or the good society requires that we "Steal from those who have in order to equalize society and reward those who have not." The new religion and morality (with its economics) of statism is the same old sin condemned by Scripture from Moses through St. John.

Bewailing the situation will not alter the matter. The answer lies elsewhere. There is no dramatic road to recovery. Only as men change will society change. Irresponsibility today, whether in the various branches of the state, in the church, in society at large, in schools, unions, corporations, and families, stems from the false faiths and values of the individuals involved. We live in a day when a pornographic film has become the "in thing" to see, and "porno-chic" is common in prominent circles. In late 1972, in a few weeks, a book, the autobiography of a prostitute and "madam," sold at a record level and was expected to reach five million copies by spring, 1973, for the United States and Canada alone. Very popular also have been two books by a notorious pimp, and pimps have becomes "heroes" to many.

Men live, not by faith today, but by debt and envy, and they look with suspicious eyes on anyone better than themselves. We are told by Plutarch how in ancient Greece the men of Athens banished the honest Aristides. When Aristides the Just, unknown to the man, asked one voter if Aristides had ever done him any injury, the man replied, "None at all, neither know I the man; but I am tired of hearing him everywhere called the Just." The mentality today is not too different. Is a man successful?

Then he must be a scoundrel, and, if not, why should he have more than others?

The result is an economic problem, but the cure is not economic. It is moral and religious, and it begins with you. If it does not begin there, then judgment will.

The easiest answer in too many eras has been to point the finger at persons and classes and demand, "Off with their heads!" Such people want the world to be good, but they want to be spared the necessity of being good themselves, a schizophrenic position. They want evil to be punished in others, but not in themselves. They see the mote in another man's eye, but not the beam in their own (Matt. 7:5). But above all else, such people look for a statist answer rather than the personal moral and religious one. If only we can control the state and manipulate people, all will be well, they reason. True order is seen as a man-made order, as some form of humanism. In one of his early writings, Karl Marx summed up the essence of radicalism in religious terms: "To be radical is to grasp things by the root. But for man the root is man himself . . . the doctrine that man is the supreme being for man" (T. B. Bottomore, ed., *Karl Marx, Early Writings* [New York, NY: McGraw-Hill, 1964], p. 52). Marx's definition of the radical fits most modern men and almost every state in the world today. Man is the supreme being for modern man. It should not surprise us that the world moves more and more into the jungle of Marx's mind: it begins with the same premise. If man is the supreme being for man, then man makes his own laws as he goes along. As a result, if man says that theft is virtue, then supposedly theft becomes virtue. Our modern economics, and our modern established religion, humanism, are alike consequences of making man his own god.

But our Lord declared, "for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve" (Matt. 4:10). And God has built in a problem which confronts the humanistic state, and will progressively in the days ahead. Man shall not and cannot long live by bread alone, and neither can he live without it. The more the state increases its power, the more it undermines both the religious and economic life of man, and its own life as well.

337

THE SEARCH FOR A HUMANISTIC EDEN

Chalcedon Report No. 127, March 1976

Almost weekly, we read of a delegation of congressmen, congresswomen, diplomats, actors, actresses, professors and others who have made a trip to Red China speak glowingly of the great accomplishments of this ostensible paradise. The real horror of Red China was effectively set forth by Tung Chi-Ping and Humphrey Evans a few short years ago in *The Thought Revolution*. Why the insistence that a new world order exists in that nightmare world? And why the shift of liberal hope from the Soviet Union to Red China?

Only lately have the illusions concerning the Soviet Union begun to wane. Alexander Solzhenitsyn's *Gulag Archipelago*, volumes 1 and 2, have contributed greatly to that end. But the facts were well known long before his day. They were described amply in the 1920s and 30s and thereafter. Why the rejection of those facts? In the 1930s, I heard professors repeatedly describe Stalin as a stable, conservative, and humane force as against Trotsky. Then in the late 1950s and the 1960s, the successors of Stalin were presented as less repressive and more humane than Stalin. In both cases, they were wrong.

The humanistic presupposition is this: what man decrees *must* be, *will* be. The Marxists in Russia, as true humanists, decreed the birth of a new world order, a humanistic order. True, Stalin said, and the humanists everywhere echoed, you can't make an omelet without breaking the eggs, so the breaking of the eggs, tens of millions of men, was casually accepted as the road to the perfect omelet, the humanist paradise.

But by the 1970s, it was beginning to be obvious that the omelet smelled badly. The trouble with the Soviet Union, the humanists apologized, is too much bureaucracy. This evades, of course, the heart of the matter, the evil of the humanist dream. The hope was retained; it was simply

transferred to Red China, always with a hope that the Soviet Union will get back on the track again.

The roots of this insanity are in Hegel, with his great humanistic first principle: the rational is the real. What man decrees is logically necessary will become reality. On this principle, men everywhere are being murdered to make the humanistic illusion a reality. The collapse of this fantasy, this insanity, is inevitable. Only what God decrees stands. There is no other reality. The grandiose and murderous fantasies of humanism are doomed.

338

THE STATE

Chalcedon Report No. 74, October 1, 1971

When words, inappropriate for political application, become political slogans, they create impossible problems. One such word is *equality*. That word has had many meanings. Several Greek words are translated as *equal* in the New Testament. One of these, in Galatians 1:14, means "one of the same age," and others also have meanings very different from modern usage. The word *isos*, however, which appears in Matthew 20:12, John 5:18, Philippians 2:6, and Revelation 21:16, and *isotes* (equality), in 2 Corinthians 8:14 and Colossians 4:1, means the same in size, number, quality, and so on. It is in essence a mathematical term, and this is its meaning in Matthew 20:12 and Revelation 21:16, as well as in 2 Corinthians 8:14 and Colossians 4:1. The other usages indicate the identity of the persons of the Godhead.

But it was in the modern era that *equality*, a mathematical concept, became a political slogan. With the Enlightenment, mathematics became very influential as a standard for man's thinking. Some philosophers felt that thinking, like geometry, should proceed from axioms and theorems to inescapable conclusions. In mathematics, the equal sign shows a balance on both sides of a problem, and the problem is solved if it is proven that they balance. The idea of equality thus came to be an attractive idea for politics: solve the political problem by introducing the solving balance of equality.

The idea of equality, once introduced into politics, created a false dilemma and offered false alternatives. Men who opposed the idea of equality began to argue that inequality was the truth of the matter.

But the idea of equality applies best to a mathematical problem; it is an abstraction. Two plus two equals four; true. But do two Englishmen plus two Frenchmen equal four Japanese? Immediately, the problem becomes

absurd. Who are these eight men? Some may be criminals, others great men. In any case, how can they be equated? How can the diversity of talents, character, and usefulness be reduced to an abstraction? Can two trees plus two clouds equal four birds? If we are dealing with lumber, steel, and other standardized and manufactured items, the equal sign is a very important and necessary tool of science and business. Applied to people, it is meaningless. To talk about either equality or inequality is to reduce the human situation to a level of abstraction. Even more, it introduces a false perspective which can only damage society. Men will try to promote their ideas of equality and inequality with passionate intensity, and political discourse and action will be geared to myths.

What is the answer? Is Willie Mays equal to Richard Nixon? Is a plumber equal to a councilman? The question must be ruled out as meaningless. It obscures the basic fact, *first*, that God's law declares that rulers and judges must be no respecters of persons: their judgment must be in terms of the law, not in terms of the wealth, poverty, or color of a man (Lev. 19:15; Deut. 1:17, etc.); in this respect, justice is blind to the status but clear-eyed with respect to the law. These human factors may or may not be important; they are, however, irrelevant to the law. *Second*, men are ultimately judged in terms of their relationship to God and His law-word, not in terms of their relationship to man's standards. Faith and character are thus central to a man and his society in any godly order; there is, then, a natural aristocracy of talent and character.

In a statist order, however, neither an organized majority or minority, nor any kind of independent aristocracy, are tolerable. In a statist order, power must be concentrated in the state in clear-cut fashion. The façade may be "power to the people," but the reality is *power to the state*.

Since the Crusades, the state has worked to eliminate all other contenders in its quest for power. It has worked to level and cut down any group within the state that might be a rival to its ambitions, or which possesses independent powers.

Three early enemies were thus the feudal lords, the Jews, and the church. Feudalism meant localism and decentralization, and, to create the centralized power of the state, feudal power was steadily undercut. The Jews, as the builders of urban pre-Crusade Europe, represented too great a power, and thus the state worked to destroy the Jews. The church, too, represented a threat to the state because of its refusal to accept a subordinate and controlled status, and it too had to be undercut and brought under control.

The rise of nationalism, a by-product, furthered the unity of the state, and therefore minority groups and their "ghettos," which were self-governing and independent areas, had to go. Cities were planned with straight

streets so that cavalry charges could sweep them free of revolutionists, and guns mounted at intersections could cut down people from all sides. The state was religiously concerned with protecting and increasing its power.

Equality came to be a valuable tool on the part of the state in eliminating diversity within the state, and in undercutting areas of separatism. Thus, in the United States, in the name of equality, the New Deal began to break up the Old South and its regional loyalties. A black voting bloc was created which, after World War I, began to grow in power. A statist order, however, can no more tolerate a Negro bloc than a white Southern bloc, and, as a result, integration became, not an idealist but a political step to break up bloc solidarity.

The effects of integration have too often been studied only by proponents and opponents of integration. Unfortunately, both believe that enforced integration is possible. From the days of the Assyrians, who moved nations and peoples about to homogenize their empire, to the twentieth century, such attempts have been failures. People do not intermarry unless a common faith, culture, and standard brings them together. Then, they cannot be kept apart. The Basques have not been independent for fourteen centuries, but they refuse to surrender their separateness and their desires for independence. The Soviet Empire has regularly liquidated both people and party members for favoring their local national groups, but without success. The Ukrainians, Georgians, Armenians, and others still retain their separateness and their dreams of freedom.

In the United States, a black leader who favors racial intermarriage stated that integration laws decreased the number of such unions and drove blacks and whites apart. Integration has not integrated. What has it done? It has introduced class divisions into the black bloc. By requiring a percentage employment of blacks, the civil rights laws have given a large number of blacks a middle-class status and middle-class aspirations. From a number of sources, the reports have come of the results: a large percentage of these middle-class blacks refuse to identify themselves with specifically black causes. They still go to black churches, visit with black friends, and create social organizations of their own, but these are essentially black *class* organizations. The reaction of many black political leaders has been resentment. The Black Panthers, Muslims, and others have reacted by calling for a black nation, black separation, and so on. They have rightly seen the statist course of action as more political, than benevolent. Blacks scattered throughout a white culture are finished as a political force. If black so-called ghettos are broken up, then black revolutionary action is less likely also.

But these black revolutionists are themselves being destroyed by the

state. Either by direct subsidies or through foundations, they are made dependent on the state, so that every black leader eyes all others with suspicion as a paid hireling. The black revolutionary leaders thus have a short-term popularity before they lose their following.

The black revolution is a hopeless, bought-out failure, but it is still a very important and weather-vane movement. The statist dream of instant paradise for all true believers when the right set of laws is passed has been broken. The bitter black disillusionment with the promises of the state has shattered the myth of a new Garden of Eden by statist measures. This disillusionment with politics is growing one. As a state senator, a Christian, remarked to me, of his fellow legislators, "Very few of these men believe any more in what they are doing." Their belief that politics is the way to the good society is dying or dead.

For more and more of the people, on both sides of the Iron Curtain, all over the world, the state is the enemy. It is the god that failed, and men are increasingly ready to smash their false gods.

The advanced stage of the statist dream has been of a scientific state. When Marx spoke of scientific socialism, the word *scientific* still had magic to it. But now, like the word *equality* and even more so, the word *scientific* has come to represent a myth and not reality.

The ideal of a scientific state is of a planned social order conducted like a scientific experiment. In an experiment, all factors are controlled there is no place for freedom. Thus Dr. Marvin Karlins and Dr. Lewis Andrews, authors of *Requiem for Democracy? An Inquiry in the Limits of Behavior Control*, believe in controlling man scientifically, because "the real problem is the threat of freedom." Dr. B. F. Skinner of Harvard, in *Beyond Freedom and Dignity*, also believes that freedom must be replaced by controls over man. When the behaviorist J. B. Watson talked along similar lines a generation or so ago, only reactionaries, on the whole, were distressed; most people saw in Watson the promises of a glorious future through science. The reaction now is hostility on all fronts. The scientific-educational-statist establishment is viewed with radical suspicion and fear.

Much is said nowadays about "the credibility gap." Pronouncements by the U.S. federal government are viewed with distrust as politically motivated lies. There are good reasons for this suspicion. However, the political lies of Wilson's era, by all the nations, far exceeded those of today. When they were exposed, there was a period of shock, and then a quick return of confidence. At that time, men were more ready to trust the state and thus to believe that some officials were guilty, but that their "government" was still benevolent and sound. That belief is largely gone now, and thus "the credibility gap" has grown and exists even when the

truth is told. As a businessman said of a prominent politician: "I'm suspicious even when he tells the truth. I start figuring, what's his angle?"

The state is no longer seen as the potential Garden of Eden: it is the world after the fall. For many bitter, revolutionary youth, the state has in fact become the serpent! This radical distrust of the state is the most ominous fact of our time. It spells the end of the age of the state.

To avoid statist answers, men, as before, prior to the fall of Rome, and the collapse of the Middle Ages, resort to all kinds of wild alternatives: astrology, witchcraft, healing cults, magic, anything that offers a rival power to the omnipresent state. In reaction against science, many youths today adopt primitive dress patterns, advocate a return to primitive farming, and generally yearn for a prescientific, prestatist order. Such movements are futile and pathetic. Their value is simply as weather vanes of popular sentiment and disillusionment.

Neither negation nor protest have ever built a social order. The Weathermen, Black Panthers, and others are simply dangerous backlashes of the past; they represent anger and rage, not a new order. People who give dramatic interviews do not make revolutions! They are self-conscious actors: they want a stage more than a battle.

The future always begins yesterday and today. It is an act of faith, and it is an act of recapitalization of spiritual and material capital. The state everywhere has become the destroyer of spiritual and material capital, not its protector. The church has largely joined the humanists and statists and is bankrupt. The state school, as the tool of the state, is facing the collapse which is threatening the state.

Only in a Biblical faith and a reconstruction of church, school, state, family, economics, and all of life in terms of God's law order is there any hope. This reconstruction is under way.

Homesick for Sodom, Lot's wife turned back, choosing life in a perishing city to freedom and a new beginning. Those who like Lot's wife have a backward look are doomed. The future lies ahead, and it is in the hands of our sovereign God, not the enemy.

The state is not god, nor is it the lord of life. To be alive is a marvelous thing, and to have the privilege of reconstructing a world by means of our own recapitalization is a pleasurable duty. To allow the state to sour our lives is to do violence to ourselves and to make ourselves into children of the state. Our problems are small compared to those of others in the communist world, and in past eras. If life is a burden for you, perhaps you are the real burden, a drag on time and progress. This is indeed a difficult era, but it is a time of great change and opportunity, and, under God a glorious time to be alive.

339

DYING AGE OF THE STATE

Chalcedon Report No. 72, August 4, 1971

Western civilization today is approaching the last days of the age of the state. This does not mean that the state will soon disappear, or disappear at all, nor does it mean that there is likely to be an immediate decline in the power of the state. On the contrary, the short-run prospect is for vastly increased powers concentrated in the state, in the hands of civil government.

What it does mean is that the religious expectancy that the state can provide man with the saving power and answers to human needs and problems is waning. For some time now, humanistic man has looked to the state in the same way that Christian men once looked to God. Man's hopes have had a political answer. Political campaigns have had a religious overtone, and politicians and voters have talked about "saving" the country. That hope and expectancy is now waning.

Not too long ago, I had an opportunity to hear a discussion among business executives, only one of whom, an older man, was a conservative, of the injustices of various federal regulations. One man suddenly raised a hypothetical question: what would you do if a confiscatory regulation affected you? The immediate response was: conceal and lie; the general attitude was that the state is a potential enemy and an unscrupulous ally at best. The old man, a board chairman, quite emotionally disagreed. I was brought up, he said, to respect my country and to obey it, and, however wrong their action, I could not be disloyal or treat it as an enemy. To the others, the old man was a pathetic voice out of the past; they themselves voted to the left, but cynically. Their expectations of the state were cynical, short-run gains, nothing else.

Political power in the ancient world was religious power. The state was man's true church and even his god in some cases. Man's hopes could only

be realized through the state. The ruler was in many cases believed to be a god, or else his office was divine, or the state was a divine order. In any case, man's savior was the state. When St. Peter declared, "Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved" (Acts 4:12), he was not only affirming Christ as Lord and Savior, but denying at the same time that any ruler or caesar was man's redeemer. For Rome, the name of the caesar or emperor was the saving name, the name of power and redemption.

The collapse of Rome was twofold. There was, *first*, the collapse of belief in the saving power of Rome; the more power became centralized in Rome, the more its failure to cope with man's problems became manifest. The same is true today. The state increases its power, claiming that more power will enable it to solve man's pressing problems, but the increased powers only lead to more aggravated problems, and more cynicism and resentment among the people. The concentration of power in the state leads to the inner collapse of the state's authority. This same development occurred within the medieval church: the more powerful it became, the less it could solve its problems, and the greater the hostility it aroused. Finally, even the Renaissance Popes and their associates viewed their offices with cynicism and expediency. This inner collapse of imperial Rome was very vividly described by the Presbyter Salvian. *Second*, Rome fell physically because, as William Carrol Bark has pointed out, the millions of Rome did not feel it was worth defending against the tens of thousands of barbarians.

Today, the state is again facing an inner collapse, a decay of authority. There was a time when young men were ready to die for their country, "right or wrong." The nation could command a religious sacrifice such as the Christian martyrs of the early church gave to Christ as they went to death in the arena. It is now becoming difficult for a nation to command loyalty even when it is in the right. The bitterness manifested by youth towards the state is often a religious bitterness, an iconoclastic desire to destroy a false god.

In the Middle Ages, the church at one time could bring forth a children's crusade. In more recent times, boys lied about their age to enlist in the armed forces. Now, they even maim themselves to avoid service. The causes lie deeper than the unpopularity of the Vietnam War, or leftist agitation, although both are important. The last "children's crusade" commanded by any state was in Red China, the use of the Red Guard, and it ended in disillusionment and serious trouble.

The authority of the state is everywhere in decay, but everywhere the state is grasping for more power as the cure-all for man's problems.

The powers of the state are thus likely to increase markedly in the years ahead, but that increase is the forerunner of the state's collapse as man's saving agency.

The Roman Empire offered the masses "land and employment, food and money." According to Levi, this was a Roman application of an idea borrowed from Athens of the fifth century B.C., namely, "that the rulers of the state had a duty to help support the citizens." The function of the state's officers came to be "the collection and redistribution of money and property" (Mario Attilio Levi, *Political Power in the Ancient World* [London, England: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1965], pp. 174–175). What men once looked to the gods for, the state now offered to provide. The popularity of such measures was enormous, and the benefits to the empire very great, in that its authority was greatly advanced by the increased scope of its provisions.

The fallacy, of course, was a very simple one, and its effect was inevitable. The state is not god: it cannot create. To provide land and employment, food and money, the state had to tax and confiscate. It provided resources to the masses at the price of destroying the sources. The masses grew, and the producers declined. Faith in the empire also declined and turned gradually into cynicism and contempt.

In every era, cynicism and contempt can lead to lawlessness and disorder, never to reformation or reconstruction. Revolution and destruction can be spawned by bitterness and a loss of faith, but not progress. When an era has lost its faith, it seeks to find a substitute for faith in charismatic leaders, and political figures come to the fore whose only asset is their appearance, voice, or glamour. The political leader becomes essentially an actor playing an expected role. The commanding person becomes the substitute for a commanding faith.

Moreover, the more man becomes empty spiritually, the more he intensifies his demands materially. What was already impossible for the state to deliver becomes all the more so as men come to imagine that nothing should be withheld from them. Students in an elementary public school in Los Angeles told their teacher that they were "entitled" to the best homes in Beverly Hills and had a right to take them. After all, that was what democracy was all about.

To the man without faith, all things that are logically impossible to others become possible, because the discipline of faith is gone. The man who believes in the sovereignty of God and the godly uses of reason under God knows the possibilities as well as the limitations of human action. A madman often does not. Similarly, the man without faith has destroyed the old boundaries and landmarks, and his thinking has no discipline to it.

A telling cartoon recently depicted the irrationality of the Keynesian economics. A man, depicting the economy, was standing on the ledge of a very tall building. Behind him, the fire of inflation promised death, and before him, the long leap down ensured death. A modern economist was calling out his advice to the harried man: "Jump slowly." Modern relativism, by denying the absoluteness of truth, has made it possible for people to believe that a man can "jump slowly." Relativism destroys the old distinctions and restores a belief in magic to an equal footing with long-developed and tested knowledge.

Relativism also undercuts all loyalties. Not surprisingly, the state has been a major victim of the erosions of relativistic philosophies. When, early in the 1960s, a college president included, in a plea to dissident students, a call for "loyalty" to school and country, the only response was snickers. Few would now dare to make such an appeal. None of the old virtues can be invoked, and no new virtues have replaced them. Instead, a deep resentment and disillusionment prevails, and, whether it be the right, left, or center, various groups thrive today by capitalizing on resentment.

Resentment against what? It is hard to get a concrete answer out of many students. The resentment is against the "hypocrisy of the Establishment," the fraud of the social order, the stagnation of leadership, and so on. Issues may be cited, notably the war, but the resentment goes deeper than issues. According to Hebrews 12:15, the alternative to faith is a "root of bitterness," a deeply-rooted disposition which sours and pollutes the whole of a man's life. That root of bitterness is deeply imbedded in the mind of modern man. His hope, the state, is failing him. The blacks and the students have demonstrated their bitterness by violence. Their only practical results have been to increase the powers of the state. At Berkeley, the effect of all the student violence has been to increase professors' pay and decrease their working hours, as a university bribe to retain their services under such adverse circumstances.

We are indeed in the last days of the age of the state; men are losing their hope in the power of the state to redeem and regenerate man and society. This disillusionment will grow deeper, but at the same time the power of the state will grow stronger. There will be no change until men change, until faith in the state is replaced with faith in the sovereign God, not until the law order of God is recognized as man's only true environment.

The problem, thus, while apparent in the political sphere most dramatically, is essentially a religious problem. It cannot be reduced to a church problem. To replace the state as man's savior with the church is

surely no progress. The urge for institutional salvation and saviors is a desire to have gods that can be pressured, manipulated, and controlled. This is in essence paganism.

As we analyze the crisis of our age, it is well to remember that the contributions of the state have been real ones, as have been those of the church. Both have an important and continuing function, and a necessary one. The end of the age of the state will not mean the end of civilization but rather its revitalization. The greatest threat to civilization would be the continued power of the state as man's saving agency.

New foundations are being laid, and the future is as bright as the promises of God. God the Lord reigns, and He alone is sovereign. History is in His hands, not in the hands of the state and its charismatic leaders. To be without God is to be without hope: to believe and obey Him is to be certain of His victory.

340

THE STATE

Chalcedon Report No. 73, September 1, 1971

A great American business leader and philanthropist, William Volker, observed in 1918 that, "Government must be restricted to those activities which can be entrusted to the worst citizens, not the best." These words ran counter to the developing statism of American life, but they reflected the historic American distrust of man and the state. America's Puritan heritage had left its mark on political life; Washington saw the state as a dangerous fire, useful if tamed and guarded, dangerous if unchecked. The purpose of the Constitution of 1787 had been to chain down the federal government in order to free the people, while having enough federal civil government for purposes of union and development.

The developing theology of the state in Western civilization gradually and steadily eroded the premises of American politics. In its place came the state as "the fatherland." The word *fatherland* does not appear in Noah Webster's 1828 *Dictionary*; it came later from the Dutch and German, although like terms existed in French and other languages. In medieval and Reformation eras, if men spoke of anything like this, it was of God's eternal Kingdom, "Jerusalem the golden" (Bernard of Cluny), or, "O Mother dear, Jerusalem." For the Christian, God was his Father by grace, and the term *mother* could at best be given to his homeland, which was first of all the Jerusalem from above. In pagan antiquity, the ruler was commonly man's god, father, and shepherd. Biblical faith warred against this religion of the state, and a new civilization emerged out of its victory, the "West." Anton Hilckman, in describing the ideas of Feliks Koneczny, contrasted the West and Asia, or Turanian civilization, stating, "The West and Turan are absolute, contrary poles. The deepest root of this opposition is a fundamentally different attitude towards man and towards the position of an individual in the human group. Turan does

not know man as a person; it does not know any dignity of a person; the individual has value and importance only in his role of a component part of the State's organization. In Turanian civilization . . . there is, legally, no such thing as a society in existence; the State is everything. The European lives *also* in the State, the Turanian lives exclusively in it" (introduction to Feliks Koneczny, *On the Plurality of Civilizations* [London, England: Polonica Publications, 1962], p. 27). This difference, however, is not one of race or geography but of religion: Biblical faith gave the West presuppositions which undercut the ancient religion of the state. However, as that faith has waned in the West, the old pagan political theologies have returned. Rulers began to talk of the divine right of kings; their successors asserted the divine right of democracy and the masses: "the voice of the people is the voice of God." For Marxism, the voice of the divine masses is incarnated in the dictatorship of the proletariat and speaks infallibly through them alone. Thus, in place of God the Father of an elect people, the doctrine of the fatherland and an elect party ruling it emerged. The powers of God and of man under God are being progressively transferred to the new god, the state.

In the process, God was ridiculed and denied. God's government was held to be unjust and partisan, because some were predestined to salvation and others to reprobation. Earlier, an Oriental story had made the same point. Some children were given a bag of walnuts, and they disagreed as to how to divide it, and the town sage was asked to do it. His response was, "How do you wish me to divide these walnuts among you? Shall I do it according to principles of divine or of human justice?" The children asked for divine justice. The old man then gave one walnut to one boy, two to another, a dozen to the next one, and then the whole bag to another. When the boys protested, the old man answered, "Did you not ask me to divide your walnuts according to divine Justice? And does not Providence always proceed in this manner when dividing her favors among mankind?"

The state offered a "better" answer. The state steadily gained increasing power in its effort to bring "true justice" to the human scene, and this true justice increasingly came to mean equality. Walnuts for all in abundance was the state's professed goal. Increasingly, the walnuts have ended in the state's coffers, and, instead of justice, the state has been seen as the source of increasing injustice. As Gaullieur observed of the paternal state in 1898, "it leads progressively to social hatred and dissatisfaction among the people, and insecurity for the state; everybody always is expecting from omnipotent managers virtues which nobody possesses" (Henri Gaullieur, *The Paternal State in France and Germany* [New York, NY: Harper & Bros, 1898], p. 223).

The irresponsibility of the state is a product, not only of man's sinful nature, but of his humanism. The humanist faith is ably summed up in the motto of a publication by "Marxist-Humanists," *News & Letters*: "Human Power is its own end." There is no god or law beyond man: therefore human power is its own end, its own law. Justice, as George Orwell saw, quickly disappears from such a faith, and all that remains is human power expressing itself as naked power, a boot stomping on a human face forever.

Humanism has not only worked to destroy the religious authority of the older Biblical form, but it has undercut its own "rational-legal" authority. Henry Adams, early in the century, wrote that "it will not need another century or half a century to tip thought upside down." Law, in that case, would disappear as theory or *a priori* principle, and give place to force. Morality would become police. Explosives would reach cosmic violence. Disintegration would overcome integration. According to Schaar, the ethical relativism of the modern era is destroying it: "the modern man, having now reached nearly full development, is turning back upon itself and undermining the very principles that once sustained order and obedience in the modern state." Moreover, Schaar holds that "contemporary social science has failed to appreciate the precariousness of legitimate authority in the modern states because it is largely a product of the same phenomena it seeks to describe and therefore suffers the blindness of the eye examining itself." Justice in the modern state has come to mean material abundance for all and security for all in spite of their improvidence. Both states and people have become relativistic in their morality. Practically, moral relativism means, "What's in it for me?" Authority has been attacked as an enemy of liberty, but, as Schaar asks, "Can anyone today still believe that liberty expands as authority contracts?" With the breakdown of authority, civilization is itself breaking down, and liberty is waning. Schaar, whose viewpoint differs from ours, very ably raises the fundamental question: "But it is clear for our time, as Philip Rieff has written, the question is no longer as Dostoevski put it: 'Can civilized men believe?' Rather: 'Can unbelieving men be civilized?'" (John H. Schaar, "Reflections on Authority," *New American Review*, no. 8 [New York, NY: New American Library, 1970], pp. 44–80).

The state appeared on the scene in the medieval era as the unifier of civilization and as its defender and champion. The more the state has gained its goals and separated itself from Biblical faith and law, the more it has become the destroyer of civilization. Statist man, who sees the state as his father and shepherd, under whose care man shall not want, is

progressively a new barbarian, welcoming statist measures which destroy his liberties and seeing these measures as great blessings.

Imperial salvation in Rome meant cradle-to-grave security on the imperial estates, where serfdom was born. For the imperial serfs, "salvation means to be delivered from the uncertainties of freedom into the blessed assurance of a welfare government which provided for their entire lifetime." As Ramsay pointed out, "The paternal government was 'Salvation' in the estimate of the cultivators on the estates . . . The 'Salvation' of Jesus and of Paul was freedom: the 'Salvation' of the Imperial system was serfdom" (Sir W. M. Ramsay, *The Bearing of Recent Discovery on the Trustworthiness of the New Testament*, 4th ed. [London, England: Hodder and Stoughton, 1920], pp. 197–198).

As the state gains power to "save" man, it distrusts power in all other hands with increasing fervor. It is a serious offense, in the Soviet Union, to give private charity, because such gifts establish a bond between people which is a power outside the state.

An American historian, writing in 1944, satirized the new philosophy of work emerging among statist social scientists. According to Andrews, such men believe that:

> We must have an entirely new philosophy of work. Work must be recognized not as a virtue or a blessing but as an intrinsic evil.
>
> Work is power, and the modern trend is of necessity to subject power to increased social regulation and supervision.
>
> An automobile, a revolver, a medical or legal education, a fishing rod, are all embodiments of power of one sort or another. As such, society requires their possessors to secure a license or permit of some kind as a guarantee that the power will not be used to social detriment.
>
> When mechanization has been carried to its ultimate perfection, there will be so little of routine production left for human hands and minds to do that in all probability there will be actual competition for the doing of it for its own sake. (Matthew Page Andrews, *Social Planning by Frontier Thinkers* [New York, NY: Richard R. Smith, 1944], pp. 56ff.)

Andrews foresaw a day when work would be distrusted and regulated by the state as an alien power, and attempts made by automation to "free" man from work in order to give the state unhindered control of power. His book today reads less like a satire and more like a report.

As the state has gained power, it has also lost authority. Heads of state are less and less revered figures held in respect and awe by the citizenry. More and more, as the modern era has advanced towards its logical end, the protection of heads of state from their own peoples becomes an increasingly more urgent problem. Security measures grow more and more

severe in order to protect rulers, and, on both sides of the Iron Curtain, the state sees the people as an enemy and a threat.

The state everywhere now has power, in fact, steadily increasing power, with steadily diminishing authority. The state's power is like the gold of Toulouse: it brings shame, dishonor, evil and disaster, and calamity upon calamity. The state, like Oscar Wilde (*De Profundis*), has denied God and His law to hold that "the false and the true are merely forms of intellectual existence," and it has thereby made its own authority another myth as well. As a result, it has produced the new barbarian, who believes nothing, respects nothing, and works to destroy everything, especially the state and its "Establishment."

The state thus, while more powerful than before, and likely to increase very markedly in power in the immediate future, is increasingly in a state of siege. As it moves toward total power, it also incurs total guilt and total attack. To meet attack from its own "sons," the state has only an intellectual void and the power of the gun. In 1960, Daniel Bell wrote on *The End of Ideology*, and President John F. Kennedy, at the Yale commencement, declared that man's problems were no longer ideological, religious, or philosophical, but technological. After Comte, he held that man had passed the age of religion or mythology, and the age of philosophy or speculation, during which times *meaning* was basic to man. In the age of science, technology or method is everything, supposedly.

Against this emptiness, college students and others, themselves empty, have rebelled. The fatherland should provide life and meaning, but instead it offers death (or war) and a denial of meaning. Earlier marches and demonstrations were in effect cries of, "O Baal, hear us!" Now Baal is hated and bombed by a generation as blind and empty as Baal.

Men can kill and destroy out of hatred; they can only build in faith. Our statist age will continue to flounder in its meaningless and downward course, hating its false god while believing in nothing else. It will, like the Baal worshippers of old, mutilate itself while it assails also its false god, because it knows no other hope.

A Biblical faith, to offer man hope, must restore the dimensions of victory and insist on the radical responsibility of the believer to work in Christ to make all things new.

David Little has shown that, for the Anglicans of the seventeenth century, the Word of God and the Christian faith meant that which is "old"; to *conform* rather than *reform* was their concern. The Puritans, on the other hand, saw the Word of God as ever fresh and new and as the continually reforming force in society (David Little, *Religion, Order, and Law: A Study in Pre-Revolutionary England* [New York, NY: Harper &

Row, 1969]). Not surprisingly, Puritanism triumphed as long as it maintained this faith.

A faith which hopes for escape from the world is doomed neither to escape nor to triumph. Those who, under God, are confident that the sovereign and omnipotent God has called His people to victory will experience both battle and victory.

History is not a spectator sport. There are no sidelines. It is a battle, and it results either in victory or defeat. Those who expect to escape, or to sit on the sidelines, will be the first victims. Why bewail the battle? Get off your duff and work for victory.

341

THE FAILING STATE

Chalcedon Report No. 77, January 1, 1972

According to Scripture, the state is the ministry of justice, whose duty it is to administer God's law as "the minister of God" in its realm (Rom. 13:1–4). The church is the ministry of grace, and the state the ministry of justice, each in its appointed realm to serve God. Only by such a service can society flourish and prosper.

Much of the struggle between church and state in the medieval era was a dispute over priority; was the emperor or the pope God's chief minister? Pope Gregory VII, in his letter to the bishop of Metz, 1081, referring to his struggle with Emperor Henry IV, spoke of "kings and emperors who, too much puffed up by worldly glory, rule not for God but for themselves." The point was well made, but it was all too often a valid charge against both church and state, that their concern for power and priority supplanted the proper administration of their ministry.

In the modern era, this old battle was supposedly bypassed and a new order instituted by the progressive separation of church and state. Both church and state were now supposedly free to pursue their respective callings without interference and with greater faithfulness. The result has been, within the state, a graceless law, and, within the church, a lawless grace, pietism, and antinomianism.

The state, however, has become intensely concerned with justice, now usually termed social justice. Rarely in history has the state expressed more concern with human welfare, with problems of health, education, and welfare, war and peace, environment and ecology, science and research, as well as agriculture and a variety of other spheres of interest. The state in effect has embarked on a zealous search for justice in every realm of life. Minority groups have been systematically studied and courted, and their claims to justice strongly championed, by state after

state. All over the world, the modern states justify their existence by their zealous quest for social justice. Old wrongs and injustices are to be righted, human brotherhood instituted, and a reign of world peace insured. It was believed that the twentieth century was to see many of these goals realized; instead, it has seen the progressive disintegration of world order and a growing resentment against the state. The effort has been a notable one, but the results have been disastrous. It is important to understand why.

Perhaps an illustration from two countries may help us to understand the problem. The tsarist order of old Russia had more than a little popular hostility to the Jews, and some legal discrimination. Many Jews left Russia for this reason, and a few of the wealthier American Jews helped finance Russian revolutionary parties in order to bring in justice. The results are now even less satisfactory, and the freedom of Soviet Jews is greatly reduced, so that the tsarist days seem like a dream of freedom by comparison. Various Jewish groups all over the world demand freedom for Soviet Jews and insist that they are the targets of discrimination and repression. The Soviet Union very indignantly denies these charges and affirms that its order is without prejudice and is indeed dedicated to brotherhood. The Soviet Union is in fact an empire of many minority groups. It must avoid a charge of discrimination and favoritism, lest it be a target of a dreaded, revolutionary liberation movement. Earlier in its history, the Soviet Union faced a charge within the country of favoritism to the Jews.

How has the present problem developed? The problem has arisen out of the attempt to avoid all favoritism and discrimination. The Soviet hierarchy is well aware of the deeply-rooted prejudices which divide its many racial groups (see Paul Lendvai, *Anti-Semitism without Jews: Communist Eastern Europe* [Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1971]). To maintain its power, it must keep peace internally. As a result, to maintain justice and equal representation, it has instituted a quota system. The various graduate schools and professions must maintain a fair balance of all groups so that equal representation and justice prevail. The result has been instant injustice. Some of the minority groups, such as the Jews, normally have a high percentage in higher education and the professions, whereas some of the backward peoples of central Asia have a very low representation. If the two are put on the same basis of representation, the result is a discrimination in favor of the backward group and against the advanced group. Moreover, the state receives a civil servant of lesser calibre. Thus, the steps taken to eliminate discrimination have given Russia its most repressive order in history.

Let us turn to the United States for a similar development. There was a time when some medical schools limited the number of Jews who were accepted for admission. This was discrimination, clearly. All the same, the percentage of Jewish doctors was quite high in ratio to the population, as was the percentage of Italian and Jewish musicians, and so on. Certain minority groups did gravitate to certain professions and sometimes dominated them. Steps are now being taken to "correct" this situation. Medical schools must now accept a percentage of black students equivalent to the black population. This means, however, that the number of Jewish, German, Anglo-Saxon, and other students who can enter medical school is proportionately reduced. If we continue to try to "correct" the situation by applying the quota system across the boards, we will very quickly lower, as we have begun to do, the calibre of medical education by introducing an alien factor. Instead of ability, race will govern. Apply the matter to every field, and the injustices increase. If opera must have an equal representation (in the pit and on stage) of all races and Italian eminence broken, then opera ceases to be a musical feast and becomes an arena of racial tension.

Such a policy will only increase racial hostility and aggravate existing problems. It will also mean that positions which should be granted in terms of merit are instead granted in terms of race. Every society already has its inner workings which favor some against others. Very often, getting a job depends on knowing the right people. Such favoritism is inescapable in any society, but, in a free society, there is always room for ability to assert itself and advance in spite of such problems. In a quota system, besides having more scope for "pull" with insiders, those of lesser abilities are consistently favored in order to equalize the situation. The state's concern with social justice has thus led to systematic and planned injustice. Why?

The framework of reference in social justice is man, not God. The attempt to gain social justice is humanistic to the core, and it lacks an objective frame of reference as its standard. The matter has been very powerfully summed up by the historian John Lukacs (*The Passing of the Modern Age* [New York, NY: Harper & Row, 1970]), who writes:

> Our world has come to the edge of disaster precisely because of its preoccupation with justice, indeed, often at the expense of truth. It is arguable, reasonably arguable, that there is less injustice in this world than a century ago. Only a vile idiot would argue that there is less untruth. We are threatened not by the absence of justice, we are threatened by the fantastic prevalence of untruth. Our main task ought to be the reduction of untruth, first of all — a task which should have been congenial to intellectuals, who, however, failed

> in this even more than the worst of corrupt clerics. Of justice and truth the second is of the higher order. Truth responds to a deeper human need than does justice. A man can live with injustice a long time, indeed, that is the human condition: but he cannot long live with untruth. The pursuit of justice can be a terrible thing, it can lay the world to waste — which is perhaps the deepest predicament of American history. (p. 166)

In a chapter on "Truth and Liberty" in my study of the *Politics of Guilt and Pity*, I showed how truth has been denied by our courts in favor of liberty and justice. Justice Douglas has declared that "[t]ruth is not the goal, for in most areas no one knows what truth is." To search for truth is to construct "totalitarianism," according to Douglas, by imposing a right and wrong on society, when the duty of men "is not to discover 'truth' but to accommodate conflicting views of 'truth' and the common good or conflicting needs." By abandoning truth, men have thus also abandoned justice, and the "justice" of the courts today is becoming steadily a new form of injustice. Truth and justice are indivisible although different, and their separation has led to an age of statist tyranny and injustice.

Under the guise of a separation of church and state, what has actually taken place is a separation of Christianity and the state (and, one might add, a separation of Christianity and the church). The state is inescapably a religious establishment, because justice, law, and social order are inescapably religious questions. What the modern state has done is to disestablish Christianity as well as the church, and to establish humanism as its religion. The speeches of heads of states and the decisions of modern courts are exercises and proclamations of the religion of humanism. In this religion, there is no truth beyond man; truth is thus relative to man and is not an objective, absolute, and transcendent order created by God's eternal decree. Where truth disappears, justice soon disappears also. China was a most progressive and advanced civilization, as was India, until relativistic and pragmatic philosophies commanded the minds of people; then, instead of advance, stagnation set in, because, truth having lost its meaning, justice and life also declined in meaning. This same decay is now infecting Western cultures.

The impact of this downgrading or bypassing of truth is apparent in many areas. In the church, it has led to an emphasis on unity above truth in the ecumenical movement. The early councils of the church (Nicaea, Ephesus, Chalcedon, Constantinople) emphasized truth and waged war against heresies, holding that the only ground of unity is the truth of God. In the ecumenical movement today, unity has priority, and truth is bypassed or neglected. In fact, this emphasis on unity has gone so far that unity is popularly equated with grace, and nothing is more frequently

used as a modern anathema than to pronounce a movement as "divisive" and potentially or actually "schismatic." To oppose unity for unity's sake is regarded as being opposed to grace.

In the realm of the so-called social sciences and of education, the perspective of Comte prevails: meaning is derided, and the concern for truth is declared to be a mark of a more primitive society, whereas modern scientific man concerns himself, not with meaning, but with methodology and technology.

The neglect of truth has led to the progressive destruction of the church as a power in society, and to the decay of education. This neglect of truth is now destroying the life of the state and reducing it to a naked and empty display of force against which its own youth rebels. Even more, the neglect of truth has led to the erosion of the individual's strength to resist the growing tyranny of the state. Man is never more defenseless than when he is without the truth. Modern man is especially vulnerable because he is a man without truth, and, even more, a man denying the possibility of truth. Impotence is thus deeply imbedded in his will and present in his every act.

As against this prevailing darkness, the light of Scripture reveals the incarnation of truth in the person of Jesus Christ. The truth of God, His absolute law, decree, and person, is unchanged and unchanging. Men are judged by that truth. "Whosoever shall fall upon that stone shall be broken; but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder" (Luke 20:18). The truth is either our foundation, the rock on which we build, or it is our destruction, grinding us to powder.

The days of the age of the state are thus numbered. Its temples of humanism, its schools, are regularly being bombed and burned by its own sons. Its chief officers are despised and regarded with contempt. Even as the state increases its power, it also increases disrespect and disobedience.

Wise men will spend little time weeping over the past: they prepare for the future.

342

THE STATE AND SIMPLICITY

Chalcedon Report No. 75, November 1, 1971

The age of the state is not only creating serious problems for man and society by its belief in the applicability of the idea of equality to man, but also because of its trust in the fallacy of simplicity.

Men yearn for simplicity, and, especially when their problems are complex and overwhelming, they hunger most for a quick and simple answer. The yearning for simplicity is especially prominent among youth in every generation, and rarely more so than now. Youth, as it wakes up to the immensity of the world's problems, wants a quick answer, a simple solution, in order to cope with an overwhelming problem. The less equipped we are to cope with a problem, the more prone we are to want a simple answer, one we can understand, and one we can apply. The deliberate primitivism of modern youth is an aspect of this yearning for simplicity. Faced with problems of war and peace, economics and politics, and theological and philosophical questions, the answer of many youth is simplicity and primitivism: bare feet, love as a panacea, old, ragged clothes and an abandonment of careful dress and grooming, and a denouncement of technology. But such demands for simple answers are usually flights from real answers, not solutions.

William Carroll Bark, in *Origins of the Medieval World* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1960) has called attention to a central aspect of the failure of Rome. As Rome grew into an empire, her problems became more complex, but the Roman mind began to resist complexity. As Bark points out, "they confused simplicity with strength, as if one could not exist without the other" (p. 144).

The same fallacy of simplicity governs the state, and its logical conclusion is some form of socialism. As society grows more complex, it grows complex because specialization and decentralization increase. The more

specialization and decentralization increase, the greater is the complexity and the advance in a society. Moreover, freedom increases with specialization. When a man no longer has to build his own house, grow his own food, and protect his own family, his ability to be free and productive increases. Similarly, if a woman has to weave her family's cloth and make their garments, make soap, kindle fires, and hand wash clothes, her freedom is lessened, and her life is more complex. Thus, a person's life becomes progressively more free and simple as complexity, specialization, and decentralization increase in productive society.

These things, which are the marks of progress and advance, are seen as dangerous social facts to the statist mind, whose constant urge is to simplify. Thus, B. F. Skinner, whose behavioristic thinking is the psychological companion of statism, sees our freedom as a threat to man's welfare. In *Beyond Freedom and Dignity* (New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf, 1971), he argues for the end of traditional concepts of human freedom and dignity, as well as of moral values in any Christian sense. His case was better stated some years ago by John Broadus Watson (1878–1958) (on Watson, see R. J. Rushdoony, *The Messianic Character of American Education*, pp. 162–169). Skinner's position is pure environmentalism. In the old view, he points out, people were blamed for their failures; liberals then blamed bad parents, teachers, and communities. "The mistake . . . is to put the responsibility anywhere, to suppose that somewhere a causal sequence is initiated" (p. 76). The answer is conditioning, the control of all men to create a society beyond freedom and dignity for mankind's best welfare.

Skinner's answer is not too different from that of the rebellious youth of our time. Both are guilty of the fallacy of simplicity. The young rebels want simplicity by a return to primitivism, whereas Skinner wants simplicity by means of the scientific, statist control of men.

The fallacy of simplicity is a humanistic, rationalistic fallacy. It rests ultimately in the belief that some few men have the answers whereby all men can be saved, all society ordered, and man's future assured. The fallacy of simplicity is an easy one for the statist mind to accept, because it usually concentrates power into a few hands. If all problems are to be answered by eliminating freedom, decentralization, and independent specialization, then an elite will have awesome and godlike powers. (If *Time* magazine's article on Skinner in its September 20, 1971 issue, pp. 47–53, is to be believed, then Skinner too is marked by a "desire to dominate.")

Consider the vast powers concentrated into statist hands by the departures from the gold standard. By creating a paper-money basis for economics, and by making money a creation of the state rather than a commonly accepted standard of value, the state has given itself virtually

total powers over the wealth of all its citizens. It can confiscate the wealth of the people at will. As Leonard Read has observed, in his essay, "Little Lessons Along the Road," "Inflation is a device for syphoning private property into the coffers of government. Successful hedging would require finding a form of property that cannot be syphoned off or confiscated. It does not exist!"

The state, however, can offer simple answers like economic controls, paper money, centralized planning, and so on, *only* when people themselves are guilty of the fallacy of simplicity. What breeds that fallacy?

Examining the matter closely, it will become apparent to us that, if power were concentrated in the wisest hands of the world, they would still make mistakes, and their errors would have deadly consequences for all of us. Thus, no group of men is wise enough to rule for all of us. The best we can hope for is that men will rule themselves wisely by God's grace and word. For any group of men to seek power over all other men is to play god. This, clearly, is the key to the matter, and it is man's original sin, to try to be as god, determining for himself what constitutes good and evil (Gen. 3:5).

Only God can give simple answers, because only God is totally omniscient and omnipotent. Only God can simplify because, by virtue of His omniscience and omnipotence, He is, to use humanistic terms, the only universal specialist with a full grasp of the total complexity of things. Moreover, because all things originate in His sovereign purpose and will, His purpose and word provide the only possible ground for a simple answer, since He is the only Lord and Maker of all things.

Thus, when men claim to have a simple, centralized answer, they are claiming to be god, and they are demanding the allegiance that only God can rightfully claim.

Every effort, therefore, to give a statist, simplified, centralized answer, is not only a move which works to level and destroy civilization, but also a move against God. The fallacy of simplicity is thus an aspect of original sin, man's attempt to be god and to order all things by his own will. Man's fiat will then requires fiat law, fiat money, and fiat morality. The word *fiat* is the Latin for "let it be done"; just as God said, "Let there be light: and there was light" (Gen. 1:3), so man's fiat is an attempt to create something out of nothing. The dictionary defines "fiat money" as "irredeemable paper money made legal tender by law." Because man is not God, his fiat money always erodes and finally becomes worthless. Because man is not God, his fiat law also fails to provide order and becomes instead the cause of disorder. Likewise, man's fiat morality leads to the collapse of society and to moral anarchy.

God's commands, His fiat declarations as stated in Genesis 1, brought all creation into being by means of simple commands. Genesis tells us, "God said and it was so." Here is true simplicity, because here is true deity. The compromising theologians who want to extend Genesis 1 and creation over millions and millions of years, and to convert a simple act to an involved and complex process, are thereby denying God's sovereignty. Not surprisingly, these theologians are usually strong advocates of simplicity on the human scene: they believe in fiat money, and in a fiat state, which, by simplifying and centralizing, will solve man's social problems. Their god has obviously migrated from the heavens to their national capital.

The fallacy of simplicity is thus at heart a theological issue. The remedy for man's attempts to play god is for man to see himself as a creature, a sinning creature, who must submit to and live under God and His law. The fiat will of the state, and the fiat will of anarchistic individuals, can only destroy social order, undercut civilization, and hamper technology.

It is very popular these days to regard technology as an enemy. Men who are guilty of the fallacy of simplicity want to downgrade technology because it so clearly requires specialization. Karl Marx, in *The German Ideology*, and Engels, in *Anti-Dühring*, declared that, when communism is fully realized, all experts and specialists would be unnecessary. Clark quite aptly asked, "I wonder who will perform brain surgery?" (Gordon H. Clark, *Historiography, Secular and Religious* [Nutley, NJ: The Craig Press, 1971], p. 86).

Let us see how this fiat mind works. Some years ago, as a student at a major city, I saw this fiat mind, the mind of the humanist, at work. Hegel long ago stated the case for such men with his assertion that "the rational is the real." The mind creates and then incarnates true reality. Thus, one professor once put on the blackboard the *x* number of acres in America capable of farm use, the *x* number of bushels of wheat, corn, and so on that could be produced, and then the *x* number of people in the United States and in all the world who could be fed *if* someone (presumably with his intelligence) organized and centralized all this and gave the right orders. At that time, in the 1930s, a similar plan in the Soviet Union had destroyed production and led to famine; he refused to believe that this was anything but propaganda. If proven to him, he would no doubt have said that the peasants were resisting progress when they resisted collectivization. In any case, he was guilty of the fallacy of simplicity. He actually believed that all problems are solved in life as easily as, theoretically, and with no contradictions permitted, they are "solved" on the blackboard.

Such "blackboard solutions" are increasingly the rule today as international economic conferences of the major nations "settle" monetary

problems. As senates, parliaments, and other legislative bodies ponder problems of politics, economics, education, and agriculture, they look for "blackboard solutions" and "blackboard experts." Then, if things go wrong, it is the people's fault for failing to become robots to the central plan.

The problem, of course, is that all men are inescapably creatures of God. They can deny God, but they cannot escape Him. At every point in life, and in every fiber of his being, man is inescapably and totally tied to God's law order and sovereign power. Those who are guilty of the fallacy of simplicity believe that man's fiat will can somehow change all this and make the masses of mankind move totally in terms of man's fiat will. This is Skinner's thesis no less than Marx's. It is the thesis of London, Washington, D.C., Paris, Rome, Peking, and Moscow, in varying degrees. It is the faith of man when he separates himself from God and tries to play god.

Thus, the closer the age of the state comes to realizing its dream of centralization and simplification, the greater the potential for misery and disaster increases, and the closer the age of the state draws to suicide. Our Lord declared that "man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God" (Matt. 4:4). The humanistic state sees man as a politico-economic animal and declares that man shall not live by the Word of God but rather by the fiat word of the state and the fiat bread of the state. However, the closer the state comes to realizing its dream, and the nearer it comes to having the power to issue a simple fiat word, the more it faces economic collapse. Its fiat money buys less and less, and often nothing, and there is also finally no bread to eat, and the state is dead.

Our Lord said, "all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword" (Matt. 26:52), i.e., all who make the sword, force, their answer and their mainstay, rather than making it subordinate, shall perish by the same meaningless exercise of force. Likewise, all who make the state, which, in its subordinate place is necessary, their mainstay, and its fiat will their law and hope, shall perish with the state.

It is time, therefore, to rebuild apart from the state, to establish independent Christian schools and institutions under God and His fiat Word and dedicated to His glory. It means establishing marriages and homes grounded, not on romantic love, but on a common obedience to God. It means establishing new businesses, relying not on a federal subsidy, but providing goods and services for free men. It means exploring the world of things and ideas to develop our knowledge and technology under God. We cannot be guilty of the clean-slate idea of the Enlightenment, of

waiting for a clean slate before we begin. We begin now, because our duty is a constant one, and the opportunity a very present one. It is a time for building, because the old structures are coming down. This, like every year, is the year of our Lord, and man's fiat word shall be shattered by the word of His power. It is therefore a glorious time to be alive, a time to work, and a time to rejoice.

CHRISTIAN RECONSTRUCTION

343

THE RECONSTRUCTIONIST WORLDVIEW

Chalcedon Report No. 367, February 1996

Christian Reconstruction is clearly and necessarily Van Tillian in its perspective. Dr. Cornelius Van Til set forth strongly that all valid thinking must begin with the presupposition of the triune God and His definitive and binding Word. No area of life and thought can be outside His government and the province of His Word. God who made all things, governs all things, and is the basic premise of every area of life and thought.

The alternative to God is not nature, evolution, chance, nor anything other than nothing. To deny the God of Scripture for evolution, for example, is to presuppose a universe of trillions of miracles, beginning with the rise of some iota of matter out of nothingness, the development of life out of nonlife, and so on and on. Those who deny the God of the Bible believe in very amazing and preposterous miracles.

Since God is the Creator of all things in heaven and on earth, only God's law-word can govern all things. As Creator and absolute Lord, He alone is the source of all law and determination. To neglect His law-word is to go against reality.

This means that no source outside of God can be used to guide and govern us. To look to man and the state for law is to deny God, for law is the will of the sovereign power, a statement once commonplace to law.

Among the implications of this faith in the sole lordship of the triune God is the fact that God declares, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me" (Exod. 20:3); "The government shall be upon his shoulder" (Isa. 9:6). God limits the taxing power of both church and state in His law, and He allows no rivals to claim unwarranted powers in any sphere, church, state, family, school, vocations, etc. Every sphere of life must be governed by His law-word. This means a free society, but not a lawless one.

This means also that God's Word prevails; that education, for example, must be Christian, and that men cannot go beyond God's law.

Moreover, as against *revolution*, we must believe that man's hope is in *regeneration*. Too often churchmen have joined the ungodly in their coercive plans of salvation. For us, God's law must provide order, and His regenerative power in and through Jesus Christ, our salvation.

Man, being fallen, must have atonement, and his common route is false atonement by means of sadomasochism. This means punishing others because we blame them for our sins (sadism), or punishing ourselves (masochism) to atone for our sins. Men all around us are seeking atonement falsely, and they thereby aggravate their sin.

Our Lord in His temptation faced the false plans of salvation (politico-religious in nature) as set forth by the tempter. The *first* was, turn these stones into bread and solve the world's persistent economic and food crisis. How can you claim to be a son of God and not so use your power? Our Lord answered, and so must we, "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by very word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God" (Matt. 4:3–4).

The *second* temptation was to cast Himself down from a pinnacle of the temple, and have angels rescue Him before He hit the ground. This temptation was to make faith unnecessary, to replace it with sight, with open proof of His deity. Again, our Lord answered with a sentence from the law, the Torah: "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God" (Matt. 4:5–7).

The *third* temptation was to fall down and worship the tempter, and He was promised all the world for it. This was a temptation to recognize the rightness of Satan's position. God was asking too much of man, and the tempter had a better plan of salvation, the miraculous solution of all economic needs, and the replacement of faith with proofs. Our Lord's answer was again from the law: "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve" (Matt. 4:8–10).

We dare not hope in anything other than Jesus Christ, our only Savior. In His stand against the evil one, He met him at every point with a statement from the law. Every word of Scripture comes from God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost. If Jesus the Christ relied on that word, how dare we ignore it? If it gave Him the answers against the evil one, it will give us what we need as we face this evil age and its needs.

Christian Reconstructionists do not believe that we and all other men can do better than our Lord, namely, to rely on God's every word. There is no better revelation nor wisdom.

344

FOUNDATIONS

Chalcedon Report No. 39, November 1, 1968

Foundations are one of the most important, abused, and misunderstood aspects of our contemporary scene. Most large foundations are strongly oriented to statism, and virtually all the rest are too afraid of losing their tax exemption to do more than drift with the current. But foundations have a central and basic place in Christian history. To understand them, let us examine briefly the ancient pagan state.

The pagan state was a totalitarian divine-human order: the state was a god walking on earth. Its divinity might be manifested in the person of the ruler, or his office, or the state or people as a whole, but this divinity was believed to be there. There was no freedom from the state: everything was absolutely under state control, whether in China, India, Babylon, Egypt, Greece, or Rome. Religion was merely a department of state.

The one exception was the commonwealth of God's people, Israel. God and His law order were accorded sovereignty over all things by all true believers. God's prophets could rebuke kings, because even apostate men were aware of the sovereign word and its power. The tyrant Ahab had to be nagged by his foreign wife, Jezebel, to act against the prophets.

The church in the Roman Empire could have readily become a recognized and legal religion by offering incense to Caesar and acknowledging his sovereignty. This the church refused to do. The Christians *as citizens* were ready to submit to Caesar in all matters of civil justice, but in those areas where God gave the state no jurisdiction, they obeyed God. The Biblical faith is not in the state as an overarching, all-governing institution which takes all others under its wings, but in God's sovereign and overarching law order, under which church, state, school, family, vocation, and all things else exist as separate yet interdependent spheres of life. The state has no more legitimate right to govern the church and

school than it has to govern the laws of mathematics and physics, and the realm of the church is similarly restricted. The realm of the state is justice and order under God; the realm of the church is the ministry of the Word and the sacraments and the discipline of its body; the realm of the school is the development of learning and knowledge under God; and so on.

The triumph of Christianity meant the death of totalitarianism, and, as a result, the state at first tried ruthlessly to exterminate all Christians. For a time, the swords and axes of executioners worked from morning to dark to kill the lines of condemned Christians. Later, when extermination failed, infiltration and subversion became the strategy.

But Christianity began to create a new society, a decentralized and free society. And *foundations* very, very early were basic to that society. These foundations were free and independent agencies, free of church and state, dedicated to specific purposes: charity and welfare, hospitals and medicine, education, orphanages, missions, and so on. These foundations began to accumulate wealth to fulfill these purposes. The history books tell us that, by the end of the so-called "Middle Ages," much of the wealth of Europe was in the hands of the church. They lie. There was considerable wealth in the hands of foundations, Christian orders and foundations, who were doing a great work for rich and poor alike. A greedy church and greedy states were trying to seize and often succeeding in taking over these foundations for their own un-Christian purposes. In this imperialism by both church and state, the state finally won.

But let us examine those foundations again. The church very early expressed its disapproval of the Neoplatonic pagan flight of the hermits from the world. In fact, in A.D. 819, the Council of Aix made it plain that the Christian duty of monastery communities or foundations was to care for the poor, or, in one way or another, minister to Christian society. Some of these foundations were monastic and clerical; others were lay foundations. All were responsible for great progress.

To cite one group, established by rich merchants with their poor tithes and other gifts, the Order of St. John of Jerusalem (also known as the Knights of Malta) was by the end of the eleventh century famous for its hospital work. We have an excellent description of one of their hospitals, built in Valletta, Malta, in 1575, for 800 patients, in a recent study of hospitals and their history:

> The equipment and service in the Malta hospital were the finest of their day. "In regard to the dignity of the Infirmary," the patients' meals were served on silver plates and in covered bowls; pewter dishes were allotted to the slaves in attendance. The three hundred and seventy beds were curtained, and fresh white linen curtains were used during the summer. All beds and

> bedding used by consumptives were burned, and sheets were ordered changed several times daily if necessary. The hospital was fortunate in having vast endowments, which permitted this comfortable equipment.
>
> The medical staff included a physician who gave students daily lectures in anatomy. Two practitioners supervised the carrying-out of the surgeon's orders, and about a dozen other men were assigned various medical duties.
>
> The wards were separated: one was for the aged pilgrims or religious, a small ward for the dying, one for hemorrhage cases, and a separate ward for the insane and their warden. As for food: herbs, all sorts of meats, pigeons, fowls, beef, veal, game, fresh eggs, almonds, raisins, sweet biscuits, apples, pomegranates with sugar "according to the wants of each" made up a partial list of the hospital's elaborate selection of foods for the patients. (Mary Risley, *House of Healing: The Story of the Hospital* [Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Co., 1961], p. 107)

The Knights of Malta are still active, and it is possible that their greatest work is ahead of them. This brief citation does serve to illustrate the fact that hospitals were once almost entirely a domain of foundation work, serving all people in Christian charity and with real ability. In the modern age, the hospital has become "independent" of Christian foundations; it has not been successful as an economic unit, that is, it has trouble breaking even financially, and it has provided the state an excuse for stepping in with socialized medicine.

The point is clear: certain social functions must be provided: hospitals, schools, welfare agencies, and so on. When Christian foundations establish and control them, they serve the purposes of Christian concern and love.

It is not enough to "vote the rascals out," although this surely needs doing. What will be done about the basic social functions, health, education, and welfare? When the state handles these, it ladles out benefits with politics in mind, and the results are social decay and anarchy. When Christian foundations assume the responsibility, the results further godly law and order.

Before Horace Mann began the state school movement in the United States in the 1830s, all children were educated by the Christian schools of the day, which were independent and self-governing. The slum children, children of newly arrived immigrants, and others as well were educated by educational missionary societies or foundations, and the work they did was excellent. (One such still existing school was recently the target of Supreme Court interference and forced integration, in violation of the founder's wishes. Whether the founder wished integration or segregation was none of the Court's business.)

As late as 1907, all welfare needs in the depression of that year were met by Christian churches and foundations. The foundation was once an independent agency whose inception, purpose, and reason for being was to manifest Christian faith and concern for all manners of men and needs. They were a basic aspect of Christian society and important and central to the cause of freedom. The plan to remove tax exemption from churches and Christian agencies is an attempt to destroy Christian civilization.

The lingering echoes of the old liberty remain in the confused statements of university students and professors. When the University of California professors and students protest *any* control by the state, we can agree with them, *provided* they renounce *any and all* support by the state and the federal government. Any other course is irresponsibility and immorality: they are seeking the best of both worlds, Christian and statist, and the responsibilities of neither. As such, they are a force for anarchy, not freedom. For liberty's death knell is always sounded by irresponsibility and license.

The forces of Christian Reconstruction are already in evidence, most notably in the Christian school movement. Today 25–30 percent of all grade school children are not in the public schools, and 10 percent of all high school children are in nonstatist schools. And this is merely the beginning.

As many of you already know, our purpose, as a small group of Christian scholars and Christian men and women dedicated to Christian Reconstruction, is to establish a center of study and learning for this cause. A new order of foundations is central to this purpose as well as a center of Biblical learning dedicated to total Christian Reconstruction.

345

DOMINION

Chalcedon Report No. 421, August 2000

Our theological position is known variously as Christian Reconstruction, theonomy, or dominion theology. All three terms are accurate.

The requirement of dominion appears first in Genesis 1:28. It is God's command to man to make the world God's Kingdom by bringing everything under God's rule and purpose. Eden, an enclosed area, was to be man's pilot project towards this worldwide goal. The whole earth, everything in it, and man were to be under God's dominion. In Genesis 1:28, God commands man as his only rightful Lord, i.e., He lays down the law to Adam and to all mankind in and through him.

The second great occasion of God's summons to dominion comes to and through Moses in the giving of the law. Law is a key means toward dominion. The giver of law is the lord of that people and society. In the modern world, either the state is the law or, as in anarchism, the individual. By denying the validity of God's law for all time, antinomians have denied the lordship of Christ. Logically, many of them deny His lordship.

A lawgiver simply says, by enacting laws, I am lord. In early America, the Bible was the lawbook used by courts and juries, and constitutions simply governed procedures of operation. The United States and various early state constitutions simply set forth procedures of operation, not laws in the historic sense.

The fundamental test on this in the New Testament is Matthew 6:33, "But seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you." God's righteousness (or, it can be translated, justice), His law, must be sought first by His people.

But today, those who claim to be His people commonly deny His law and see this as a moral stance! They deny morality in the name of morality!

Humanism substitutes man's law for God's law because its god is man. Humanism vilifies those who adhere to God's law because it is a threat to man's claims to sovereignty.

Because most churches are antinomian, Christianity is in retreat. In the twentieth century, U.S. church membership increased dramatically while its influence decreased phenomenally. Antinomian churches, churches which bypass God's law, have, whether or not they admit it, another god than Jesus Christ. And so, with full churches, Christianity so-called is in retreat. In fact, it hates dominion theology quite commonly.

The state, with its man-made laws, seeks false dominion, or domination. The Son makes us free, but the humanistic state makes us slaves. Only when the Son makes us free are we free indeed, according to Scripture. The modern state defines freedom in terms of its lordship, not Christ's.

By denying, avoiding, or revising God's law, the modern church has transferred sovereignty and dominion to man and the state, the prerequisite to slavery. It sees God's law as bondage rather than evidence of God's sovereignty and our freedom under God. Law is not for us salvation, but for the redeemed of God, it is freedom under God. Or do we wait for Christ's lordship until heaven?! If so, we may wait in vain. How can Christ be our Lord in heaven if He is not now our Lord?

How can we have Christ as our Savior if we deny His lordship? If the Lord has no dominion over us now, how can He see us as His people? If we want salvation without lordship, can we have either?

The subject of dominion, of lordship, is basic to the Bible. Should it not be basic to our faith and law? Can we truly believe in the Bible from cover to cover and deny dominion, law, and lordship?

The fact of hostility to us for our dominion theology is a sad one. We must see a change soon, or else Christian churches will retreat into at least irrelevance. And true Christianity can never be irrelevant.

346

SPARE-TIRE RELIGION

Chalcedon Report No. 344, March 1994

In the early 1930s, Dr. Otto Piper of Princeton Seminary wrote about an ominous trend in contemporary Christianity. He called it "spare-tire religion." Everyone feels safe if there is a spare tire in the trunk of his automobile, but, knowing it is there, gives no more thought about it. It is important to have, not to think about.

Most churchgoers are like that, he said, where Jesus Christ is concerned. It is important for them to be acceptable to Christ and to feel assured of heaven, but, once they have accepted Christ as Lord and Savior, they give little thought to Him outside of the church. As a result, we have a great deal of formal profession but little practice of Christianity.

Certainly Dr. Piper's words are truer now than when first written. Many people are more ready to fight *about* the faith than to practice it. I am regularly surprised by the persons who are in a rage over what one or another of our writers have written. Some of these critics I have come to know, and it never occurred to me that they were Christians. After all, more than a few of our readers make no profession of faith. But these critics are enraged over opinions and beliefs when in reality they in some cases have few or none! They generate much heat with little light. It seems that some cannot say what they really believe, but they know what they do not believe.

The major problem, however, is that sizable group who cannot get angry about anything. They are unhappy about those who question things out of faith, or from lack of faith. They want nothing to jar their spare-tire sense of security.

To me the wonderful part is that at the same time, more and more people are abandoning spare-tire religion. I find that we have today more and better Christians who are theologically and Biblically informed.

Remarkable developments are under way. Quietly, lay-led study groups, Protestant and Catholic, are meeting from coast to coast in increasing numbers to study the Bible and doctrine. A strong Christian laity is in the making. The devotees of spare-tire religion have reason to be unhappy: their position is being challenged.

Look, for example, at the growing number of thoughtful Christian periodicals. Most, it is true, have a small circulation, but their total impact is very great. A new and independent force is at work in Christendom, and it is a challenge to spare-tire religion.

This new force is Biblically and theologically well informed. Its loyalty is less to a church and more to the faith and the Lord. It is allied to and has helped create the very important Christian school and homeschool movements. It is producing books, videos, and other materials to fuel the new groups, and also computer networks have been formed.

Spare-tire religion is doomed. It will be replaced by Christianity. Wake up to the future!

347

CHRISTIANS

Chalcedon Report No. 97, September 1973

A very popular myth, first propagated by the Romans, is that the early Christians were recruited from the dregs of society and from slaves. While the early church won converts from all classes, it very clearly appealed most to thoughtful and educated men, who saw the decay of civilization. Pliny the Younger (ca. A.D. 112) referred to Christianity as "a depraved and extravagant superstition," in his report to the emperor Trajan, but Pliny also admitted the high moral character of the Christians and the fact that a number of them were Roman citizens. In those days, citizenship was reserved for the elite. (Many slaves, however, were highly educated people.)

The myth tells us also that the disciples were ignorant fishermen. The high level of education in Israel in that era rules out ignorance. Moreover, fishermen are not necessarily or by any means poor or backward. We know that John and James were the sons of Zebedee, a wealthy fisherman, and either related or a family friend to the high priest (John 18:15–16). St. Paul was a man of education and importance, as was his family, in the Roman Empire.

The New Testament gives many evidences of the importance of many of the early converts. St Luke addressed his gospel and Acts to Theophilus, a man of high official rank. In the very earliest days of the church in Jerusalem, "a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith" (Acts 6:7). The converts included the officers of Caesar's court (Phil. 4:22), prominent merchants like Priscilla and Aquila, and many other persons of note.

The first eyewitness account we have of the execution of Christians, on March 7, A.D. 203, at Roman Carthage, is an especially revealing account. *The Passion of St. Perpetua* gives us an eyewitness narration of the

arrest, trial, and death in the arena of a group of Christians of various strata of society, from slaves to Vibia Perpetua, who was a young wife and mother of noble birth. Like all converts, they had not only their faith in common but also an awareness of the decay of the civilization around them. The anonymous author of the account writes to give his readers "modern instances" of faith and martyrdom. Perpetua's stand was especially offensive to Hilarian the procurator, because he was a family friend. The young woman, however, could not be shaken from her faith and was thrown to the wild animals (R. Waterville Muncey ed., *The Passion of St. Perpetua* [London, England: Dent, 1927]).

The reason for such incidents was an obvious one. Young mothers like Perpetua, concerned about the decay of culture and the future of their families, were drawn to study groups and accepted the new faith. The same was true of many intellectuals of the day. This, in fact, was a major problem to the church. So many intellectuals were drawn to the faith but brought with them the framework of their old philosophies that the early church had a major battle continually against the syncretistic heresies created by philosophers who fused old philosophies with the new faith.

The humanism of Greece and Rome had decayed into superstitions. Astrology, occultism, magic, pornography, perverse sexuality, and much more, had become the working faith of many. Because of their extensive adoption of astrology and occultism, these humanists had lost increasingly the idea of causality, and, with it, science. The cult of fortune, according to Cochrane, led to "the deification of chance itself. To make the course of history turn on such a principle is fatal to intellectual integrity and moral responsibility alike" (Charles N. Cochrane, *Christianity and Classical Culture* [New York, NY: Oxford, 1944], p. 479). All that Rome had was the power of the state, an increasingly brutal power: it was increasingly bankrupt, intellectually and spiritually. The more Rome became bankrupt, the more it depended on brute force.

For a thoughtful minority, the Christian faith offered a solution, the only possible solution. As Cochrane noted, the central theme of early Christian thinkers was one of "emancipation" (p. 221), as witness Justin Martyr's joyful summation of the difference in his *Apology*, 1.14. Joy, meaning, and direction had been restored to life.

Much of the savage hatred and slander of the early church by Romans was based on the fact that they resented the drain of great minds to the opposition, and their answer was to call them "superstitious" and "slaves."

The same situation prevails today. An undergraduate student declared that no scientist could believe the Bible. When he was told of the

distinguished men of science who did, and of the number of important men in space research who did, his answer was simply, "No one can believe that God literally made the earth and be a scientist."

The fact is, however, that, for the past decade, many of the best students from the camps of statism have "freaked out" and have become irrelevant freaks. By default, more and more positions of authority are being lost to the statists and quietly occupied by Christians. As Wheeler has so plainly stated it, "The secular thrust is toward the creation of natural man, i.e., men who do not have a strong internalized sense of guilt and whose interest is to do pretty much as they please." This "new" man of secularism sees the enemy as the repressive past (Richard S. Wheeler, *The Children of Darkness* [New Rochelle, NY: Arlington House, 1973], p. 11). As a result, he wages war on the "past," on tradition, institutions, laws, and, above all else, the church. His vision is past-bound, and his answer is essentially to destroy, so that, whether it is Marcuse or unthinking hippies, the result is a belief in salvation by destruction. In any other era, if as many persons were involved in antisocial warfare as the 1960s saw, it would have meant revolution. The undisciplined "natural man" of the secular world was not able to function well even in his rebellion.

The modern state is bankrupt, and its children are bankrupt. There is no future with them. In all the world today, there is not a single head of state with any intellectual calibre and direction, or with great moral force. One nation after another is faced with internal corruption and moral decay. Many of these rulers have great power, but they are incompetent in the exercise of power in any form other than repression. Their answer to problems is to control and repress, not to solve them. More than in the days of the early church, an intellectually alert Christianity is needed to provide the answer. The world is up for grabs, but only by the men of faith and ideas to command it.

348

FAITH AND SOCIETY

Chalcedon Report No. 98, October 1973

St. Paul declared that "after the flesh" ("that is, judged by human standards," as Moffatt renders 1 Cor. 1:26), not many elite men were in the ranks of the church. To become a Christian in the early centuries was to be disqualified from consideration as a gentleman and a scholar. The Romans regarded membership in this new faith as disgraceful. However, as time passed, it became more and more apparent that what Rome had was totalitarian and repressive power, and what the church had was the thinkers of the day. Charles Norris Cochrane's study of *Christianity and Classical Culture* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1944) makes clear how bankrupt Roman thought had become. Rome had no real argument against Christianity and substituted brutal force for intelligence. It reached the point where Constantine recognized that the empire was suicidal in waging war against its best element, a point his successors usually failed to realize, for they favored humanistic doctrines thinly disguised as Christianity. The intellectual leadership had passed into the hands of the Christians, in spite of all persecution, because they alone provided a faith for the future. Not all Rome's power, nor its attempts *first* to eliminate the new faith, and, *second*, to use it as social cement, succeeded in deferring the day of bankruptcy and collapse. Rome had attempted to substitute power for faith, and it finally had few who trusted in or believed in the ability of Rome's power to save them. Rome was not so much overthrown, but, rather, it crumbled away.

The Christendom which arose out of the ruins of the empire and on barbarian soil had a major task, in that it had great handicaps to overcome in the new Europe, barbarians who practiced human sacrifice, social and moral anarchy, and an extensive absence of continuing authority. The new order, however, was marked by an emphasis on youth. It is

startling to see how, from Boethius to Calvin, youth marked the thinkers of the new era. Whether orthodox or heterodox, men of intellect came to the fore in their early years. Boethius wrote his first work at twenty years of age. Anselm of Canterbury was prior in Le Bec at thirty; Bonaventure was a university teacher at twenty-seven, at thirty-six the general of the Franciscan order. Many others can be cited who gained eminence in their youth. John Calvin, born in 1509, wrote his *Institutes* in 1536, and it was not his first work. Men found themselves quickly, gained eminence early, and found that ideas readily had consequences because however much denied at times in practice, men recognized the priority of faith and intelligence.

Christian thinkers ceased to be the elite men of Western culture with the Enlightenment. (There had been a blackout previously with the Renaissance.) It is not an accident that Pietism and the Enlightenment arose at the same time. As Christian thinkers retreated from the world and regarded the inner, spiritual realm as the only valid sphere for the faith, so the vacuum which remained was occupied by the new humanists, the men of the Enlightenment.

Society is an act of faith. Power cannot bind men together. At best, it can compel a sullen submission, but, even then, a serious problem remains. Without a faith to give meaning and direction to the power structure, not only is it impossible to convince the men who are herded into submission by guns to have any hope in the power structure, but it also becomes progressively difficult to convince the men who hold the guns that there is any sense to what they are doing. The Red Army under Trotsky was motivated by a savage zeal for their cause. Today, the new tsars of Russia do not trust their own army. Soldiers, whether on patrol or on the rifle range, are given a numbered amount of ammunition and must return the same number of empty or full shells each day: there is a fear of what the men might do if free access to the power of bullets were to exist.

At the beginning of the seventeenth century, Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish thinkers were agreed on one thing, the necessity for godly rule and for a godly concept of society: they disagreed on what the specific nature of that rule should be. By the end of the seventeenth century, men in all three groups had come to accept the idea of secular, humanistic rule, of a society built on a social contract, with not faith but self-preservation as the key. The purpose of religion was now seen as a duty to convert men and make them moral, but to leave the rest of life to secular man. The inner world belonged to God, it was held, but the outer world was a neutral realm at best. The men of the early seventeenth century saw religion

not only as conversion and morality but also as godly rule in every area of life. By the end of the nineteenth century, the secular world began to feel the necessity of claiming the inner world also. Freud insisted that the whole of the supposedly spiritual realm was a product of the unconscious and within the province of humanistic science. The problem of guilt was also made a scientific rather than a religious concern (see R. J. Rushdoony, *Freud* (Nutley, NJ: The Craig Press, 1965, 1972). Religion itself began to turn more rapidly into another area of humanistic thought and to surrender its theological character.

Christians had surrendered the world to the enemy willingly. They were busy asserting that it is a virtue to be unconcerned about the problems of this world. As a recent best seller representing this policy of surrender states it, "We should be living like persons who don't expect to be around much longer" (Hal Lindsey, *The Late, Great Planet Earth*, p. 145). What was once said of a famous senator can also be said of these men: theirs is a trumpet that always sounds retreat.

The churchmen have surrendered the world to the enemy, and the humanists, after having tried one remedy after another, now have essentially only one more answer: more power. As in the days of Rome, this is a confession of bankruptcy. It is also a threat to peace, because the man without a philosophy has not answer but brute force. But brute power is impotent as a constructive force; it can only destroy.

The necessity for Christian Reconstruction has never been greater.

349

DECAY OF HUMANISM

Chalcedon Report No. 71, July 1, 1971

Because more than a few have become aware of the growing decay of our worldwide humanistic culture, the concern for answers is extensive and intense. Some of the most anti-Christian leaders have expressed strongly religious hopes and answers. As Theodore Roszak, in *The Making of a Counter Culture* (p. 126), says of one degenerate writer's emphasis, "The cry is not for a revolution, but for an apocalypse: a descent of divine fire." The humanists need miracles and demand them; they want a radical change in everything except themselves. Even here, however, some humanists see the problem also. The young leaders of the May 1968 Paris insurrection, Daniel and Gabriel Cohn-Bendit, in *Obsolete Communism: The Left-Wing Alternative*, write that, "The real meaning of revolution is not a change in management, but a change in man." True enough, but who shall bring about that change in man? God is rejected, so this leaves man in control. Experiments using man as the test animal are already in progress. Is this what the Cohn-Bendits want? If man is to change man, some kind of coercion and inhumanity becomes inescapable. Man as he is becomes then only a raw material, a resource for the future, and is thus expendable.

Such an answer only enforces the call for more statism. Whether proposed by statists or anarchists, the insistence that man must change man is a requirement for statist coercion and control. Having abandoned God, the humanist has not thereby rid himself of his need for God. As a result, he makes the state into his new god. The state is a Moloch demanding the sacrifice of youth in every age, demanding that the priorities of the state become sacrosanct in the eyes of its citizens. The humanists may rail against the establishment, but their only alternative is to become themselves the establishment. In the new states of Asia and Africa, revolutions

come and go. Each new set of leaders vows idealistically to institute a new order and soon reproduces the old evils. Nat Hentoff, who earlier wrote an idealizing campaign book about New York's Mayor John V. Lindsay, now finds Lindsay practicing all the tricks of the "power brokers" whom he once fought against. Men have a habit of remaining sinners, and neither state office nor state coercion can usher men into a state of grace. The statist answer is a moral and social dead end.

When God changes man by His sovereign grace, He then commissions man to change society by means of God's law. The rebirth or regeneration of man is God's task; the application of God's law-word to all of life is man's task.

There are today many earnest champions of reconstruction, concerned humanists who recognize that civilization is in decay. Because their answers are humanistic and/or statist, they inescapably fail, because they simply reproduce the existing evils. The answer is well stated in the title of T. Robert Ingram's excellent study, *The World Under God's Law.*

The financing of godly reconstruction is by means of the tithe (see report no. 43[1]). Social financing is an inescapable necessity. It will not do to rail against the state, welfarism, public schools, and other forms of socialism if we do not have a legitimate alternative. In every era in Western civilization, when tithing declined, social financing was instituted by coercive and statist means.

During much of the medieval era, health, education, and much more were all financed by means of the tithe. Later, under Puritanism, all these things and newer institutions, such as workhouses for job training, were products of the tithe. When state financing returned with the decline of Puritanism, the evangelical reawakening led, in the early part of the nineteenth century, to an abandonment again of statist answers. W. K. Jordan, *Philanthropy in England, 1480–1660* (1959), has given us an account of the English scene in that era. In the United States, in the first half of the nineteenth century, voluntary societies, products of tithe funds, were formed to deal with every kind of social problem, provide Christian schools for immigrants, care for orphans, seamen, servants, and others, and to work to further the "Moral Government of God" in every sphere.

Whatever its faults, America then was a very free society, and its people were truly upper and middle class because of their emphasis on certain principles. *First*, they were future-oriented as Christians who saw history in terms of God and a glorious and manifest destiny in terms of Him. *Second*, this purpose was to be unfolded by means of the voluntary

1. See "Social Financing" (March 1, 1969), pp. 1263–1267 of this work. — editor

principle, and those who believed in that future gave their money and their efforts to furthering it.

Social financing cannot be avoided. The state is ready to assume it as a means of power (as is the church); the tithe places the power and decision in the hands of the believer. State financing cannot be "abolished" unless it is replaced. The answer is therefore not legislation but Christian Reconstruction. We cannot wait for people to vote the abolition of welfarism and the public schools; we must construct our own schools and our own more godly welfare agencies. Quietly and steadily, these things are being done.

Many of the older agencies, schools, and colleges have been captured by the humanists and statists. The best way to honor the memory of their founders is to carry on in their spirit by establishing new agencies, churches, schools, and colleges. The lower class concentrates on the present and blames "the world" or the "Establishment" for all its problems. An upper class is too busy with the problems of reconstruction and the duties of everyday life to have much time for tut-tutting over the world. Every man who builds has his eye on the future, and he is busy making it for when tomorrow comes, it is his work that stands in it, whereas all the whining and complaining of the bewailers is gone with the wind. The world was not empty when we came into it. Other men have labored, and we have entered into their labors. Now, in a time of cultural decay, the need to rebuild is especially urgent, and, as always, it takes time, money, and work. Those unwilling to pay the price, and those who discourage easily, have no future. Let them eat, drink, and be merry, for tomorrow they die. Of such men, Solomon said, "Give strong drink unto him that is ready to perish, and wine unto those that be of heavy heart" (Prov. 31:6). Nowadays, those who are "ready to perish" want marijuana as well!

Meanwhile, the work of reconstruction goes on all around you. True, new foundations do not loom as large as old structures, but they are there. But where are you? In the old structures, or building on the new foundations?

350

"WE HAVE MET THE ENEMY..."

Chalcedon News #6, 1986

A man deeply concerned about all the problems of our times, spoke to me not too long ago. He was ostensibly asking me some questions, but, in reality, during the course of twenty minutes, he did virtually all the talking. However, it was clear to me that he was a part of the problem, himself a problem in every sphere of activity, and, at the moment, a pain to his wife! All too many who bewail the world's condition are a part of its evil. As a character in Pogo said many years ago, "We have met the enemy, and they are us."

I was reminded of this recently when one of our Chalcedon trustees, Howard Ahmanson, passed on a very telling bit of data to me. It was this: the American middle class gives a *lower percentage* of its income to religious and charitable causes than either the lower or the upper classes. The middle class, in this analysis, was made up of all who receive an annual income of $25,000 to $100,000.

Those below $25,000 give a higher percentage of their income! Many of these, as they move into a higher income bracket, begin then to give a lower percentage. Their middle-class concern becomes material self-improvement, more ambitious vacations, luxury items, and so on. Our wealthier people give generously also, and they face a serious problem. They are continually besieged by groups and causes seeking their support. However, even if our wealthier people gave all their money away, it would only slightly affect the religious and charitable scene because there are not that many wealthy people with cash. Most wealth today is in buildings, factories, offices, land and the like.

Historically, the great social force for change and growth since the Reformation has been the middle class. Because of its numerical strength, (in the United States, most people are in the middle class), its Christian

faith and giving have made the development of missions, education, Christian agencies and activities, charities, and more, possible all over the world. Our present world decline is in large measure due to the retreat of the middle class into self-indulgence and minimal giving. When the middle class, about 85 percent or more of the population, becomes self-indulgent, we have no future.

God has created and ordained two kinds of ministries. The *first* is the ministry of the Word and of grace, which is to receive our tithes and offerings. This sphere of ministry includes the church, its missions and educational work, charitable work, groups such as Chalcedon, which seeks to teach the meaning of God's Word for our times, and much, much more in the way of ministries.

The *second* God-ordained area of ministry is civil government, the ministry of justice: we have a duty to support it. We do not have many Christian leaders here (nor in the church, etc.) because we do not support them. More than a few Christians who have run for civil office have told me how church people treat them. They are told, "God bless you, brother; we need men like you in government: I'll pray for you." At the same time, they will not contribute to their campaign expenses! Is it any wonder so few Christians are elected?

The Lord calls civil office a ministry (Rom. 13:1–4); will He not judge us if we fail financially to support His ministers? Is not our present condition as a country a sign of His judgment?

If we have fed and nurtured you with Chalcedon's ministry, we should have your financial support, and the Lord God will judge you for taking without giving.

If you want, need, and expect Christians to function in civil government, *then you must support them financially or be judged by the Lord.*

We urge you to increase your support to us and to other Christian ministries.

We urge you to help finance Christian candidates and incumbents. (If you do not know where to sent such support, drop us a note, and we will send you data. Do not send us such funds, that is, for the support of candidates: we are only seeking to be helpful to you).

The Lord God did not create us for such a time as this to indulge ourselves but rather to serve Him. Will you do it?

351

THE FAILURE OF THE CONSERVATIVE MOVEMENT

Chalcedon Report No. 390, January 1998

The failure of the conservative movement in the United States has been a failure of the churches. This has been true in other countries as well. With rare exception, conservatives have lacked Biblical and theological roots. This is not surprising, given the fact that the clergy are themselves abysmally ignorant.

I have repeatedly been amazed at the ignorance on the part of pastors and clergy of the doctrine of sin and total depravity. These are now termed by some as simply Calvinistic dogmas, but at one time they were common to all churches.

Without the doctrine of sin and total depravity, men will trust in the abilities of men and civil governments to do good, and they will concentrate powers in the hands of church and state, an action which will surely lead to evils. We have today a millennialist expectation of politics which is destructive to men and nations. In my lifetime, beginning with President Woodrow Wilson, more than a few times, an apocalyptic hope has surrounded politics. The League of Nations and the United Nations are evidences of this. Many other like efforts are now forgotten. Who now remembers the Kellogg-Briand Pact to outlaw war? In my early school days, it was hailed internationally as the dawn of a new era, and school teachers solemnly told us of its epoch-making nature.

Men and nations who disregard the fact that man is a sinner will never cope wisely with evil.

Again, the doctrine of soteriology, of salvation, has a great implication for society. It means that salvation comes, not by politics nor good workers, but by the grace of God through Jesus Christ. Man cannot be saved by acts of state, but he can be corrupted thereby. Congress, parliaments,

and other like bodies are in the salvation business, and their failures do not convince them of the error of their ways. The salvation state, instead of securing society's redemption, tends to work its damnation by shifting the hope of salvation from God to acts of state.

Furthermore, the state seeks to bring about communion though enforced community. Granted that hatred of other races and groups is evil, can it be solved by legislation or enforced communion? Community is a religious fact, and it requires a unified faith. Racism is a modern fact, a product of evolutionary thinking. For Charles Darwin, evolution "explained" why some races were superior. Darwin never doubted Anglo-Saxon superiority. Like other evils of our time, racism claimed a scientific basis, but when science, faced with Hitler, chose to discard it, it blamed religion for racism!

Christian eschatology tells us what our hope is, and it depicts, in classic postmillennialism, the triumph of Christ from pole to pole, "From Greenland's icy mountains, to India's coral strands," as the old hymn had it. Now, on all sides, we see the decay of humanistic eschatologies, Marxist, democratic, scientific, and otherwise.

Those forms of humanistic eschatologies still surviving are weakening. At the same time, Christian eschatologies have become defeatist or escapist. They surrender the world to the devil. This is not surprising, given the fact that "conservative" churches have abandoned most of the Bible by abandoning God's law. Most modernists, by giving the prophets a social gospel meaning, have a bigger Bible than evangelical Christians.

The law of God was given as a means of dominion, of godly rule. But too many Christians limit their interest to being saved from hell, not *to* the Kingdom of God. Not many pay attention to our Lord's command, "But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness" or justice (Matt. 6:33).

The Christian element in the conservative movement lacks theology; the non-Christian elements are usually inconsistent humanists, closer to the Left than to anyone else.

At present, by the grace of God, here and abroad, some conservatives are beginning to rethink their position and to abandon antinomianism. As a result, a sound theology may again undergird politics. Until then, the conservative movement will continue to retreat because it has nowhere else to go. It better represents the Left's yesterdays than conservatism's future.

But more is needed, for "faith without works is dead" (James 2:17–26). Christians must manifest their faith in works of grace and charity. Socialism is the humanistic solution to society's problems with the sick, unemployed,

needy, homeless, and broken peoples. Today statist "social services" insist on their "right" to do what was once a part of the Christian ministry.

In recent years, more and more Christians have begun ministries to human needs, with excellent results. Certainly, Christian schools and homeschools represent a major advance in the Christian ministries, as do services to care for unwed girls who are pregnant. All across the United States, such ministries are abounding, and new areas of relevance are steadily developed. Quietly and steadily, a major movement is underway that promises to reconstruct both church and state.

Almost any issue of the *Chalcedon Report* will tell you of a few such activities.

352

IS AMERICA A CHRISTIAN NATION?

Chalcedon Report No. 396, July 1998

Friedrich Nietzsche wrote that Jesus Christ was the first and last Christian, and it was pseudo-wise comments like this that made him popular with many pseudo-wise people. Unhappily, some church-related scholars have often imitated Nietzsche in like statements, denying the facts of church history. For example, some decry that America has ever been a Christian country.

As the son of immigrants to whom America was a promised land, and Americans, a Christian people who sent missionaries and relief to the needy everywhere, I cannot but regard such "scholars" with anything but disgust. But a question does remain: After 1917, Woodrow Wilson completed a shift of the United States from a missions-minded country to one dedicated to saving the world by military and political interventionism. The facts on that are clear. Since the 1960s, we have seen a shift also whereby the intellectual elite regard as the only valid morality the freedom to do as one pleases, especially in the sexual sphere. The sexual revolution has replaced the War of Independence as the fundamental event in American life for many. Only a few years ago, an Oregon senator was forced out of office for what is now common in Washington, D.C.

But is the truth about America summed up in our humanist establishment in church and state? Certainly I am a strong critic of present-day Christianity and its antinomian hostility to God's law, and I am uncompromisingly Calvinistic. Theonomists and Calvinists are increasing, but they still are not many. How, then, can I call Americans still a Christian people?

In the valley below us, many churches still practice a form of gleaning. All summer and early fall, the church's lobby will be full of boxes of fruits and vegetables brought by farmers for the elderly, needy and others

to take freely. North of us, young people and adults glean hundreds of tons of fruit from the apple orchards after harvest and then use the proceeds for the needy and aged. A few days ago, a dairyman in the valley lost much of his herd in a freakish accident. When this was reported on the television news, other dairymen and listeners stepped in with donations of cows and money to enable the dairyman to survive. These are not unusual incidents. Such things occur all around us but are rarely reported. These countless events witness to the Christian character of millions of Americans.

Like evidence can be found in the area of doctrine. I learned yesterday of a layman's resignation of his church office and membership because the church took a compromising view of the historicity of Genesis 1–11; he will now go weekly to another church some seventy-five miles away: the faith matters to him. Unusual? No. Everyday people are making stands refusing to compromise their faith. True, many denominations, seminaries, and colleges are compromising the faith, but untold numbers are standing firm and are advancing the faith.

True, we have a humanistic establishment, but consider the Christian school and homeschool movements: they witness to a Christian America of growing power. In California, there are several regional associations of homeschoolers, and I spoke to three of them in 1997; one of them alone had approximately 10,000 parents in attendance. To me, this is Christian America, alive and on the march.

But what scholar apart from Chalcedon pays attention to such things? Not many. The *Chalcedon Report* does tell you of men in all the world who are capturing men and nations for Christ.

The compromisers are many, as are the humanists, but the men of action are the men of faith. The scholars are remote from reality. They have not seen the realities of a Christ-hating state that hates and kills Christians. They do not realize how much we Christians alter and hold in restraint evil forces, and impact society. Their world is the realm of respectable humanism and its scholarship, and they cannot see the sun because they bury themselves in their unreal and limited communities of cloudy doubt and unbelief.

But this is God's world, and, for the present, a battlefield. More Christians have died for their faith in this century than in any before us, in Armenia, Russia, China, Africa, and elsewhere. Some have estimated that 300 are killed *daily*, but 600 converted *daily*. Get into the battle if you want a part in the victory!

The way some scholars want to define a Christian country would make only heaven qualify, and no doubt they would find fault with that.

I hear constantly of incidents small and great that tell me this is a Christian people. Though surrounded with ungodliness and the ungodly, and also by the fearful and the lukewarm, we see countless numbers living the faith and rejoicing in it. Both my grandfathers, and many other relatives, died for their Christian faith, brutally murdered because they were Christians. Of course, I have faced much hostility, and many gross insults for my faith, but I have also been blessed, thanked, and, yes, rewarded for it because I live, unlike my grandfathers, in what is still, despite serious problems, in and among a Christian people. For that I thank God and His mercy. As for those who deny our American Christian past and present, I can only regard them with amazement and bewilderment.

353

SHOULD WE CLEAN UP TELEVISION?

Chalcedon Report No. 215, June 1983

One of the things most of us can agree on is that television is full of programming which is aesthetically and morally on a very low level. The usual targets of the critics of television is the strong emphasis on sex and violence. (One can add to that the increasing vulgarity of television, so that it is painful to watch even momentarily so cheap and degrading a view of man.)

But are the critics right? Is "cleaning up" what television needs? Will we have better television if we eliminate the offensive sex and violence, the profanity, and the vulgarity, or will it not in fact be worse?

Our Lord issued a warning against a false and empty cleansing. To expel one demon without remaking the man means to lay him wide open to seven worse demons (Matt. 12:43–45). Such a false reform leads to turning men into "whited sepulchers" which are the epitome of uncleanness (Matt. 23:27).

If all we do is to "clean up" television and the films, will we not be creating whited sepulchers? This is in fact what will result. We will give a façade to humanism to make it resemble Christian morality. Most television programming and film productions as well give us the "gospel" of humanism. Do we want to put a Christian face on that? Humanism with a façade of Christian morality will be the greatest deception and evil imaginable. Apparently, this is what such churchmen want. What we need instead is programming which reveals a Christian world and life view. This means a work of affirmation and reconstruction, an entrance into the arts, not a retreat from them. The image of the Christian as critic is a false one. The true Christian is a builder and a re-creator in Christ our Lord; the Christian's calling is to bring every area of life and thought under the reign of Christ the King.

Should we "clean up" television? Rather, should we not make it our own? Should we not move into it and make it a Christian domain?

354

POLITICAL APOSTASY

Chalcedon Report No. 376, November 1996

Man's most ancient heresy is humanism, and we first encounter it in Genesis 3:5; its essential faith is in man as his own god, knowing or determining good and evil, law and morality, for himself. Very often, man has expressed this faith by making himself, very openly, his own god; at other times, man objectifies his own goals and makes images which he calls gods. Very commonly, man has expressed his self-worship collectively in the state. In fact, the oldest religious institution in history is the state. The worship of the state has sometimes meant that the state has been seen as divine; at other times, its rulers; and at still other times, its offices. In modern thinking, the voice of the people is held to be god, and democracy is seen as divinely right.

Although the early church, and then the councils, notably Chalcedon in A.D. 451, fought against this redivinization of the state, it returned in full force after a time. At first, it bore a Christian façade; then it became increasingly anti-Christian, covertly or openly.

As a result, especially in the twentieth century, we have seen a repaganization of the state and of society, a trend strongly supported by the media. The U.S. Supreme Court, since circa 1952, has furthered this trend, as in *Roe v. Wade*, and, more recently, in the case of a Colorado state constitutional amendment securing special legal rights for homosexuals as a class. Only Justice Antonin Scalia opposed it, calling strong attention in his *Romer v. Evans* dissent, to the specious character of the majority opinion. There are, currently, more radical cases in process attacking the very life of the church. Our political candidates for offices high and low maintain a façade of piety with an absence of faith. Christians are treated as idiots who can be easily placated with meaningless gestures, as indeed too many are. However, a growing number of

Christians are deeply disturbed over these trends, and at the tendency of prominent churchmen to act as chaplains to our modern caesars.

On the one hand, we have churchmen using 1 Timothy 2:1–2 wrongly, as though we are to pray for our rulers to be blessed. But the goal of the prayer is to be "that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty," i.e., that they may leave us alone! We should pray for political rulers "and for all that are in authority" that they may be converted or judged or whatever is required. How can we ask God to bless our modern equivalents of Nero?

On the other hand, we have many who want to fight over everything, or resort to arms. Assuming for a moment the very unlikely prospect of winning, what difference would it make, given our current population? The old proverb is still true: You can't make a good omelet with rotten eggs. History shows us how ridiculous such efforts are, as does the present political scene.

The change we are required to make is by regeneration, not by revolution. Nothing short of that will satisfy our Lord. Since the French Revolution, the political heresy has strongly emphasized revolution as the true means of change. Such a view is a return to paganism, to a belief that external conformity is the key to a good society; it is an echo of Plato's insane *Republic*.

Politics must be an area of responsible action. Our Lord stressed patience and gradualism in the work of the Kingdom: "first the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear" (Mark 4:28); in other words, we cannot expect the full ear of corn when we have only just planted the seed! God warned Zechariah against all who have "despised the day of small things" (Zech. 4:10), for to do so is to despise the future. The gigantic starts are much noise and show but empty of results. It is political apostasy to trust in them, and a departure from common sense. Mark 4:28 should be our premise in every area of life.

Chalcedon's premise has been "first the blade." In our area of endeavor, as in all, we believe that this is what God blesses.

355

THE NEW POWER IN THE "CHRISTIAN RIGHT"

Chalcedon Report No. 234, January 1985

The most important and virtually unknown story behind the U.S. presidential election of 1984 has not been told. According to one pollster, the "moral majority" was responsible for 20 percent of the vote. The pollsters, however, lump a variety of Christian groups, some almost unknown but powerful, under the name of the "moral majority." That organization has served an invaluable purpose, among other things, in drawing the fire of the liberals, and Falwell has been able to defuse the attacks with wit and grace. But the "moral majority" has no grassroots, precinct-walking organization, but rather a national voice.

The unknown power was made up of great numbers of young men in their late thirties and early forties, and some younger. These men were campus radicals and leaders in the 1960s and early 1970s, ex-feminists and ex-Trotskyites. They learned political action in confrontations, demonstrations, riots, flag burnings, and more. In the process, they came to realize that the humanistic state, instead of being the voice of reason and the good, is an evil monster. Out of this disillusionment, many became Christians: fundamentalists, charismatics in great number, Calvinists, Reconstructionists, and so on. With the 1984 election, they returned to political activism as Christians.

In 1976, about 20 percent of the electorate called itself conservative. The number of dedicated liberals were far fewer. Elections were won or lost in one campaign after another by the ability of one group or another to command the pragmatic majority. This pragmatic majority has voted in terms of their pocketbook: does the economy "feel good," and will a particular party do the least to rock the boat? In 1984, about 40 percent of the electorate, on pragmatic grounds, spoke of themselves as

"conservative," still not enough to elect a man. However, between 15 to 20 million voters were brought into the picture by the so-called "Christian Right." This was apparently the margin of victory.

In this victory, these young ex-Marxists-turned-Christians played a major role. They had previously scored on the congressional level. In 1984, many of the new congressional victors campaigned as Christians.

Since the election, these young activists have been meeting all over the United States to organize for 1986, as well as to work on the state and local levels at once.

Add to this another factor, the pro-life people, who worked hard on the precinct level, wore out shoe leather, and came to the conviction that education and protests are not enough. Organized political action is necessary.

The president's reelection was thus the surface froth on a new and strong movement which is determined to reshape the United States on Christian premises. It is principled, and it is future- and action-oriented. It has escaped notice because of its elusive nature. These ex-campus radicals turned Christians are no longer amateurs!

356

REVOLUTION OR REGENERATION: A FURTHER WORD

Chalcedon Report No. 285, April 1989

SINCE the appearance of my article on "Revolution or Regeneration" (*Chalcedon Report* No. 282, January 1989)[1] a considerable number of letters have arrived. A few have been from faithful friends and supporters, who expressed a gracious dissent, and I thank them. Many came from people who had no use for Biblical arguments, used four-letter sexual and scatological words freely, and promised never to read the *Chalcedon Report* again. For this, too, we are grateful, since none had ever supported us anyway! Some dissenters were not on our mailing list. These venomous dissenters apparently are not aware that no one is converted by a man who spits in his face and insults him! The intelligence of such people is questionable! Two letters came from men in prison, one a minister in a federal prison for an attempt to bomb an abortuary, another for participation in the tax revolt. The letters showed overlap between "Operation Rescue" and the tax-revolt movement.

This statement is an answer to those whose letters were gracious and Christian. *First*, a commonly cited Scripture by the leaders of Operation Rescue is Proverbs 24:11–12, a text which has also been anciently used to oppose the death penalty. This text refers to helping the oppressed, not to those under a legal sentence of death. If it meant interfering with the civil courts by demonstrations, why did the Christians fail to mount mass gatherings to protest Paul's arrest, or the arrest of Peter and John? Why did they have a prayer meeting, when man's demonstrations can accomplish more?

1. "Revolution or Regeneration" is Position Paper No. 105 and can be found in *An Informed Faith: the Position Papers of R.J. Rushdoony*, pp. 85–88. — editor

Second, the Hebrew midwives are routinely cited. The midwives were asked to commit murder; this is very different from a demonstration at a clinic. No one asks us to abort our children. Moreover, if we have the right to block entry (or, to invade) such clinics, what can we say if the entrance to churches is blocked? It is violence to block access. There is a great difference between the Hebrew midwives and the demonstrators. The murder by Moses of an Egyptian overseer is not justified by Scripture, and citing this seems strange to me. Rahab's act is commended by God; she did not owe the truth to men who were going to commit murder. Obadiah did protect the prophets against Jezebel's orders, but the covenant law was the true authority, not Jezebel.

The fact is that Scripture is very explicit about important matters. It tells us very plainly what the penalties for various sins are: we are never in the dark about God's will for us. No one attempted to answer the fact that, in an age of abortions, neither our Lord nor the apostles ever called for demonstrations. The very idea is ludicrous. The early church made a very strong stand against abortions, but it did not organize demonstrations. The reigns of the first-century emperors saw monstrous evils, but the answer of the Christians was the gospel of salvation through Jesus Christ. There is no *commandment* to justify Operation Rescue.

One very fine person wrote me that 50,000 ministers cannot be wrong. If there are 50,000 ministers in Operation Rescue, or 100,000, they can still be wrong, as can you and I. Only the Lord God is infallible and wholly righteous. He also speaks very clearly in His Word. By using analogies, not commandments, churchmen have often done wrong over the centuries. One man used like arguments in a letter to me to justify polygamy. We are required to obey God's plain commandments, not what we read into a text.

A practical note: The demonstrations are illegal. The people arrested can pay their fine after arrest and leave. They thereby admit that they have broken a law. They are then liable to civil action, lawsuits against them for millions of dollars. Even if, after two or three years, these lawsuits are dropped, they will have paid immense sums of money in legal costs. Some very fine Christian groups and churches are already facing major financial burdens for their part in Operation Rescue. Is this a godly stewardship of time and money?

It is to me a very sad fact that Christian action is seen as pressure tactics and demonstrations rather than the gospel.

357

FIRST LINE OF DEFENSE

Chalcedon Report No. 121, September 1975

Communism does not need to defend itself militarily in the same way as do other forms of politics, because it is usually on both sides of every border. It is on the march in enemy territory as a militant faith. Its real strength is its religious appeal. However, as a false religion, unable to deliver on its promises, its defeat begins wherever it is victorious, in that a disillusioned people then must be kept in suppression by force. It is thus destined to become one of the biggest failures of the twentieth century.

Wherever a people rely on the military as their first line of defense, they are lost. Military strength is a necessity, but a reliance on it for security is a disaster. If men rely on the sword for their defense, our Lord made clear, they shall perish by the sword (Matt. 26:52), because "man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God" (Matt. 4:4).

The first line of defense is a true and living faith. In the nineteenth century, when the United States had little military power except in wartime, U.S. power moved men all over the world, and America was the dream and ideal of millions. In those years, the U.S. peacetime army numbered from 200 to a maximum of 20,000 shortly before World War I, yet its influence made European and Asian autocracies afraid because of the "subversive" infiltration of American beliefs and practices. In every situation of need, American aid, not from the federal government but from the people, was a decisive factor in every area of the world. As against defense by military power, the American strength then was a strong offensive by means of a sense of Christian mission. Earlier, Christian Europe had commanded the world with that sense of mission and power, then America.

A primary reliance on military (or police) defense is the last resort of impotent men. Where men's minds and passions see force as the essential

answer, it means that faith, while professed, is lost. The cry of, "*kill the* (black, white, yellow, Communist, Fascist, or what-have-you) *bastards*," is the mark of impotent men, with no sense of mission and no faith to command themselves or others.

When, a century ago, Sir Samuel Baker took his beautiful and protected bride into the heart of Africa to search for the sources of the Nile, his companions were all pagan and murderous Arabs and blacks who determined to rob and kill the Bakers at the first opportunity. They never did. Baker's sublime sense of mission and command held them in awe. At the least sign of trouble, he lectured them like an earnest Sunday school teacher putting a disorderly class in its place. His aura of power was enough to command them.

Western man now has instead an aura of fear and of greed. He thinks of himself only, and his only mission is self-security. He wants to be left alone, to have privacy, his pleasures, and his own way. He cannot command himself, let alone a world. He can be in the majority in a country and still lose. Before he acts to defend anything, he asks himself, "Will they come after me if I lose?" When this is true, a man is already dead within, and already a prisoner.

The Puritans, as against the usurping power of the king, Charles I, made their standard, "The crown rights of King Jesus." The Puritans at their maximum strength were 4 percent of England, but the crown rights of the monarchy fell before them. When they began to think more of the rights of their church and their interests than of Christ the King, the Puritans also failed.

The key, thus, is return to a sense of Christian mission and to a faithful application of God's law to every area of life. St. Patrick's greatness was that, in an age when the enemy was overrunning the land, St. Patrick overran the enemy. He set out to convert his enslavers and enemies, and he made of pagan Ireland one of the greatest Christian cultures the world has known and the great missionary force on the continent. More able men than St. Patrick failed because they hated and bewailed the savage enemy. St. Patrick converted and commanded them.

Impotent men give impotent answers. Leave them alone and pass them by. God's regenerating power and His law give man power, estate, and calling. To be a redeemed man and to have God's law is to have the plan of conquest and dominion and the power to execute it.

Remember, too, before you call yourself a Christian that *God has no impotent sons*. He has suffering and sometimes martyred sons, but never impotent, and ultimately always victorious sons.

There are hundreds of millions of peoples in Communist countries

who hate Marxists and wish them dead: such people, impotent and self-destructive in their hatred, are easily cowed and controlled. The underground church is a far greater problem: it is busy trying to convert its oppressors, and often succeeding. The Communists realize that they have little to fear from hatred: it is too deeply grounded in fear to be other than impotent. It is Christian faith which is for them the menace. "Holy fools" are aggressive and confident, and everywhere at work.

Well, where do you stand in all of this? Have you made it your mission to fear and to hate? (We may hear from you then, an angry, hateful, and, of course, anonymous note!) Or is it your estate and calling to believe and obey the Lord, and to exercise dominion in His name?

358

EDUCATION FOR CHAOS

Chalcedon Report No. 357, April 1995

Henry R. Van Til, in *The Calvinistic Concept of Culture*, has said that culture is religion externalized. Basic to every culture is a religious faith, whether it is called a religion or not. This faith, as long as the civilization is growing, is held aggressively, zealously, and, in a very real sense, uncompromisingly. In Koneczny's words, "Every civilization is on the offensive, so long as it is not dying." A civilization rests on a particular premise or faith carefully and systematically developed, as Cornelius Van Til has shown. If its faith is vague and general, the culture is uncertain and dying. Moreover, as Koneczny has stated it,

> A synthesis of civilization does not exist and is not possible. The only thing which is possible — and history is rich in examples of it — is a mechanical mixture of two or more civilizations, but its result is only chaos, barbarity, disintegration and cultural decadence, because such mixtures are a sin against the fundamental condition of the vitality of every civilization, which is the law of harmony of existential categories. The norms which rule the life of a human group have to form a unit; they cannot contradict each other. (Feliks Koneczny, *On the Plurality of Civilizations* [London: Polonica Publications, 1962], p. 25)

Basic to our problem in the United States today is precisely such a decline. The United States has as its basic philosophy a confused humanism which is a mixture of religious presuppositions. To reproduce this confusion educationally is education for chaos. It is important in any institution to have dedicated men who understand the Christian, Augustinian, and Reformed presuppositions of our basic American culture as formulated in constitutionalism. This means, *first*, that the men *must* be thoroughly Christian, but this is *not enough*. As Dr. Martyn Lloyd-Jones

has pointed out, there are many Christian doctors, but very few doctors with a Christian theory of medicine. Many colleges and universities have a fair number of dedicated Christians on their faculties, but almost none with men who have a Christian philosophy of science, history, education, sociology, political science, economics, etc. Of those who have no such philosophy, it can be said that such Christian professors are schizophrenic. Thus, the *second* need is for well-grounded men on the faculty or staff of any Christian institution. Anything less is to gather a collection of likable men, able in their fields, who are educating for chaos because their basic faith is a mixture of humanism, anarchism, Christianity, Thomism, and tidbits of other origins.

America will *not* be renewed by a dedication to save America, nor the church by a resolution to save the church. It will be renewed by men whose *first* concern is to know the fundamentals of their faith and then to apply them. To be interested in Christianity as a personal issue only is fatal. Many scholars are interested in Christianity and ready to believe in it, but few are ready to reorder their whole scholarship in terms of it, uncompromisingly and fearlessly.

Furthermore, another point is in order. Churchmen used to speak of "cuckoo preachers," i.e., men who would occupy a church pulpit only when it was built up by someone else, even as the cuckoo builds no nest but lays its eggs in other birds' nests. Given an institution with potential prestige, plus financial terms better than those already available, a new foundation or school can quickly gain notable figures — and become a fine cuckoo's nest of sterile men. Mavericks ready to fight and to sacrifice are needed.

To set one's sights any lower than a root-and-branch faith, a systematic and thorough theology and philosophy, is to be pragmatic ultimately. To seek God's Kingdom and His righteousness has this promise: all these other things *shall* be added unto us.

(The above was written on March 24, 1963, to set down premises for Chalcedon, *not* education for chaos but for Christ and His Kingdom. This was written in answer to one person's request.)

359

"SEEK YE FIRST"

Chalcedon Report No. 333, April 1993

Our Lord, in Matthew 6:33, commands us to seek first His Kingdom and righteousness or justice. This means that, however important, neither the church nor our salvation can take priority over our Lord's Kingdom. To give centrality to our salvation or to the church over the Kingdom is simply idolatry. We are commanded, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me" (Exod. 20:3), however good they may seem to be. We turn a good thing into an evil one if we give it priority over the Lord. People have done this with their children, spouses, work, and many other things.

A symptom of this evil is the common and contemptuous use of the term *parachurch*. The early church quickly established courts of settlement (1 Cor. 6), work to help the needy, the old and young, health care, the ransoming of captives, and much, much more. These were diaconal works very often, but also the works of Christian individuals or persons moved by the Lord. The woman Dorcas was not rebuked by any apostle for her many good works, nor ordered to allow the church to govern her (Acts 9:36ff.)! Today, such a woman would be commanded to submit everything to the oversight of the church. She would be charged with "parachurch" activities.

During virtually all of history, the state has tried to control every area of life and thought, every activity and every person. At times, the church has imitated the state in this evil. There are indeed God-ordained authorities in certain spheres of life, but none have more than *limited* authority. Only God has total authority, and for any man or institution to do more than God ordains is his legitimate rule and domain is to transgress on God's sovereignty. We are not called to control the world but to proclaim Christ, to serve and obey Him, to use the opportunities He provides us to

further His Kingdom, and to remember that we are not called to be lords over men but Christ's ministers and servants (Matt. 20:25–28).

People who rail against parachurch activities want to limit Christ's work to what they can control. They are a sorry people. "But seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness" (Matt. 6:33).

360

"FOR THE HEALING OF THE NATIONS"

Chalcedon Report No. 355, February 1995

In Revelation 22:2, we are told of the Tree of Life, Jesus Christ, whose leaves were "for the healing [or, the health] of the nations." Too little attention has been paid to the meaning of this phrase. If Christ is the Tree of Life, what are the leaves?

In John 15:1–8, our Lord declares himself to be "the true vine," and we are His branches, called to bear fruit. In the Sermon on the Mount, we are called to be "the light of the world" (Matt. 5:14), reflecting His true light (John 1:4, 5; 8:12). Similarly, we are called to be "the salt of the earth" (Matt. 5:13), its preserving power. In antiquity, salt was primarily used to preserve foods, especially meats, from spoiling, and such usage is still common in some areas. In my earlier years, I salted and kept fish for winter use.

The parallels are many. Christ, the true vine, produces us, His branches, to bear fruit. Christ, the Tree of Life, bears leaves, His people, *for the health of the nations*.

This gives a very clear meaning to our redemption. Our salvation has more to it than to preserve us from hell! It is much more than fire and life insurance. Its purpose is the restitution of all things to their rightful place under Christ our King.

Branches and leaves that bear nothing and heal no one are fit only for burning. "If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered; and men gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they are burned" (John 15:6). Does no one take this seriously? One man has expressed his *contempt* for Chalcedon's increasing involvement in Christian charity, in works of diaconal mercy and grace. Too many feel that Christian work should be limited to saving souls, and its intellectual tasks to disputations one with another! Our Lord's words call for another way.

If we as Christ's branches and leaves have the health of the nations (not simply our nation), as our task, we are very derelict if we neglect it. (We seek to represent you in such tasks; we *need* your support, but, even more, you *need* to be with us for your own sake.) If we are in Christ, we transmit health. Apart from Him, we transmit death (Prov. 8:36).

Revelations 22:2 makes it clear that "the healing of the nations" is our task in and under Christ. It is related to the Great Commission: "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. Amen" (Matt. 28:19–20).

The nations all need health or healing, beginning with ours. We live in a time when the political agenda is increasingly the paganization, the de-Christianization of the nations, beginning with ours. Public acts of perversion are tolerated, and public prayer increasingly protested. Virtue is often derided and degenerate acts hailed as symbols of freedom. "The healing of the nations" is clearly our task, and it is no less a major and difficult calling than in the days of Rome. This problem exists because Christians faltered in their calling. Too many people in the churches saw their salvation and their peace of mind as the primary objective and the highest good of God's Kingdom.

Ours has been called a "culture of complaint," and this complaining spirit is no less evident in church circles than in the world. It takes much faith and patience to remain in the ministry. Too often, instead of being a healing power, church people are a nagging, complaining force, or else sleepers who do little or nothing.

But we have a calling, "the healing of the nations." This is the culmination of St. John's vision and of God's plan. Are we out of step with it, or are we a part of it?

361

VALERIAN'S PERSECUTION

Chalcedon Report No. 370, May 1996

STEWART Perowne, in *Caesars and Saints: The Evolution of the Christian State, 180–313* A.D. (1962), made a very important point with regard to the persecution by the Roman emperor, Valerian, in A.D. 257. Needing both money and a scapegoat, he persecuted the Christians. As Perowne noted, "Once again it was the Christian *Society*, not the Christian *Faith*, which was proscribed as illicit; the persecution was, as usual, based on political and economic, not on religious or theological, grounds" (p. 145). Had the faith remained within the inner life of believers, a spiritual faith and no more, it would not have troubled Rome too much. But, by applying their faith to every area of life and thought, Christians created an empire within the empire, a government apart from Rome and more efficient than Rome.

Things have not changed much since then. A purely spiritual "Christianity," if it can be called that, is too withdrawn from life to be a threat to the world. But, when Christians apply the law-word of God to every area of life and thought, and when they assert "the crown rights of Christ the King" over every realm, then they are a threat to the kingdom of man. Then, obviously, the Kingdom of God is on the march.

One reason why Christian Reconstruction is so much attacked is its insistence on a relevant faith. The thought of a relevant Christianity fills many with horror because it brings back the King into every sphere of life. The faith must change all of society. God the Creator wants nothing less than the fullest government over all things. It is the duty, not only of the church to be Christian, but also the family, the school, the state, the arts and sciences, and all things else. Christ's royal claims are unlimited. The church has a very limited sphere, but not so the Lord.

There is an interesting aftermath to Valerian's work. In the war against

Persia, he was taken captive, then executed, stuffed, tinted by Persian artists, and then placed in one of their temples.

When Valerian had gained the throne, he issued a coin with his image and the words, "Restorer of the earth." In death, he lacked even a grave.

362

THIS IS THE VICTORY

Chalcedon Report No. 385, August 1997

Having been born into an immigrant family and attending a foreign language church, I was isolated from many of the theological currents of the day. It was thus only as I started college that I became aware of a startling development in American theological thinking: eschatologies of defeat. Perhaps no other nation in all history has been so remarkably blessed as the United States. As a student, I knew that in one sphere after another, the United States was very successful: uniformly successful in wars, in the economic sphere, as a missionary force, and so on and on. And yet, strangely, they saw only evil ahead in history, either a future of growing grimness (amillennialism) or the triumph in history of satanic forces and the necessity for a supernatural rescue of the Lord's people (premillennialism). And there I was, a child of a long-persecuted people, expecting victory!

But that faith and hope colors one's outlook. In the past year, some have passed on to me publications criticizing and misrepresenting Christian Reconstruction. One called us an "identity group" (a movement we regard as evil because it sees salvation as by race, not grace), and a militaristic movement (whereas we believe in salvation by conversion, not coercion)! One person recently asked how misrepresentation affects me: I had to say that I don't like it, of course, but it does not upset me because I know from the Scriptures that I am on the winning side, and these people are losers. From my early years, I have believed that "this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith" (1 John 5:4). These losers hate God, so it is logical for some of that hate to be directed against us. Some losers are full of anger and hatred, and they are to be pitied.

Are we winning? Well, when I began in the late 1940s to collect materials that led to the publication in 1963 of *The Messianic Character*

of American Education (with *Intellectual Schizophrenia* preceding it by about five years), some near me thought the triumph of state schools so final that I was wasting my time trying to create a Christian school movement.

I cite this to show that our advancement is real. The old compromising churchianity that baptized the fallen order around it has now begun to fall apart. A polarization is setting in. In any case, however, we must not look to history for our hope, but to the sovereign and triune God. He has not grown old since Bible times, nor has His omnipotent hand grown arthritic! He is the same, yesterday, today, and forever.

The full and final accounting is in the hands of the Almighty, and we must leave it there. We are neither the judge nor the jury, and to attempt to be so is to usurp God's prerogative. We do our duty, and we leave the results in God's hands, whose mercy and judgment both far exceed ours.

We cannot make a stand in terms of truth and justice in a fallen world without paying a price, and to expect only good from the hands of men is to be very foolish. Our lives can be blessed ones if we accept the realities of the fallen world around us and recognize that God is the determiner, not man.

FAITH & ACTION

Volume 3



FAITH & ACTION

VOLUME 3 • CHURCH, FAMILY & CHRISTIAN LIVING

the Collected Articles of

R.J. RUSHDOONY

from the CHALCEDON REPORT, *1965–2004*

CHALCEDON / ROSS HOUSE BOOKS
VALLECITO, CALIFORNIA

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 3

Theology

363 The Use of Scriptures in the Reformed Faith 1157
364 Rationalism and the Holy Spirit 1163
365 On Knowing God 1166
366 Consistent Faith 1170
367 The Importance of Six-Day Creation 1172
368 Escapism 1174
369 Justification 1178
370 Baptism Into His Justice 1184
371 The Covenant and Baptism 1186
372 Except a Man Be Born Again 1189

Christian Living

373 Who Rules? 1195
374 History's Purpose 1197
375 God Loves His Creation 1198
376 Christian Reconstruction 1201
377 Hope 1203
378 "The Lord's Hand Is Not Shortened, That It Cannot Save" . . . 1205
379 "I Am the Door" 1207
380 Secularism 1208
381 Stoicism 1211
382 Amateur Christianity 1214
383 The Retreat of Theology 1216
384 God Is Not Queen Victoria 1219
385 "A Vagrant Liberty?" 1222

386 Praying for the Impotent 1224
387 Our Acts 1226
388 Are You Astonishing? 1228
389 What Is Man? 1230
390 Man's Creation and Dominion 1232
391 A Blocked or Open Future? 1234
392 Clipper Ships 1242
393 The Culture of Duties 1244
394 Sin Defined 1246
395 Abominations 1248
396 On Being Holier Than God 1250
397 The Faithful 1253
398 Can We Force God's Hand? 1255
399 Christian Reconstruction 1257
400 Social Financing 1263
401 Tipping 1268
402 The Good Life 1270
403 Debt and Fear 1273
404 A Death Wish? 1277
405 The Lonely Grave 1279
406 Work and Culture 1281
407 Work 1284
408 Mild Atheism 1287
409 Trusting God 1289
410 Stress 1290
411 Testing 1293
412 Patience 1295
413 Waiting on God 1297
414 The Psalms 1299
415 Though He Slay Me 1301
416 "God Is No Buttercup" 1303
417 Faith 1305
418 Prayer 1306
419 How Not to Pray 1310
420 Praying Against God 1312
421 Praying by the Yard 1314
422 For His Mercy Endureth Forever 1316
423 Being "Evil Spoken Of" 1317
424 Respectable "Christianity" 1318
425 The Valley of Misery 1320
426 Love and Hate 1322

427 Love Thy Neighbor: What Does It Mean? 1325
428 Living by Disgust 1327
429 The "Omnipotence of Criticism" 1331
430 Judgment. 1334
431 Phariseeism 1336
432 Faith and Pettiness 1340
433 Coarseness 1342
434 Demanding the Best 1344
435 Good Guys, Bad Guys. 1347
436 In Praise of Noah 1349
437 A "Root of Bitterness" 1351
438 Community and Strength 1354
439 For God and Country 1356
440 The Biblical Doctrine of Submission, Part 1 1361
441 The Biblical Doctrine of Submission, Part 2 1366
442 Honoring Ungodly Men 1370
443 How to Be Blessed. 1372
444 Whatever Happened to Deathbed Scenes? 1374
445 Heaven 1377
446 Gathered Unto Their Fathers 1379

Christmas & the Incarnation

447 Christ's Birth: The Sign of Victory 1383
448 The Word, The Person, and the Song:
Comments on Luke 2:8–15 1388
449 The Annunciation: Luke 1:26–38 1394
450 The Magnificat 1399
451 Wise Men Still Adore Him: Matthew 2:1–12 1404
452 On the Birth of Our Lord 1408
453 Silly Surrenders 1410
454 The Birth of the King 1412
455 The Birth of the Great King 1414
456 The Incarnation 1417
457 Christmas 1419
458 A Barn to House Thee. 1421
459 The Birth of the King 1422
460 The New Adam, Jesus Christ 1424

R.J. Rushdoony & Chalcedon

461 Why I Am Reformed 1429
462 Born Rich 1431
463 Fatherhood 1433
464 My Last Days 1435
465 On Death and Dying 1436
466 Chalcedon 1438
467 Chalcedon's Direction 1441
468 The Opportunity and the Need 1444
469 Is It Nothing to You Who Pass By? 1446
470 Why Chalcedon? 1448

General Index 1451
History Index 1577
Scripture Index 1595
Works Cited Index 1605
Chalcedon Report Directory 1623

THEOLOGY

363

THE USE OF SCRIPTURES IN THE REFORMED FAITH

Chalcedon Report No. 434, October 2001

Calvinists to a degree resemble other branches of Christianity in that they affirm the Trinity, salvation by Christ's atoning grace, creation by God, and much, much more. The distinctive aspects of the Reformed faith all stem from the doctrine of the Scriptures. The Reformed faith is by no means alone in affirming infallibility and inerrancy; such a view is common to other theologies as well. Calvinism, however, gives to Scripture a priority lacking in other theological systems.

In the Westminster Standards, we have the full development of the Reformed faith. In recent years, some have sought to separate those standards from Calvin and to insist on a marked difference. Such contentions were shown to be false by Paul Helm.[1] The Westminster Standards give us in summary form the essentials of the Reformed faith, and their view of Scripture is of interest to us.

Because our view of God and our faith is dependent on the Bible, the Bible has a necessary priority. The truth of a faith is governed by and depends upon its foundation. If that foundation is a religious experience, then the faith is a private revelation; moreover, given man's fallen and frail nature, man's experiences are at best a dubious standard. The same is true of man's reason. Paul in Romans 1:18ff. makes it clear that all men know the truth of God, because it is written in all their being. Men, however, "hold" that truth in unrighteousness (i.e., they suppress it because they are unjust and in sin). The redeemed give voice to that truth, but, not being perfectly sanctified in this life, cannot give other than a faulty

1. Paul Helm, *Calvin and the Calvinists* (Edinburgh, Scotland: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1982).

and sin-conditioned witness to it. The same is true of tradition; there is often more to tradition than some will allow, but tradition is transmitted by and filtered through sinful men, and, hence, it reflects man's will all too often. The Bible, however, is God's Word, given by Him, protected by Him, and speaking for Him.

The Westminster Confession of Faith hence begins with a chapter on "The Holy Scripture." It asserts the God-centered nature of Biblical authority in section four:

> The authority of the Holy Scripture, for which it ought to be believed, and obeyed, dependeth not upon the testimony of any man, or Church; but wholly upon God (who is truth itself) the author thereof: and therefore it is to be received, because it is the Word of God.

There is an important Biblical premise here. Both truth and authority are identified with God. There is no neutral realm of truth by which God and man are alike to be judged. This is the premise of rationalism and of other perspectives. God and man are alike held to exist in an independent environment which sets the standards for both. Hence, for example, some like Gordon Clark would have an independent law of contradiction govern both God and man. For him, "the logical consistency" of the Bible is its best defense.[2] The law of contradiction, however, cannot be used as a test or a proof of God or the Bible, because the law of contradiction *presupposes* the God of Scripture and His orderly creation. If the universe is one of brute factuality and chance, then no law of contradiction can exist. There can be no legitimate use of the law of contradiction unless all are agreed that it can only exist in God's creation. To agree on this, however, means that its use as a test or proof of God is unnecessary. The usual use of this law is to detach it from God, to give it a neutral power and dominion over God, and then to use it as a yardstick to judge God and the Bible. In the process, the law of contradiction is Hellenized and is ascribed to a world of brute factuality, upon which various patterns are imposed. As Van Til noted:

> A law of contradiction that is found to be operative in the created world in the sense that man's intellectual operations require its recognition, but that rests on God's nature, is something quite different from a law of contradiction that operates independently of God. In the former case the facts of the universe, if they are to be rationally intelligible, are not ultimately dependent upon the law of contradiction as man knows it, but upon God's internal coherence that lies behind the law of contradiction. Thus the facts of the universe can retain

2. Gordon H. Clark, *God's Hammer: The Bible and Its Critics* (Jefferson, MD: The Trinity Foundation, 1982), p. 15ff.

> their novelty for man while they have not lost their rationality for God, and therefore also for man. In the latter case the rationality of the world does not depend upon God, but upon the principle of contradiction as an abstraction. In that case facts lose their novelty for man when he sees that they work according to the law of contradiction.[3]

To use the law of contradiction abstractly and without presupposing the God of Scripture is as logical as asserting the validity of Christ's atonement in a universe without God. It is an amazing arrogance on the part of men to insist that God must be verified by them and receive their philosophical seal of approval before He shows His face in public! All too many theologians and philosophers of religion, however, hold to such a demand.

For us, however, whatever God says is truth, because God is "truth itself." Scripture has authority because it comes from the supreme and absolute authority.

The Westminster Confession, moreover, declares that God gave the Word and also gives "the saving understanding of such things as are revealed in the Word" by His Holy Spirit (chap. 1, sec. 6). The Spirit does not speak in contradiction to the Word. It follows, therefore, that:

> X. The supreme judge by which all controversies of religion are to be determined, and all decrees of councils, opinions of ancient writers, doctrines of men, and private spirits, are to be examined, and in whose sentence we are to rest, can be no other but the Holy Spirit speaking in the Scripture.

The Larger Catechism, Question 2, makes it clear, moreover, that, although "the very light of nature in man, and the works of God, declare plainly that there is a God," both man and nature being fallen, God's "Word and Spirit only, do sufficiently and effectually reveal him unto men for their salvation." Note the phrase "for their salvation." All men can read and be learned in the Bible; only those whom the Spirit moves can have "the saving understanding" and read "for their salvation."

Because of this priority of Scripture, the Reformed faith is catholic in its use of the Bible, i.e., it recognizes its universal jurisdiction and application. God through His law-word governs the totality of life, so that nothing is outside of God and His government. The Bible, thus, is not only a salvationist book but a manual for our total lives, for law, politics, economics, the family, school, church, and more.

If we limit the scope and jurisdiction of God's Word, we limit God and His dominion. All too many theologies box the faith with a corner of creation. The vast domain of the universe is seen as divided into a variety of

3. Cornelius Van Til, *An Introduction to Systematic Theology* (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Co., 1976), pp. 37–38.

polytheistic realms. Most of the universe belongs to science, and most of the earth, to politics and the state. Off in a sterile corner, boxed in from the rest of creation, is a private institution called the church, and its private, isolated religion, Christianity. Because of this mutuality, churchmen limit the faith to the salvation of the soul and to ecclesiastical concerns. The vision of such men is so narrow that for them to fight the wars of the Lord means to fight against other churches. No doubt, on Judgment Day, some Presbyterians in line for sentencing will spend their time passing judgment on the Baptists; the Baptists will tell one and all how bad the Catholics are; while the Catholics will assure the Protestants that they are heretics. Meanwhile, the Lutherans will tell all others that the salvation of non-Lutherans is questionable. To all such, the Lord will say, "Thus have ye made the commandment of God of none effect by your tradition" (Matt. 15:6).

In brief, the Bible is not a church book; it is God's book for all of life, for church, state, school, family, economics, the arts and sciences, and all things else. It is God's command word, giving marching orders for all of life.

Calvin spoke of the necessity for the Bible to preserve man from twisting God's revelation to his own devices:

> For, if we consider the mutability of the human mind how easy its lapse into forgetfulness of God; how great its propensity to errors of every kind; how violent its rage for the perpetual fabrication of new and false religions, it will be easy to perceive the necessity of the heavenly doctrine being thus committed to writing, that it might not be lost in oblivion, or evaporate in error, or be corrupted by the presumption of men.[4]

The offense of Scripture to the unregenerate is that it tells him that he is not a god but a sinner under the judgment of God. To the regenerate, the Bible is the good news of his salvation, but, to the extent that he is unsanctified, to that extent the offense of Scripture remains. This side of heaven, therefore, the believer must contend with an unwillingness in himself to read and to submit to God's Word. Behind this fact of offense is our reluctance to keep on growing; we tend to be satisfied with a few drops of faith in the ocean of our sin. We are unwilling to change, to see our faults, to forgive as we have been forgiven, to hate only what God hates, and to love as we have been loved. Hence the necessity of Scripture: we need the open and sure Word of God as a corrective, a guide, and as commandment.

4. John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, vol. 1 (Philadelphia, PA: Presbyterian Board of Christian Education, 1936), bk. 1, chp. 6, sec. 3; p. 83.

This is why reading the Bible, and our submission to its law-word, is a moral act. An immoral resistance to holiness keeps us from the Word, whereas the fact is that to read and obey means to grow in grace and holiness. Calvin noted:

> That the mind of man, being full of pride and temerity, dares to conceive of God according to its own standards; and, being stuck in stupidity, and immersed in profound ignorance, imagines a vain and ridiculous phantom instead of God.[5]

Many men use the Bible as a building block in their creation of idols by making partial use of it together with their various humanistic concepts. One such example is the belief in God as love. Very plainly, the Bible tells us, "God is love" (1 John 4:8), but it also tells us that He is a consuming fire of judgment, that He is a jealous God, and much, much more. The Reformed use of the Bible precludes using one aspect of the Bible or one attribute of God in isolation or in priority above all others. To illustrate, it is a perversion of the Reformed faith to stress the sovereignty of God above all His other attributes. Our human nature lacks balance; some of us are good in certain areas, such as philosophy, music, or mathematics, and weak in other areas, such as carpentry, painting, and selling. Just as there are a variety of human beings, so, too, there is a variety in their aptitudes. In God, not only is all potentially a full actuality, but all powers and attributes exist in perfection. To single out love, sovereignty, law, justice, grace, or any other attribute of God's nature and to give it priority is to view God in humanistic terms, as a man. It results in an anthropocentric doctrine of man.

Faithfulness to the Reformed view of Scripture prevents this. We then live by every word of God (Matt. 4:4), and we see God in terms of His total Word. To illustrate, if we forget the tabernacle as a part of God's revelation, we have a limited view of God, because we fail to see how central and important God's Word is concerning all approaches to Him and the worship He requires. If we dismiss the simple sacrifices as irrelevant now for us because they ended with Christ's atonement, we underrate the seriousness of sin in God's eyes and the exactness of His requirements. If we neglect the law, we neglect the justice or righteousness of God, and so on. We then wrongly divide the Word of truth and separate moral law, ceremonial law, and civil law. The fact is that all law is moral law; all law tells us what is right or wrong; and all law calls for a separation from certain practices as contrary to God's covenant requirements. No law of God is immoral or amoral, and no law of man can be so either.

5. ibid., bk. 1, chap. 11, sec. 8; pp. 122–123.

Calvin began his *Institutes* by stating, in the first paragraph, that "It is evident that the talents which we possess are not from ourselves, and that our very existence is nothing but a subsistence in God alone."[6] If "our very existence is nothing but a subsistence in God alone," then it follows of necessity that our every word, thought, and act should be governed by God alone. God's sufficient word for that government is the Bible.

If we approach the Bible humanistically, we will either reject it, or else we will see it as a life-and-fire insurance contract, in terms of what it can offer to us. If we approach the Bible from a faithfully Reformed perspective, we will then see ourselves, our salvation, and our calling from a God-centered perspective. Our Lord tells us plainly therein, "Seek ye *first* the kingdom of God, and his righteousness [or justice]; and all these things shall be added unto you" (Matt. 6:33). We will then recognize, when we seek first God's Kingdom, what Van Til sets forth so clearly:

> In saving us from sin, Christ saves us unto his service. Through the salvation that is ours in Christ by the Spirit, we take up anew the cultural mandate that was given to man at the outset of history. Whether we eat or drink or whatever we do, we want now to do all to the glory of God. Moreover, we want our fellowmen with us to do all things to the glory of God. We are bound, as we are eager, to inform them of that which we have been told, namely, that we shall continue to abide under the wrath of God and eventually be cast out into utter darkness, unless, by God's grace, we seek to do all things to the glory of God. Calling upon all men everywhere to join with us in fulfilling the original cultural mandate given to mankind which we may now undertake because of the redeeming work of Christ is our joy each day.[7]

As we have seen, there is a perfection and a simplicity in God's being, so that all His attributes and the totality of His nature makes all things equal and perfect, so that no one aspect of His being can be exalted over another. God is totally God and totally perfect and absolute in all His being. This is not true of man. Man as a creature is God's creature, and therefore has been created by God to serve Him in various ways, each of us according to the gifts we have received. At one point, however, there is a difference. Of all men everywhere, the same requirement holds: "Man's chief end is to glorify God, and to enjoy Him forever." Every aspect of our lives must have a single focus, the service, glory, and enjoyment of God. In this, Scripture is our guide and command-word.

6. ibid., bk. 1, chap. 1, sec. 1; p. 14.

7. Cornelius Van Til, *The Doctrine of Scripture* (n.p.: The Den Dulk Foundation, 1967), p. 1.

364

RATIONALISM AND THE HOLY SPIRIT

Chalcedon Report No. 336, July 1993

One of the monstrous absurdities in the history of theology has been the recurring error under various names such as rationalism, scholasticism, evidentialism, and the like. The purpose is to "prove" the existence of God. But if there were no God, there could be no world, mind, nothing. To assume the existence of the universe as a product of chance is insane. It presupposes the greatest series of miracles imaginable, and an abandonment of science, to believe that *by chance*, out of a total void, a single atom came into being, possessing in its microscopic self, all the potentialities of the universe. This spontaneous generation led to a whole universe of miracles, amazing leaps in being whereby something came out of nothing and evolved into a cosmos of things. Every scientific tenet is violated in the process, and more potentiality is ascribed to the original atom, or, before it, to the original nothingness, than to the God of Scripture. I find that I do not have enough faith in the miracles of chance to believe in such miracles.

Bertrand Russell assumed he had the solution, namely, that, if a thousand monkeys typed at a thousand typewriters for perhaps a million years, all the works of Shakespeare would by chance by reproduced. This was a silly statement: where did the monkeys, typewriters, and paper come from? What would keep the monkeys typing instead of wrecking or abandoning the typewriters? Rationalism is a form of unreason!

Neither man nor his reason can exist without God. The rationalistic theologians are fools to think that there can be any intelligent starting point for reason other than God and His revelation.

But modern philosophy has especially given itself to this absurd quest. Descartes's premise was himself: "I think, therefore, I am." His "autonomous" mind was his starting point and judge. In time, with Hume, Kant,

Sartre, Carnap, Wittgenstein, and others, the only thing that remained was momentary consciousness.

In this process, reason was denied its place under God and became god and judge over all things, God included. Reason under God thinks God's thoughts after Him. Reason as god sits in judgment over all things. Whatever cannot pass the judgment seat of reason as god cannot receive its rationalistic good-housekeeping seal of approval!

Because of this development, both in the early church, the Middle Ages, and in rationalistic Protestantism, reason has replaced the Holy Ghost to all practical intent in many circles. In the civil sphere, parliaments, congresses, and politicians have become the true voice of the spirit because they represent Hegel's *Geist*, Rousseau's general will, and the voice of the people, the new god.

As a result, too many churchmen expect the Trinity to remain sedately in heaven while they, the voice of reason, function as the true holy spirit on earth. They regard it as highly improper for the triune God to intrude on their government of things here on earth. The Holy Spirit especially should not interfere with their rational and eminently sensible management of this world.

The church father, Irenaeus, declared, "Where the church is, there is the Spirit of God; and where the Spirit is, there is the church and every kind of grace." The church cannot exist apart from the Spirit. It is then simply a graceless institution. The Council of Constantinople, in A.D. 381, summoned the faithful to believe in "the Holy Ghost the Lord, the Life Giver, who proceeds from the Father, who with the Father and the Son is worshipped and glorified, who spoke by the prophets."

The Arians, when they denied the full deity to Christ, did so also to the Spirit. Athanasius, in his letter to the people of Antioch, condemned this opinion and stressed the full deity of the Son and the Spirit.

Where the Holy Spirit drops out of theology and the church, there, too, godly reason is replaced by rationalism. Man exalts himself, and the Holy Spirit is no longer seen as a present power and person. Church life is then overgoverned by man, because ecclesiastical man sees himself sitting on the right hand of God the Father, fully empowered and fully wise in governing God's house.

There are several texts that tell us that God the Spirit, rather, all three persons of the Godhead, examine and try all men. Our Lord says that "I am he which searcheth the reins and the hearts" (Rev. 2:23). "The Lord searcheth all hearts, and understandest all the imaginations of the thoughts" (1 Chron. 28:9). Where men replace the Holy Spirit with the church or the clergy, this radical searching is then assumed by them. The

same is true when the state replaces God and the Spirit of God: the state becomes the great prober and searcher.

The doctrine of the Holy Spirit is essential to freedom. We then believe that there is another premise of government than the totalitarian state of the church. We look to another governor, and we rely on God's law and God's Spirit, for "where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty" (2 Cor. 3:17). Only when we recognize that there is more to the government of all things than man, can we rest in the freedom of God's rule. If we hold that our reason is lord and judge over all things, we assume too much, and we are then also at war with all who are content with God's rule. As Cornelius Van Til often stated, rationalism leads to irrationalism: it becomes unreason.

The Bible is a presuppositionalist book: never once does it tell us that it is offering us rationalist propositions, reasons that demand a proof, or evidences calling for a conclusion. We are plainly told that *every* man knows the God of Scripture, but we are also told that he *holds*, or hinders, that knowledge because of his unrighteousness or injustice (Rom. 1:18ff.). As a sinner, he seeks to suppress the truth about God and himself. The rationalists to the contrary, men do not have a problem of knowledge: their problem is sin. It is not reasons "proving" God that they need but a confession of sin and the Savior. Rationalism is guilty of confusing the issue: man does not have a noetic problem but a moral one. He needs the Savior, *not "proofs."*

At every point, the rationalist warps our perspective. Because the problem for him is *knowledge*, he excuses the sin by telling us, this person really did not know the meaning of the act. He says, what the sinner needs is education, instruction in the consequences of things. (Our present-day "condom mania" is due to rationalism.) Every excuse is made for the sinner, despite God's blunt statement in His Word that "they are without excuse" (Rom. 1:20). But the rationalist knows better than God, apparently, what is in the heart of the sinner! The doctrine of the Holy Spirit, however, tells us that, among other things, He convicts us of sin. We sin, therefore, with knowledge. The best of all authorities, the Holy Spirit, tells us that we are sinners. But the rationalistic apologetics tells us that man's problem is a lack of knowledge. The rationalist's faith is far closer to that of ancient Greece than to Christianity.

We do have a choice: rationalism or the Holy Spirit.

365

ON KNOWING GOD

Chalcedon Report No. 439, March 2002

Moses as a Hebrew was very familiar with his people's history, and the fact that God had chosen them to be His means of bringing redemption to the whole human race. In defense of his people, he had killed an Egyptian and was a fugitive in Midian. There, as a shepherd, he had led the flock onto the backside of the desert, and God had spoken to him from the midst of the burning bush. Now, Moses knew God as the living God who had revealed Himself to the patriarchs, to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. However, when God spoke to him, identified Himself, and commissioned Moses, Moses responded by asking God, "Who are You, What is Your name, Whom shall I say has sent me to Israel's fathers?" Now, Moses did not doubt that it was God who spoke to him. The meaning of his question rests on the definition of *name*. Names in the Bible are descriptions of the person bearing them. We do not know Abraham's original name in Ur, but we do know that God first renamed him Abram, father of a multitude, and later expanded it to Abraham. Only Abraham's wealth and power, and his command of 318 fighting men (Gen. 14:14), enabled him to use that name when he was a childless man.

Moses asked God to define Himself. Now, names describe to us limits, boundaries, and localizing factors. How can an infinite, omnipotent, and omniscient God be named? He can, within limits, be described, but to name or define Him is impossible.

Man's Problem

God's answer thus had in mind fully Moses' problem, and that of Israel. They were God's chosen people, and yet for generations they seem to

have been forgotten by God. Now, suddenly, He remembers them. Who can understand such a God?

Moses' problem is ours also. What does one say to those unjustly persecuted and killed? Or what can we say to a very promising, godly, and remarkable young man, full of great potentiality for Christ's work, who is dying before his work is begun? How can we comfort the afflicted? Our heart often cries out, "Lord, what is Thy Name?" How can we understand or comprehend these things? We know this fallen world is in bondage to sin and death, but why these shattering events? Moses had no doubt seen many Hebrews beaten even unto death by their Egyptian taskmasters, with no justice done to their killers. Why was he a fugitive for this one murder?

God's reply to Moses was that an answer such as Moses wanted was impossible. "I AM THAT I AM" (Exod. 3:14)—I am He Who is, the eternal, self-existent God, *beyond all definition*. You and I can be described and identified; we have a beginning and an end in our lives here, we have our features, aptitudes, characteristics, and more whereby we can be described. By describing ourselves, a stranger can meet us at an airport and identify us. But God tells Moses that He is beyond definition.

God then tells Moses to gather together the elders of Israel to say to them, "The Lord God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob," (v. 16) has sent me to you and commissioned me to lead you out of Egypt. God refused to give a rationalistic definition of Himself. He could not be comprehended by reason, experience, or anything else. He is to be known by His self-revelation.

This is basic to all the Bible. God is known by His revelation, not exhaustively, but still truly known. He is totally self-consistent in all His being so that what we do know of Him is without contradiction. There are dark corners and unused potentialities in our being, but none in God. He changes not but is the same, yesterday, today, and forever (Mal. 3:6; Heb. 13:8). In this sense, we can know God better than ourselves. There are no surprises in all His Being, mysteries, yes, but no surprise. He is the changeless One.

Knowing God

How then do we know God? By His Word, His revelation.

Rationalists, in their arrogance, seek to define God for us, but they fail. We know God through His infallible Word, His self-revelation.

We have inherited the bias of our world from Greco-Roman culture, with its insistence on the centrality of man and his thinking. Aristotle,

in his *Politics*, defines man as a political animal, whereas according to the Bible, man is a religious creature. The difference between these two definitions is vast. Either a man is a creation, a creature of God, or he is the creature of the state. If the state is man's maker, then the state molds man and gives man statist law to live by. If God is man's Maker, then God alone has the prerogative of molding and directing him, and only God's law-word can legitimately govern man. What the Bible tells us is that God is our Maker and also our Lawgiver and Definer.

God's revelation, His enscriptured Word, thus, defines us and our world. Reality is what God says it is, and we are to develop our knowledge of ourselves and of His creation under Him and in faithfulness to His Word. David says of God in Psalm 36:9, "For with thee is the fountain of life: in thy light shall we see light." Our basic presupposition must be that God in His Word establishes the premises of our knowledge. Initiative and origination are thus in God, not in man, nor the state, nor anything else.

The Defining Word

The Bible is God's defining Word. It does not give us the data of biology, but we are to take its perspective of biology; nor does it tell us of the factuality of the universe, but of its origin in God's fiat creation. It tells us also what man is, his nature and his destiny, and it tells us plainly how we are to live. We are creatures of God, not of nature nor of the state. Without God's Word, we can only found our lives on false premises, on our hopes of evolving rather than regeneration. Because man is a fallen creature, in rebellion against God and His law-word, his history is one of perpetual crisis. Man-made cures are necessarily wrong by their nature. The focus of the twentieth century has well been summed up as "perpetual war for perpetual peace." We are told in Isaiah 57:20–21: "But the wicked are like the troubled sea, when it cannot rest, whose waters cast up mire and dirt. There is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked." If we believe this, then we have a different philosophy of history and politics than do the humanists in and out of the church. Apart from God and His infallible Word, our thinking will rest on faulty and evil premises. History then lurches from crisis to crisis, from one evil answer to another. The defining God alone provides the defining word. Definitions provide us with valid limits. A geneticist, after changing his views from evolution to six-day creation, won eleven prizes in genetics because his field of experimentation was now within limits rather than limitless. Dr. Walter Lammerts thus held an advantage over others in his experiments.

The sociologist Emile Durkheim, an evolutionist, saw the criminal as an evolutionary pioneer, as possibly representing the next step in man's development, rather than as a transgressor of God's law. Durkheim's view was logical, given his premises. An incarcerated criminal, a university student of marked abilities, once made the same statement to me. He saw himself not as a criminal but as a liberated mind.

God as the Creator and the Definer is also necessarily the Lawgiver. He who made men and all creation is also the Lawgiver: "All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made" (John 1:3). The Creator provides the only defining and saving word for His creation.

It thus *warps* the gospel to reduce it to the salvation of our souls alone. It is the salvation of history, science, and all things else because it is the defining word. In the church today, man wants God to save his soul and then allow man to save everything else on his own terms. This is not only a fallacy, but also evil. It is God's world, and it must be ruled by God's law-word, His defining Word. Anything short of this is false and dangerous.

> And Moses said unto God, Behold, when I come unto the children of Israel, and shall say unto them, The God of your fathers hath sent me unto you; and they shall say to me, What is his name? what shall I say unto them? And God said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM: and he said, Thus, shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you. And God said moreover unto Moses, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, The Lord God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, hath sent me unto you: this is my name for ever, and this is my memorial unto all generations. (Exod. 3:13–15)

366

CONSISTENT FAITH

Chalcedon Report No. 413, December 1999

In my student days at the university, I occasionally chatted with a professor of anthropology. He was interested in me because I was, in his opinion, so extremely "reactionary" and yet very well read. On one occasion, I was invited to have lunch with him and a few other scholars.

He asked me about my recent reading. I cited a book on one "native" culture, and told him of an amusing part of it. A trader, a widower, was asked if he found the native women, who were far from clean or appealing, at all attractive. His answer was that, when they began to look attractive, he knew that he had been there too long, and it was time to take a "furlough" to his country, Scotland.

The professor was furious over my account. He believed it wrong to assume one culture was better than another, or that cleanliness should be a universal virtue. For him, as a consistent unbeliever and an evolutionist, all cultures were equal. As a consistent man, he would not call dead cultures inferior to, or lower than, present ones. Also, the dinosaur was not inferior to the rat, which had survived when the dinosaur had not. Quite consistently, he held to no values, nor was life better than death.

Today that man's faith is more prevalent, perhaps, as relativism becomes logically the faith of more unbelievers. Today, too, his faith is more and more in evidence among many.

For him, evolution produced the world as we know it, but it issued no standards or laws. Other unbelievers see evolution as progressive and "upward" in its progress. He, logically, did not.

Now, too many churchmen show signs of similar views or worse, since God is not even the Creator for them, and God has no law for us. They are on the road to relativism.

I recall a friend of my student years, and afterwards, who wanted no

part of the first table of the law but strongly favored the retention of the second table. He wanted Biblical morality, but not Biblical theology. I challenged him to find a valid ground for this without God. After some effort, he admitted that he could not.

Unless God is both our Creator and Lawgiver, we cannot long retain Biblical morality, nor can we retain God as Savior. If evolution "created" me, I am responsible to evolution for my standards and behavior. If God created me, I am then responsible to God. Our Creator is our Lawgiver, our Redeemer, and our King.

There are two mutually exclusive worlds of thought here, that of Darwinism and that of God's Word, the Bible. There can be no valid compromise between them. Over the generations, however, men in the church and out of it have been given to compromise. We have become a "mushy-headed" people.

Truly to believe in the Christian faith is to be uncompromising in our adherence to it. The Biblical emphasis on "every word" is a necessary and logical one. But too much of existing Christianity is riddled with compromise. The battle to avoid compromise was basic to St. Paul's work in Corinth. The spirit of Paul is needed today.

Compromise is a rejection of God's absolute authority over us. It makes us gods over God because we then in effect claim the wisdom to amend His Word. But we are His creatures, not His lords.

From time to time, I remember that professor, and I do so with appreciation for his consistency, but not for his faith. What we need is a consistently Biblical faith, not a compromising one.

367

THE IMPORTANCE OF SIX-DAY CREATION

Chalcedon Report No. 398, September 1998

Creation is the initial doctrine we encounter in opening our Bibles, and it has been the point of initial attack of critics of Biblical faith. The attack is almost as old as Christianity, because the early church moved in a Greco-Roman culture deeply committed to an evolutionary perspective. Aristotle as a scientist was deeply interested, as Cornelius Van Til showed us in a telling essay, in freaks because they represented a possible next step in evolution. More than a few of the early church fathers, being pagan in origin, compromised on Genesis 1.

With the Enlightenment, the departures from an orthodox view of Genesis 1 became more common, and they were the starting point for the development of modernism. Today, in seminaries professing to be orthodox and created as a protest against modernism, six-day creationism is held in contempt, and compromising views are held.

All attempts to undermine strict six-day creationism have a deadly effect. *First*, they require a different view of the Bible. Orthodoxy has long held that the plain and obvious meaning of the text must prevail, not those meanings known only by scholars and apparent to no one else. These novel kinds of exegesis deny the validity of the Reformation and the view of Scripture as given to the believer, not the scholar.

Second, a denial of six-day creation requires a different view of God. Process theology rapidly takes over and the Biblical God wanes as a humanistic and evolutionary "god" replaces him. Biblical theology has waned with the rise of process theology. The expert replaces the common believer, and the Bible becomes a closed book.

Third, more than a few adherents of this shift can be called symbolic theology champions. They can read meanings out of a text which we, as men of simple faith, never can imagine are there! They are indeed a

self-appointed elite in the world of the church.

Fourth, a grim division has been created by these attacks by the anti-six-day creationists between the seminary and the church. Thus far, the seminaries have prevailed, but a rebellion in some circles is brewing. It is important to note that the rapid growth of the church since the 1960s has been among churches bypassing the seminary. The seminary sees this as the triumph of ignorance, but many of these untrained pastors have taught themselves Greek and Hebrew and more theology than the seminaries can boast of. A revolution is underway.

The issues in six-day creationism are thus more basic than many are willing to admit. The life of the church is at stake.

I pass at times in my travels a large stone church here in California. Seating about 1,400, it was once full, but modernism killed it. The church which then purchased the structure started off well, until a seminary-trained fool gutted it with his modernism. It may soon need a third buyer!

368

ESCAPISM

Chalcedon Report No. 34, June 17, 1968

One of America's original and greatest bleeding heart liberals was Horace Greeley, famous editor and socialist of Lincoln's day. Greeley was not a Christian but a humanist. Of him, President Andrew Jackson wrote, "Greeley is all heart and no head. He is the most vacillating man in the country. He runs to goodness of heart so much as to produce infirmity of mind." Greeley's religion, by his own words, was simply this: "my affirmation creed is mainly summed up in the belief that God is infinitely wise and good, and that all evil is temporary and finite and to be swallowed up in the end by Universal Good." Greeley's "God" was a vague universal good.

As a result, it always bothered me to read that this agnostic and bleeding-heart liberal supposedly had a deathbed conversion and died murmuring, "It is done! I have fought the good fight. I know that My Redeemer Liveth." Various church papers, preachers, and writers have made much of that statement, but it never rang true to me, no more than did other "last words" of some famous old reprobates. But Henry Luther Stoddard quotes it in his book, *Horace Greeley*, as do others. Lucius Beebe, in *The Big Spenders*, gives us another version. Whitelaw Reid, editor of the *Tribune*, who gradually took over ownership from Greeley, was at Greeley's bedside with Greeley's daughters. Greeley, at the end, opened his eyes, saw Reid, and muttered, "You s.o.b., you stole my newspaper." When Reid rejoined the others who were awaiting the end, he was asked by Tom Rooker, "What were his last words, Mr. Reid? Give us his last message." It was then that Reid said, "His last words were, 'I know that my redeemer liveth!'" It made a prettier story, and it stuck.

Why am I quoting this story? Because it illustrates so well the desire of many people for a happy ending, for fairy tales. A few years ago, when I

spoke in one city, a woman told me (the entire group knew the story from her) that Charles Darwin had renounced evolution in his old age and died a Christian. Also, she claimed, this could be found in a book she had seen of Darwin's letters, and that the book had since "disappeared" from the public library. I stated that I owned that book, and it contained no such statement. The result: no one in that group wanted to hear me again! Or take another case. Martin Luther King has been compared to Christ by the pope, by many ministers, and by many lecturers. But King denied the Bible and Christ and worked in association with a pervert and with communists. How do some of these people square their church's stand with their conscience? Well, the story is making the rounds that a day or so before he was killed, King told a friend that he had been very wrong, that the Bible was true, and Jesus indeed was the incarnate second person of the Trinity! The story is not only false, it is wicked. The people who believe it are trying to run away from reality and from responsibility. Their position is one of escapism, of moral irresponsibility.

One such group of people is today urging Christians to do nothing about our world problems: instead, they should separate themselves from every political, social, and religious controversy and problem and simply await the "rapture." Indeed, this group is preparing for that "event" by equipping itself with rapture suits!

I have not taken time heretofore to criticize various other theological viewpoints. I only do so now because, repeatedly, various persons have raised the question of the "rapture." It has been repeatedly said that because I and others do not hold to this view, we are either defective Christians or are not preaching the gospel, or are even enemies of the gospel. Several friends have been told that they are not Christians and that they must submit to truly "fundamental" teaching or be lost.

Before going any further, let me state that not all who hold to a belief in the rapture are so arrogant, nor are all so given to escapism. Indeed, at one meeting, where one such believer attacked my concern with social problems, another stood up to say that the Lord's command is, "Occupy till I come, and no one, whatever their doctrine of the last things, could afford to neglect this order."

The main source of these escapist doctrines is in the *Scofield Reference Bible* notes. Scofieldism is a system of doctrine which sees the fulfillment of Biblical prophecy in national Israel. (It is a kind of Christian Zionism.)

Related to this teaching is the school known as Dispensationalism. Dispensationalism holds to three major intervals or "parentheses" in history: 1) between the first two verses of Genesis 1; 2) The church or mystery parenthesis between Pentecost and the rapture; and 3) the Jewish

remnant parenthesis, a seven year interval between the rapture and the appearing. Scofield basically accepted this system. Dispensationalism is essentially evolutionary, while claiming to be fundamental; instead of a God who is unchanging, it gives us a changing God; it makes room for modern geological theories. It becomes antinomian or anti-law. A major dispensationalist group, the Plymouth Brethren, emphasize other-worldliness and a surrender of this world and its problems. Some have refused to hold public office, to take daily papers, to vote, or to become involved in the world's activities by trying to establish Christian law and order.

In its extremes, Dispensationalism becomes anti-Christian. S. D. Gordon rejected the cross of Christ and held that the Mosaic sacrifices saved men in and of themselves. He wrote, of the cross, "It can be said at once that His dying was not God's own plan. It was a plan conceived somewhere else and yielded to by God. God had a plan of atonement by which men who were willing could be saved from sin and its effects." This plan was the Mosaic sacrificial system. Scofield held to a similar belief to a great degree, and he looked for the restoration of the temple and of sacrifice. Those who want a detailed examination of the heresies of Dispensationalism and Scofieldism can find it in O. T. Allis, *Prophecy and the Church* (Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Co.).

Mysticism, too, leads to similar viewpoints, that is, a denial of the importance of this world and an attempt to escape from history and its problems and responsibilities. The roots of all such thinking are Neoplatonic or else Manichaean.

Neoplatonism held (it stemmed from Greek philosophy) that only spirit or mind is real, and that matter is not equal to spirit, nor as real. This belief Horace Greeley echoed, and its culmination is in Mary Baker Eddy.

Manichaeism held to two kinds of reality, matter, which is evil, and spirit, which is good. (In some versions, such as Marxism, matter is good, and spirit is evil, or, in an inverted Neoplatonism, nonexistent.) The spiritual Manichaean forsakes the world of matter, of history, politics, and problems to concentrate on the world of spirit. The "higher" Manichaeans said marriage was evil, and put marriage on the same moral level as rape and incest.

The Biblical position is that body and soul are alike created wholly good, alike fallen, and alike redeemed in Christ. The Christian's duty and responsibility is to bring all the world into subjection to the rule of Christ, in whom alone is our true and perfect freedom. To deny either our material or spiritual responsibilities is to deny God. The Christian must seek to bring all things into captivity to Christ.

Those who expect to be "raptured" out of their problems are not Christian. This is paganism: it is a *deus ex machina* belief, that is, the Greek belief that salvation means being rescued from our problems. Biblical faith holds that salvation means that, now, having been justified by God's grace, we are empowered to overcome our problems, to do battle unto victory.

I have had some of these escapists tell me that if the Lord will not rapture them out of the "tribulation," they see no point in being a Christian! This is not faith: it is blasphemy. (The "rapture," incidentally, is not to be confused with the doctrine of the Second Coming, which is different.) I do not find this escapist doctrine of the rapture taught in the Bible. I do find a commandment which declares that the church must "teach all nations" (Matt. 28:19). Men and nations are to be brought into subjection to Christ the King and His law-word. We have been saved, not to run from the world, but "that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us" (Rom. 8:4). The world must therefore be brought under God's law. This is not escapism: it is a marching order.

369

JUSTIFICATION

Chalcedon Report No. 330, January 1993

> For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek. For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith: as it is written, The just shall live by faith. (Rom. 1:16–17)
>
> For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; To declare, I say, at this time his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus. (Rom. 3:23–26)

Too often, past victories either become forgotten, or their significance is to some degree lost. This is very true of the Protestant Reformation and the doctrine of *justification*. In shorthand fashion, it is reduced to the words, "The just shall live by faith." Paul cites this from Habakkuk 2:4, and, when we look Habakkuk, we can see at once that it does *not* mean salvation by faith. In fact, what Paul is saying is that men who are just before God because Christ's atonement has redeemed them, shall *live* by faith. We are "justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 3:24). Habakkuk speaks of the justified facing the horrors of invasion as God's judgment falls upon the land. Paul speaks of the great assault of an ungodly world in which homosexuals are very strong against the godly, against the justified, and he says we shall and must live by faith, not by sight.

When we go back to Martin Luther's *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, we find that he wrote, of Romans 1:17 and 3:24,

> God's righteousness is that by which we become worthy of His great salvation or through which alone we are (accounted) righteous before Him

> . . . The righteousness of God is the cause of our salvation.
>
> God does not justify us freely by His grace in such a way that He did not demand any atonement to be made *for our sins*, for He gave Jesus Christ into death for us, in order that He might atone for our sins. So now He justifies freely by His grace those who have been redeemed by His Son, (as he adds: "*Through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus*"). (Martin Luther, *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* [Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1954], pp. 24–25, 62)

Calvin is also very emphatic. Commenting on Romans 1:17, he says in part:

> We have now this principal point or the main hinge of the first part of this Epistle,—that we are justified by faith through the mercy of God alone. We have not this, indeed, as yet distinctly expressed by Paul; but from his own words it will hereafter be made very clear—that the righteousness which is grounded on faith, depends entirely on the mercy of God. (John Calvin, *Commentaries on the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans* [Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1948], p. 66)

It is necessary to stress and to clarify this fact because too many supposedly Protestant and Bible-believing churches are today anti-Reformation. They believe and teach that we are saved by our faith, our act of believing, so that belief becomes the great good work whereby man attains salvation. We are not *saved* by our faith, but as the justified, "justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus," we *live by faith.*

Arminianism has turned belief into man's great saving work. Everything is done to bring men, women, and children to the point of their decision for Christ. One Arminian has written of "proofs that demand an answer"; men are to be saved by an act of reason. This is not the Reformation premise but a popularized form of Scholastic rationalism, which held, "I understand in order that I may believe."

For a truly reformed theology, one faithful to Scripture, salvation is an act of God's sovereign grace whereby we are made a new creation. We must therefore say that too much of Protestantism is now anti-Reformation.

Paul tells us that we are justified, we are made to stand before God's tribunal in Christ, as now righteous or just men. Our status depends on our great advocate, our Priest, Prophet, and King, Jesus Christ. By His regenerating power, our triune God, our atonement having been effected by the incarnate Son, makes us a new creation. In St. Paul's words:

> Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature [or, a new creation]: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new. (2 Cor. 5:17)

All such men, new creations in Christ, now members, not of Adam,

but of Christ, are no longer members of the fallen human race of Adam, but members of the new humanity of Jesus Christ. They are the justified, the just, who are *called* to live by faith.

Habakkuk tells us what this means. The word of the Lord to Habakkuk was that the Chaldeans were about to invade the land. This was very grim news. It meant destruction, rape, captivity, and a stream of horrors. It was true that in Judea the law was despised, and men were faithless. Wrong decisions in the courts were routine.

Habakkuk's reaction to God's promise of a very radical judgment was one of shock and dismay. Habakkuk had no illusions about the apostasy and evils of God's chosen people, but why should an even more evil people triumph? Why? Then, we read in Habakkuk:

> I will stand upon my watch, and set me upon the tower, and will watch to see what he will say unto me, and what I shall answer when I am reproved. And the Lord answered me, and said, Write the vision, and make it plain upon tables, that he may run that readeth it. For the vision is yet for an appointed time, but at the end it shall speak, and not lie: though it tarry, wait for it; because it will surely come, it will not tarry. Behold, his soul which is lifted up is not upright in him: but the just shall live by his faith. (Hab. 2:1–4)

God tells Habakkuk that what He has ordained in the way of judgment will indeed come. He also told Jeremiah of the thoroughness of His judgment declaring,

> Then the word of the Lord came to me: You must not take a wife, you must not have sons and daughters in this place. For thus says the Lord concerning the sons and the daughters, who are born in this place and concerning the mothers who bore them and the fathers who begot them in this land: They shall die of the pestilence, they shall not be mourned, neither shall they be buried; they shall be as fertilizer on the topsoil. They shall be consumed by the sword and by famine, and their corpses shall be food for the birds of the air and for the beasts of the field. (Jer. 16:1–4; Berkeley Version)

God's Word makes it clear that this is a fallen world; His judgments level every ungodly age and culture. Our world around us now faces God's judgments for its sins and apostasy. But we who are the justified of God by Christ's atonement, and who are new creatures by His regenerating power, how can we expect a world order which crucified Christ to love us who are His people? How can we expect the floods of judgment to spare us in the days ahead?

Paul tells us that "the carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be" (Rom. 8:7). The world around us hates God, hates His law, and it hates us, His people. The

more clearly we are Christ's, and the more faithfully we serve Him, the greater the world's enmity and hatred. Our Lord, preparing His disciples for confrontation with an evil world, told them and tells us,

> These things I have spoken unto you, that in me ye might have peace. In the world ye shall have tribulation: but be of good cheer; I have overcome the world. (John 16:33)

We are in enemy-occupied territory as God's commandos, and we have a duty to reclaim it for our King. We are engaged in what John Bunyan called "the holy war."

This is why the just, *the redeemed*, must live by faith. We are in a battle, with a world to win. This fallen world seeks instead to destroy us.

After declaring that the just shall live by faith, Paul goes on to speak of what kind of world we face. He concludes thus:

> And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient [or, decent]; Being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity; whisperers, Backbiters, haters of God, despiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, Without understanding, covenant breakers, without natural affections, implacable, unmerciful: Who knowing the judgment of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them. (Rom. 1:28–32)

Such are the enemies we face. We *are* given advance word of our victory: "The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever" (Rev. 11:15). Meanwhile, the justified must live by faith.

Those who are hostile to the Reformed perspective will insist, however, that *our faith justifies*, which is not the Biblical view that Christ works our justification, and we are given salvation by His sovereign grace. It is necessary, therefore, to consider the relevant texts that are used by Arminians. The relevant texts in Romans on justification, other than those we have used, are as follows:

> For not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified. (Rom. 2:13)

> Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law. (Rom. 3:28)

> Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ . . . Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him. (Rom. 5:1, 9)

> Moreover whom he did predestinate, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified, them he also glorified. (Rom. 8:30)

We must assume that Paul knew what he was talking about and did not contradict himself. In Romans 8:30 he tells us that our justification rests in God's sovereign predestination. It is therefore entirely of grace. In Romans 5:9, Paul says that the immediate source is Christ's atoning blood. It is because of this reconciliation made by the atonement that we have peace with God and the faith that makes us aware of our justification (Rom. 5:1), and our new relationship to God. In Romans 3:28, Paul is not locating our justification in our faith, for, as Hodge said of this text, Paul "places the ground of justification out of ourselves" (Charles Hodge, *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* [New York, NY: A. C. Armstrong and Son, (1882) 1983], p. 156).

Turning now to Galatians, we read:

> Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not the works of the law: for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified. But if, while we seek to be justified by Christ, we ourselves also are found sinners, is therefore Christ the minister of sin? God forbid. (Gal. 2:16–17)

> Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. (Gal. 3:24)

In Galatians 2:16, Paul contrasts salvation by works and salvation "by the faith of Jesus Christ." In verse 17, he says that "we seek to be justified by Christ." This obviously does not mean justified by our believing but by Jesus Christ. The saving act is not ours nor our believing, but the work of Christ. Modern versions often render the act of believing as our salvation.

Galatians 3:24 is a favorite with those who locate justification in the act of believing. Duncan's comment here is telling:

> The familiar Authorized Version translation, the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, is apt to convey the false impression that the Law's function was essentially educative, and has been used to corroborate the modern (but quite unscriptural) conception of an evolutionary progress in religion, as if man naturally advances from the truths of the Law to those of the Gospel. Equally erroneous is the idea that, as the pedagogue frequently accompanied the child on the way to school, so men were led by the Law to the school of Christ, where they could get, so to speak, superior instruction in religion. It is not as a Teacher that Paul thinks of Christ, but as a Redeemer: the Christian

> life is not an advanced education, but a deliverance from death into life. The real meaning of the passage is well brought out in the translation: The Law thus held us as wards in discipline, a discipline which was designed to last till such time as Christ came. Paul adds that the function of this discipline was that we might be justified. By this he apparently means that the Law, just because it was repressive in its discipline, robbed us of all faith in human advancement, and left us with no alternative but to cast ourselves in faith on Him who came to emancipate us. (George S. Duncan, *The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians* [New York, NY: Harper & Brothers, 1934], pp. 121–122)

The law was our pedagogue, taking us to Christ, and, casting ourselves in faith on Him, we know His grace and saving power. Kenneth S. Wuest, not Reformed, summarized Galatians 3:24–29 in these words:

> The law was given in order that, by showing the sinner that sin was an actual transgression of God's laws, he might see the necessity of faith in a substitutionary sacrifice for sin, and thus be led to put his trust in the Christ of prophecy who would in the future die for him. (Kenneth S. Wuest, "Galatians," in *Word Studies in the Greek New Testament* [Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, (1944) 1974], p. 110)

1 Timothy 3:16 speaks of Jesus being "justified" by the Sprit, but this is better rendered as *vindicated by the Spirit*. Titus 3:7 sums up the matter: we are "justified by his grace." Justification is always spoken of as an act of God's sovereign grace. The justified live in that faith.

(This sermon was preached at the Carbondale, Pennsylvania Covenant Reformed Church, Pastor Dennis Roe, October 25, 1992.)

370

BAPTISM INTO HIS JUSTICE

Chalcedon Report No. 448, January 2003

> Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you: and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you a heart of flesh. And I will put my spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do them. And ye shall dwell in the land that I gave to your fathers; and ye shall be my people, and I will be your God. (Ezek. 36:25–28)

This text is about baptism and the gift of the Holy Spirit. The gift of the Spirit was a sign of the Messianic age (Isa. 42:1; 44:3; 59:21; Joel 2:28–29), and so, too, was the baptism of both Jews and Gentiles. Baptism means in part purification; hence the use of water. We are all born into Adam's world and the heritage of sin and death; the world of Adam is a continuing rerun of man's fall. It is not surprising that a cyclical view of history is so common in paganism. An endless cycle of sin and death marks history outside of Jesus Christ.

The meaning of baptism is that this cycle is broken by the power of God in Jesus Christ. Sin and death are replaced with righteousness, or justice, and life. History moves forward to establish the Kingdom of God among men and over men. Baptism is thus a sign of victory. It sets forth our faith that the repetitive pattern of sin and death has been broken by Jesus Christ. It summons us to become a part of a new creation, members of God's Kingdom, and heirs in Christ. To be baptized, and to baptize our children, is thus a sign of faith and life.

God promises a new heart, i.e., a new human nature. This means new life in the new human race of Jesus Christ.

The new heart and the new spirit have "added" to them God's Spirit. The result is that the Holy Spirit causes us to walk in God's statutes and

to keep His judgments (Ezek. 36:27). God's law, His justice, begins to govern the affairs of man and his world. This leads to a marvelous goal, whether in the Old Testament era or now, and we dwell in the good earth God gives us in peace and safety (v. 28).

Thus, we are baptized, or purified; we are made God's covenant people; we are given a new heart and spirit; we are empowered by God to further His Kingdom, and this is all God's work and not ours.

Baptism is thus a Kingdom sacrament and therefore must be seen by the administering church in relation to God and His Kingdom rather than to the institution.

It means a cleansing from our sin and our idolatries so that we are prepared for His service.

Our children are given in baptism to be God's children, to be used by Him in His Kingdom and to His glory. We are baptized into serving Him according to His commandments. We are thus baptized into His justice as our way of life.

371

THE COVENANT AND BAPTISM

Chalcedon Report No. 449, February 2003

> Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you: and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh. (Ezek. 36:25–26)

The covenant sign of the Old Testament era was circumcision and that of the New Testament, baptism. Ezekiel 36:25–26 speaks of the sprinkling with clean water as a sign of rebirth. Before Christ's coming, proselytes among the Gentiles were both circumcised, if males, and baptized to indicate their status as the Messiah's people in the renewed and extended covenant.

Circumcision was a symbolic castration. It witnessed to the fact that man's hope is not in generation but in regeneration. *Man cannot renew himself*, nor can history avoid the fact of sin and man's war against God. Apart from Christ, history *does* repeat itself: sin and death mark all its days.

Among the images used in Scripture to define baptism is that of death and resurrection. Paul says in Romans 6:4:

> Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life.

There must be a dividing line in our lives between our inheritance in Adam of sin and death, and our regeneration into the image of God in Christ.

In baptizing our children, therefore, we are *redirecting history* from the old pattern of sin and death into the new life in Christ. This baptism does *not* produce an end product. It does not say that either we or our

children are now perfected and thus ready for glorification. It means that, by God's grace, we have been redirected.

The World of Anti-Law

The world of the ungodly is the world of *anomia*, lawlessness, or anti-law. Paul describes it as "enmity against God" (Rom. 8:7). It is the willful insistence that man is his own god, his own source of law and determination (Gen. 3:5). It means walking or living "in newness of life," or, in James Moffatt's words, we now "move in the new sphere of life." Because our baptism does not make us a finished product, we can and do sin. The word for sin, *hamartia*, means missing the mark; this *can* mean carelessness and indifference, but we are at least moving towards the mark, not against it, as in *anomia*, or lawlessness, or anti-law. Our distinguishing mark becomes *righteousness*, or, *justice*. The world talks much about justice while working all the while to subvert it, because justice means God's law and sovereignty.

Baptism is a witness to God's regenerating power, as Titus 3:5 makes clear. It is not the sacrament of baptism that regenerates us but God the Lord. It is not a natural fact but a supernatural one. The Lord can work His miracle of new life with equal ease in a baby as in a hardened old sinner. The power and the initiative in the regeneration is not ours but God's.

Two Errors

This means that there are two obvious errors regarding baptism to be avoided. *First*, there is the decisional error, namely, that my decision for Christ, my choosing Him as my Lord and Savior, is my rebirth. This is humanism in effect, and it is emphatically Arminianism. Its prevalence does not sanctify its error.

Second, there is the error of sacerdotalism, the belief that a power resides in the church and the sacrament, when the power really remains totally in the hands of the sovereign God. The church too often tries to impose a straightjacket on God's actions and on our freedom in Christ. Sacerdotalism, too, is a form of humanism. The church's right is to administer baptism, not to control or define it apart from Scripture.

It is important to insist on the priority of God in all things, and therefore certainly in baptism. The churches, by following erroneous ideas about baptism and other matters have lost much power as well as much freedom. It is interesting to read C. H. Dodd's 1951 comment about the first Christians:

> But the most striking thing about the early Christians was their astonishing confidence in the face of overwhelming opposition. The Church was a minority movement, with every kind of power in the world against it. But they were convinced that all this power was already crumbling away. They knew it, and soon (they thought) everyone would know it. So they refused to be intimidated.[1]

The rite of baptism is a part of this holy confidence, the belief that we are "*more* than conquerors" in Christ (Rom. 8:37). It is an aspect of our vision of the future, that the world powers are crumbling, and that we are citizens of a Kingdom that shall have no end.

We therefore rejoice in baptisms, in a child's or an adult's, because we know that, whereas death reigns outside of Christ, we are in Christ's Kingdom, and He shall prevail.

1. C. H. Dodd, *The Coming of Christ* (Cambridge, England: University Press, 1951), p. 5.

372

EXCEPT A MAN BE BORN AGAIN

Chalcedon Report No. 451, April 2003

> There was a man of the Pharisees, named Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews: The same came to Jesus by night, and said unto him, Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God: for no man can do these miracles that thou doest, except God be with him. Jesus answered and said unto him, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God. (John 3:1–3)

These three verses are amazing. A ruler, an intellectual man and a scholar, comes to Jesus at night to make a startling confession. "We *know*," he says flatly, "that your miraculous power comes from God." By *we*, he meant the Sanhedrin, the ruling body. These were the men who later crucified Christ, and they knew what they were doing. Their problem was not a lack of knowledge but a lack of faith and character. They preferred their way to God's way, and their government to God's government.

Our Lord does not allow Nicodemus to raise the theological and practical questions he no doubt had in mind. He at once answers Nicodemus that, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of heaven." The issue is brought at once to the fore: rebirth is necessary. Moreover, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God" (John 3:5). Our Lord forces the basic issue to the forefront: regeneration and baptism, the Holy Spirit at work in us, and the open act of baptism.

Osterhaven wrote of the meaning of baptism:

> Baptism has no meaning apart from the fact of human sin. Christianity in all of its branches holds that something tragic has happened to mankind, that the race of men has been morally and spiritually affected with a disease called sin. Because God is holy and just and cannot, because of His nature,

"whitewash" sin we need cleansing if we are to see him.[1]

The whole human race, men, women, and children, has a problem: it is born with a tendency to sin; this means self-will and self-centeredness; it means the will to be one's own god and determiner of good and evil (Gen. 3:5); it means, my will be done, come what may. The natural man naturally wants his own way: his life's goal is *self*-fulfillment, not the Kingdom of God and His justice (Matt. 6:33).

As long as men are like this, history offers us no hope. Whatever material progress is made only gives sin more scope to work its will, and sin becomes more dangerous and more powerful.

The solution, our Lord says, is you must be born again. Natural man must be replaced by supernatural man. We are in Christ all of us a new human race, the Christian race, a supernatural people with unexpected powers and reserves.

And this is what we want for our children, our grandchildren, and our progeny to the end of time. We want them to be Christians, members of Christ's new humanity, a people of grace and power.

The tired old round of natural man is sin and death, pretensions, false fronts, cowardice, and defeat. But we as Christians have a different calling; it is to life and justice (or, righteousness); it is to victory, for "this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith" (1 John 5:4).

We give our children to Christ in a great hope, that He will make them His, and that they will be another step forward in the conquest of all things for Christ's kingdom. The hope of Christian parents is beautifully expressed in a fifteenth-century hymn by Heinrich von Laufenberg, as translated by Catherine Winkworth perhaps a century and a half ago:

Lord Jesus Christ, our Lord most dear,
As Thou wast once an infant here,
So give this child of Thine, we pray,
Thy grace and blessing day by day.
Oh holy Jesus, Lord Divine,
We pray Thee guard this child of Thine.

As in Thy heavenly Kingdom, Lord,
All things obey Thy sacred word,
Do Thou Thy mighty succor give,
And shield this child by morn and even.
Oh holy Jesus, Lord Divine,

1. M. Eugene Osterhaven, *The Meaning of Baptism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Society for Reformed Publications, 1951), p. 17.

We pray Thee guard this child of Thine.
Their watch let angels around *him* keep

Where're he be, awake asleep;
Thy holy Cross now let *him* bear,
That *he* Thy crown with saints may bear.
Oh holy Jesus, Lord Divine,
We pray Thee guard this child of Thine.

Baptisms are therefore joyful occasions, because they are evidence of the extension of Christ's Kingdom into the future, into the lives of our children. We give our children to Christ to make them His new human race, the people of grace and power, the people who are the only good future this world has.

CHRISTIAN LIVING

373

WHO RULES?

Chalcedon Report No. 358, May 1995

One of the prevailing beliefs on the right and on the left is in conspiracies. People like to believe, "They did it to us." Now, a conspiracy is a plan by a group of men to accomplish a particular goal, and the goal may be good or bad. There have been no lack of conspiracies in history, and they are surely with us today. The important question is a moral and religious one: who determines history? Conspiracies, or men under God empowered by the sovereign and determining God?

Christianity has said, over the centuries, that man is in *sin*; Christ is man's Savior, giving man *salvation*; and the purpose of our salvation is *service*, doing the King's work in terms of the King's law-word.

If we do not see this, the power of God working through us as determinative of history, we will see another and a dangerous answer. We will then see history as *determined* by evil conspiracies which exercise a radical control and power over us. Men are then puppets and tools, not God's vicegerents called to make all things new in Him. To regard conspiracies as determinative of history is to deny God's sovereignty.

Not too many years ago, a man became very angry with me for saying that the Soviet Union could not endure because it was anti-God. The Soviet Union, moreover, was so derelict in its economy that it was ensuring its own collapse. This man insisted that the laws of economy did not apply to the Soviet Union because it had replaced economics with slavery. He saw no hope of its collapse.

In a world without God and His law, tyrannies can rewrite reality and ensure their indefinite continuance, but in God's world the wages of sin are always death. We are commanded, "Trust in him at all times" (Ps. 62:8). Because God is God, no power can or does exist except by His permission.

To see history as determined by conspiracies, or by demonic forces, or by evil men means, *first*, to deny that God is the Lord, that He is Sovereign. *Second*, it also is a denial of our responsibility. Our Lord did not give us an impossible commission (Matt. 28:18–20) but a totally possible, necessary, and required one. We need to read and reread the commission to Joshua (Josh. 1:1–9), of which the Great Commission of our Lord is an expansion (from Canaan to the world and all nations) while a summary thereof. The promises are remarkable: "Every place that the sole of your foot shall tread upon, that I have given unto you" (Josh. 1:3). "Have not I commanded thee? Be strong and of good courage; be not afraid, neither be thou dismayed: for the Lord thy God is with thee whithersoever thou goest" (Josh. 1:9).

One of our problems today is that we forget that we are a *commanded* people. One of the greatest evils in the church today is the heretical belief that *we* choose Christ. Our Lord in John 15:16 is emphatic that we do not choose Him but He chooses us and commands us to bear fruit to Him. People who deny God's predestination scare me; some actually say, "I know what the Bible says here, but it can't mean what it says." God is not our servant, although some will say, "He gives me what I ask for"; but He is our Lord and Commander who says, "You will give me all of yourself and your substances as I require it." Between the two attitudes, there is a world of difference, and they are different faiths. Arminianism and conspiracy theories have much in common.

Ours is a command faith because our God is the Lord, and He does whatsoever He pleases (Ps. 115:3). What He ordains cannot be undone. The nations or heathens do indeed rage, and the rulers conspire together against God the Lord and His Messiah, but God laughs, and He holds them in derision (Ps. 2:4). We need to share in that heavenly laughter. Instead of trembling at the vain imaginations of man, we need to stand fast in our faith.

Paul has a magnificent answer to all the evils the ungodly perpetrate on God's people. Whatever happens to us, "Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us" (Rom. 8:37). This is an audacious statement. Paul had in mind Roman conquerors, their triumphal entries with many slaves, the gold and other treasures of the conquered people, and their leaders in chains. As against this fact of mighty conquerors, Paul simply states that we are *more* than these conquerors in our victories when we faithfully serve our King. Our King shall reign when Marx, all his followers, and all other tyrants and conspirators are only dim memories and fading lines in history. Our Lord is the great King over all kings.

374

HISTORY'S PURPOSE

Chalcedon Report No. 283, February 1989

John Vertefeuille, in *Sexual Chaos* (Crossway Books, 1988) has some important things to say, among other things, about the future: "Nothing informs the way we live today as much as how we view tomorrow . . . When history has no purposeful beginning, it has no purposeful end. Disconnect ourselves from the future, and life is left without meaning, hope, or purpose. Freedom from the future leads to a hedonism for today" (p. 21).

The humanists of our time believe in neither a purposeful beginning, nor a purposeful end. Life began and "evolved" as an accident, and all will end in universal death. Christians often believe in a purposeful beginning, creation, but, in thinking about the future, they limit its purpose to their salvation. As a result, the world is adrift, because time and history require true faith to have direction.

We are plainly told, "The Lord hath made all things for himself: yea, even the wicked for the day of evil" (Prov. 16:4). We like to think that all things were made for our welfare; we think egocentrically, or humanistically, and as a result we are out of touch with reality, out of touch with God and His purpose.

It was not easy for Job to say, "Though he slay me, yet will I trust in him" (Job 13:15), but it was Job's recognition that only God's purpose is right, and nothing else can prevail.

It must be our purpose to restore God's meaning and direction to life and history.

375

GOD LOVES HIS CREATION

Chalcedon Report No. 321, April 1992

One of my earliest memories is of a woman in the neighborhood who held a home Bible study every Sunday afternoon for men and women. In the early 1920s, women teaching or preaching to men were still uncommon. I knew a little of her because I sometimes played with her son, Jack. I saw just enough of her to become aware of her religious contempt for material things; she acted as though she only ate to live. She lived very well, and, somehow, despite her disdain for food, she was clearly overweight.

What she represented remained in my mind as I grew up, because I encountered more and more people and churches whose "spirituality" did not mean life in the Holy Spirit and His law-word, the Bible, but a Neoplatonic disdain for God's creation. From my earliest years, because I read my Bible from cover to cover constantly, I learned that God rejoices in His creation and that we are to rejoice in it also. It is sin, not matter, that we must separate ourselves from.

Genesis 1:31 tells us that "God saw every thing that he had made, and, behold, it was very good." Our task as His people is to bring all things into captivity to Christ (2 Cor. 10:5), and to use all things to His glory and to rejoice in His creation as He did "When the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy" (Job 38:7).

God made us into physical beings, and we should be grateful for that fact and enjoy it. The final triumph in our salvation is the resurrection of the body (1 Cor. 15:35–37), and we shall live eternally as material creatures of God in a sin-free world.

One of the charges made by the Pharisees against our Lord was because of His obvious relish for life, food, and drink: "The Son of man came eating and drinking, and they say, Behold a man gluttonous, and a winebibber" (Matt. 11:19; Luke 7:34).

Many texts speak with relish of God's presence in all His creation: "The voice of the LORD is upon the waters: the God of glory thundereth: the LORD is upon many waters" (Ps. 29:3).

The new creation, which began with our Lord's resurrection (1 Cor. 15:20), continues with our regeneration, for "if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature [or, a new creation]: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new" (2 Cor. 5:17). With the new creation, we enjoy, free from all sin, our physical and spiritual lives in the Lord.

John Milton, in *Paradise Lost*, with considerable perception, showed Satan watching Adam and Eve in Eden enviously. Satan is a purely spiritual being and yet totally evil. Being nonmaterial makes nothing good. Only godliness, regeneration and then sanctification by obeying every word that proceeds out of the mouth of God (Matt. 4:4), makes a man godly.

It is Manichaeanism, a very ancient and very evil heresy, which is behind such thinking. For Manichaeanism, two equal gods exist; the one is the creator of matter, an evil god who believes in law, justice, and judgment; the good god created the spiritual realm and believes in love, not law.

Increasingly in our time, evidences of Manichaean thinking can be seen in the churches. Churchmen abstract themselves from the world of law and politics; business is seen as a money-grubbing vocation; the body is viewed as an impediment to the spirit when too often with such people it is their thinking and spirituality which is both false and evil.

Together with this false spirituality there goes an idiotic perfectionism. False use is made of Matthew 5:38–42. Judea was under Roman rule; many groups plotted rebellion, confident that God would miraculously deliver His chosen people. Roman law gave military and other officers the legal right to commandeer help in time of need, and to assault ("slap") the offender and draft ("compel") him to transport supplies on order. Our Lord counsels compliance, not foolish resistance as the revolutionists advocated. Too many held to a belief that the world had to be as they wanted it!

A few years ago, I was involved as an expert witness in church and state litigation in many states. Very often, churchmen were as great a problem as state officials. They demanded everything at once! In at least two states, churchmen *rejected* settlements which would only have required attendance reports so that the state would be able to account for its student population. I felt and feel strongly that this is idiotic perfectionism. I wrote a position paper on Mark 4:28, our Lord's statement, "For the earth bringeth forth fruit of herself; first the blade, then the ear,

after that the full corn in the ear." In other words, things do not happen overnight. Growth takes time. The church, having surrendered health, education, and welfare, among other things, to the state can only recapture lost ground a step at a time. In our Lord's words, we cannot sow grain and expect to reap a harvest simultaneously. Only fools expect to do so, and we have too many in the church. (Incidentally, that position paper displeased many!)

God loves His creation. He made it with order, and with a requirement for growth in every sphere. If we despise God's plan and demand miracles to eliminate growth and history, we have no respect for God's order, and we do not receive His blessing, His providential care, nor His miraculous deliverances. We must respect God, His Word, and His creation in order to be blessed by Him.

Roman law, which has increasingly influenced Western law, was abstract and impersonal. God's law is concrete, specific, and personal. In Roman law, the goddess Justice is impersonal and wears a blindfold. God is totally personal and all-seeing; His law is the expression of His being, and to break His law is to offend Him personally. His law is mindful of man, created in His image, and all creation. It deals with sanitation, weights and measures, diet, and more. The only true ecology is a Biblical one. No one loves creation more than God, and His law provides a sane and balanced view of it, unlike that of environmentalists.

The object of our faith is to make us a regenerate people in Jesus Christ, a godly people, not a Neoplatonic spiritual people. We were created in Adam out of the dust of the earth (Gen. 2:7), and we are mortal. By God's grace, at the time of the end, this mortal shall put on immortality (1 Cor. 15:53–54); this literally means that the dying body (mortal comes from *mortis*, as in mortuary) shall put on non-death; it is a "spiritual body" (1 Cor. 15:44) because it is now fully in obedience to and in the life of the Holy Spirit.

God loves His creation; we must love it also as we love Him who made it.

376

CHRISTIAN RECONSTRUCTION

Chalcedon Report No. 1, October 1, 1965

In this first newsletter, instead of a report on activity, I want to discuss the significance of what you, my supporters, are doing.

Most of us know the Renaissance as a period of great art, promoted and sponsored by wealthy patrons who were the kings, dictators, and rulers of that era. That art was the beautiful icing on the Renaissance era: the heart of it lay elsewhere.

For centuries, the church had been the major patron of arts and letters, and a Christian culture had flourished. Emperors and kings very early began to subsidize contemporary thinking with this view. There were clearly religious and philosophical trends pointing towards humanism and statism, but it was the heavy, steady, and long promotion of these things by subsidy that was responsible for the rapid spread and victory of these forces. Europe has been steadily conquered by a rapacious and brutal statism; the Renaissance was a period of showy art, but, behind that façade, it was an era of brutal terror, an era that brought monstrous men to power, some of whom made the Borgias look pale by comparison.

Our age is seeing a similar development. The major and minor foundations have been extensively captured by the forces of humanism and statism, and a new age of terror is developing all around us. Scholarship, arts, and literature are being subsidized to serve the purposes of humanism and statism, and our schools and colleges have been largely captured by these forces, as have been most publishers and periodicals.

This movement has been a long time in developing: it cannot be defeated overnight. It cannot be defeated by short-sighted people who want victory today or tomorrow, and are unwilling to support long-term battle. The future must be won, and shall be won, by a renewal and development of our historic Christian liberty, by an emphasis on the fact: the

basic government is the self-government of the Christian man, and by a recognition that an informed faith is the mainspring of victory. History has *never* been dominated by majorities, but only by dedicated minorities who stand unconditionally on their faith.

What you are doing, in your support of me, is to sponsor a countermeasure to the prevailing trend, to promote by your support, interest, *and* study, a Christian Renaissance, to declare by these measures your belief that the answer to humanism and its statism is Christian faith and liberty. Our choice today is between two claimants to the throne of godhood and universal government: the state, which claims to be our shepherd, keeper, and savior, and the Holy Trinity, our only God and Savior. You have made your choice by both faith and action.

377

HOPE

Chalcedon Report No. 2, October 31, 1965

DURING this past month, in the course of my travels, I spent several hours visiting with an outstanding conservative leader, a man who is a major force in one of our most notable anti-communist organizations. In the first few minutes, he raised the question: "Do you see any hope?" Many ask this same question. I am reminded of the question asked of Adoniram Judson (1788–1850), pioneer American Baptist missionary in Burma. Hostile forces soon succeeded in destroying Judson's mission, his converts, printing press, and his possessions. Judson himself was thrown into a filthy Burmese prison, and, with arrogant humor, asked by a captor, "How are your prospects now?" "As bright as the promises of God," responded Judson, who lived to see those promises fulfilled in the success of his mission. Our prospects are also as bright, if our confidence is in the same omnipotent God.

The revolution of our day rests on certain anti-Christian premises: *First*, it is held that anything goes, because there is no God. No God means no law, and no law means that nothing is a crime, and hence all acts are equally valid. *Second*, by "outlawing" God and declaring Him to be nonexistent, the revolutionaries outlaw the idea of good and evil. They are supposedly beyond good and evil. If good is mythical, then evil is also, and man cannot be evil! Therefore, whatever the world planners do cannot be evil, because evil does not exist: it is simply either a successful scientific experiment, or it is a failure. *Third*, because God is abolished as a myth, the approach to man's problems must be scientific, that is, experimental, and man is thus the prime laboratory test animal. In school, your children are to be objects of experimentation, even as you are also by means of every communication media. There is no evil in such experimentation, since there is no God, but only success or failure.

Fourth, every experiment, to be valid, requires total control of all factors. Hence, the scientific society must be totalitarian to the full measure, or it will not work.

The various phases of this vast attempt to turn the world from God's creation to the scientific planners' re-creation can be documented in detail. It has been done by the volume. The answer, however, is not in facts and knowledge but in a restoration of Christian faith.

Because God is God, and because He will not allow Himself to be dethroned, the scientific planners are doomed. This judgement is a certainty because God cannot allow sin to go unpunished. All sin is either atoned for, or punished. The question is whether we will be among those judged, or among those, the saved remnant, who shall undertake even now *the task of reconstruction*.

378

"THE LORD'S HAND IS NOT SHORTENED, THAT IT CANNOT SAVE"

Chalcedon Report No. 334, May 1993

It is easy to be discouraged about the future by looking at Christians. The ungodly are not so distressing because they are, in every sphere of their lives, radically suicidal. They have no future, nor do they want others to have one, beginning with many unborn babies.

But too many Christians seem to believe that, apart from saving souls, God is unconcerned about His work, *His creation*, and therefore we should be so also. I recall a prominent pastor of a full generation ago who joyfully listed all the bad news on a page of his magazine as "proof" that the world had to end soon with the Lord's return.

Other Christians do concern themselves with the world around them, but pessimistically so. They are not indifferent to the evils of our times, but they have no answer, no hope of victory. For them, the days of God's power and miracles seem to be over.

Isaiah, in 59:1–2, deals with this mentality as he saw it in his day:

> Behold, the LORD's hand is not shortened, that it cannot save; neither his ear heavy, that it cannot hear: But your iniquities have separated between you and your God, and your sins have hid his face from you, that he will not hear.

The Lord God had not grown old, nor had His hand shortened, nor His hearing grown dim. The difference was in the covenant people, not in the covenant God. Isaiah went on to say, "None calleth for justice, nor any pleadeth for truth: they trust in vanity, and speak lies . . ." (Isa. 59:4).

The problem was not then, nor is it now, in God. It is not because we live in a different dispensation or age, but because we are a covenant-breaking, law-despising people that we do not receive God's delivering and prospering grace.

We have a world to conquer for Christ (Matt. 28:18–20), and we are impotent at the task because we have not yet conquered ourselves. We are too often more interested in our entertainment than in God's requirements. To read the Bible and to tithe are too much for us. We seem to prefer the back of God's hand to His blessings.

But "Behold, the Lord's hand is not shortened, that it cannot save." In a brief span of time, only seventy-seven years, I have grown old, but God has not. He is "the same yesterday, and today, and for ever" (Heb. 13:8). To assume change in the triune God is false and insane thinking. He tells us, "I am the Lord, I change not" (Mal. 3:6). The God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, of David, Daniel, and the apostles, He rules still, and His counsel alone prevails.

Must we, like lemmings, join the suicidal world of the ungodly?

In our time, a variety of things like pain, poverty, and death have replaced sin as the greatest evil, and as a result the faith has been sentimentalized and warped. We have refused to believe, as our forefathers did, that life can be "a vale of tears" and a place of much tribulation, but many of them, by their perseverance and conquest, made it also a place of victory, for "this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith" (1 John 5:4).

Who is on the Lord's side? Let him prepare for victory. "The Lord's hand is not shortened, that it cannot save," and the Hebrew word for *save* means free, avenge, rescue, and get *victory*.

379

"I AM THE DOOR"

Chalcedon Report No. 177, May 1980

One of our Chalcedon friends remarked, not too long ago, that Jesus said, "I am the door" (John 10:9); He did not say, "I am the doormat"! All too many churchmen seem to believe that what Jesus actually said was, Father, I am the doormat. They further assume that true piety means making ourselves into doormats. As a result, they counsel an implicit pacifism, surrender, and a continual subservience to every evil that comes along.

As a result, we see today persecuted pastors, Christian school teachers, and parents facing a double assault, from humanistic statists on the one hand, and compromising churchmen on the other. These churchmen who counsel meek submission to statism and humanism are anything but meek in facing their persecuted brethren! Then they are indeed bold and vocal.

If Christ is indeed the door, as we believe He is, He is the door to salvation, to freedom, to power over the forces of darkness (including humanism and statism), and to victory. Doormat Churchianity is not Christianity. John says emphatically, "For whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world: and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith" (1 John 5:4). Victory is a condition of our new creation. To counsel surrender and defeat is to counsel a form of unbelief.

380

SECULARISM

Chalcedon Report No. 219, October 1983

Discussions of secularism are complicated by the fact that the word has two major meanings. *First*, secular means *lay* as opposed to the *clergy*. Secular humanism is the religious practice of humanism by laymen. The application of humanism by school teachers, legislators, and judges is secular humanism. Its application in churches by the clergy is clerical humanism.

Our conflict in the courts and in the world at large is with secular humanism. It is the religious force present in newspapers, television, the world of labor and capital, the arts and sciences, and elsewhere as well. Secular humanism is a major and powerful force on every continent and in virtually every nation in the world.

But, *second*, secular means of the world, profane, and not sacred or religious. Secularism in this sense is a matter of recent history, although it has deep roots; only in the modern era has this kind of secularism commanded society.

In earlier eras, all things were seen as religious by Biblical and non-Biblical faiths. The sacred governs the totality of life, and to regard any area of life as secular was profane and evil. St. Paul is clear on this point: "whatsoever is not of faith is sin" (Rom. 14:23). In this sense, to make anything secular is to diminish our view of God and to sin. Since God created all things, governs all things, and sustains all things, to regard anything or any area of life as outside His law-word and government is to be guilty of profanity and to sin. God's rule is total, and to declare anything or any area of life and thought *secular* means that men claim that area as one reserved to human sovereignty and law.

The roots of secularism in this sense go back to Neoplatonism at least. Elements of this entered into the church and colored the monastic

movement. Successive reforms within the monastic movement placed the monks into the context of the world, however. Late medieval reform movements and mysticism stressed a withdrawal from the world as secular, as did some major strands of Anabaptism.

However, it was only after 1660 and with the rise of Pietism that this movement into secularism began to command Christendom, Catholic and Protestant. The pietists began to withdraw from politics, economics, the arts and sciences, education, intellectual pursuits (even rejecting an emphasis on doctrine as "arid" intellectualism), and to stress pious gush and "spiritual exercises" as the essence as well as the fullness of the faith.

All concerns over political order, social problems, and intellectual pursuits were seen as worldly; all were declared secular by deliberate choice. God was limited to the narrow world of inner experience. As a result, antinomianism triumphed. In the first half of the eighteenth century, the pastor of the French Church at The Hague, Jacques (or James) Saurin preached powerfully against this trend. By 1800, however, the pietists had so triumphed that Saurin's name in religious encyclopedias is still blackened by their hostility and one of the great theologians of the pulpit goes neglected.

The doctrine of sin was thus radically altered. William Wilberforce, in *A Practical View of the Prevailing Religious System of Professed Christians . . . Contrasted with Real Christianity* (1797), wrote: "Sin is considered in Scripture as rebellion against the sovereignty of God, and every different act of it equally violates his law, and if persevered in, disclaims his supremacy" (p. 223). Sin now came to be defined in terms of pietistic spirituality, not the Lord and His Word.

Secularism in this second sense limits the realm of God and of the sacred. It surrenders most of the world and life to the devil and reserves only a small corner for God. This kind of secularism began in the church and still prevails in much of the church. The church found the world happy to receive this release from the government of God.

The devotees of this perversion of the faith actually warn Christians against "worldliness," i.e., involvement in politics, art, intellectual and scientific disciplines, and so on. *One* natural consequence of this is antinomianism: God's law *requires* us to act in relationship to the world in terms of God's holy purposes. The law is thus discarded as a lesser and worldly matter. A *second* consequence is a disregard for the Old Testament and a misreading of the New. The prophets are read in abstraction from the controversy with the state or civil government of their day, and in abstraction from the false concepts of economics and justice which the prophets attacked.

To be *profane* is literally to be outside the Temple, or outside the faith. Secularism in this second sense places most of the world outside of God's province. We must add, however, that nothing can be nor is more secular, or, *more profane*, than a church or churchmen who places most of the world outside of Christian faith and concern, and outside of the government of God and His world. This is the ultimate profanity, and it is all too common.

381

STOICISM

Chalcedon Report No. 334, May 1993

Stoicism is an ancient Greek philosophy from the fourth century B.C. which still has an influence on us today. Stoicism has been given varying emphases, but its essential meaning is a radical naturalism. Its three areas of concern were physics, logic, and ethics or morality. Some Stoics were religious in their emphasis, others cynical, but the gap between them was not great.

Their physics was a stress on the natural world as the only real world. Therefore, conformity with nature was their goal. Rationality meant the acceptance of the natural order as definitive, ultimate, and determinative. The moral is that which conforms to the natural.

There were Stoic thinkers, like the emperor Marcus Aurelius, who sought to find nobility and order in the natural world, but all Stoicism was heavily fatalistic. To conform with the natural was to be moral. If this world gave you troubles and unremitting evil, you accepted it as also the moral. Whatever is was seen as the right, and the philosopher lives with that reality. Marcus Aurelius regarded clemency as the evidence of true morality; this meant, you do not judge, interfere, or condemn. Life according to nature meant that one did not interfere to correct or condemn if at all possible. As a ruler, this was not entirely possible for Marcus Aurelius. He did have a belief in a divine reason in nature, but that divine reason had no law whereby men were to be judged. Divine reason was simply reason and logic, not a moral law. He was a follower of Plato's thinking that philosopher-kings, not a higher law, should govern men and nations. His cyclical view of history led to his belief that change is superficial, not real.

The thinking of Marcus Aurelius was not unlike that of a man who came centuries later, at the time of the French Revolution, the Marquis

de Sade. They differed in that, for Marcus Aurelius, the life according to nature meant a retreat in reason and thought, whereas for Sade, the natural was total sexual freedom. Not surprisingly, the son of Marcus Aurelius was the emperor Commodus (A.D. 161–192), a Roman Sade. Commodus as emperor could do what Sade could not; being an emperor, he could afford a double harem of three hundred boys and three hundred women. (His mistake was that one, Marcia, was a Christian, and she had him assassinated.) A coin of Commodus' reign declared, "Under the reign of Commodus the world experiences an age of blessing." The "blessing" was the radical contempt for morality that a life according to nature means.

A life according to nature can mean the quiet thinking of Marcus Aurelius, or the active immoralism of Commodus and the Marquis de Sade. In either case, it is passive towards active moral reform in terms of a supernatural law. Not surprisingly, Stoicism has been the philosophy of choice with those unwilling to work for the moral reformation of the world in terms of God's law.

Stoicism is a form of moral pacificism, a belief that no moral progress is possible. Its inroads into the church in the twentieth century have been extensive. Tied to eschatologies of defeat, Stoic "Christianity" waits for the rapture rather than seeking to make the world God's Kingdom.

One of the most common expressions of "Christian stoicism" asks people to suffer for Christ's sake when in fact they should be working and fighting against evil for Christ. (Once when I was faced with very evil forces, a prominent pastor, a kindly man whom I could never dislike, told Dorothy that I should surrender and suffer "as He did on the cross." Christ's passion brought us atonement, and no man's suffering can add to His atonement for us. Such talk is blasphemy, but it is also common.)

For men to adopt a Stoic retreatism leads to victimhood, and there is no holiness in allowing ourselves to be victimized!

But, in our time, in and out of the church, the Stoic mentality is all too much in evidence. Many popular expressions witness to the Stoicism of our time, e.g., "don't make waves," "go with the flow," and so on. Americans were once anything but passive, but, with the spread, among Christians and non-Christians, of a Stoic attitude, they have too often been passive and even wimpish.

But victimhood is not holiness but cowardice or retreat. The idea that there is virtue in making ourselves victims is an evil one. In the early church, *at times* the Stoic temperament of some converts led them to court martyrdom, as though it were a merit to do so. We see this attitude in too many of those who take part in Operation Rescue demonstrations.

In Matthew 10, however, our Lord warns His disciples against courting needless hostilities. If they were not heard, they were to move on (Matt. 10:14). They were not to waste words nor time. Saint Cyprian, who himself died a martyr, still rebuked Christians of his day who sought to make demonstrations against evil. His mandate to them was simple and direct: "Not demonstrations but profession." They were to show their faith in their lives and action; they could not change things by vain demonstrations.

Neither Stoic passivity nor aggressive demonstrations can alter the fact that men need rather the saving power of Christ. Christian action is positive, not negative. It is reconstructive, not demonstrative. Stoics have always been losers. Our calling is to victory.

(Debts must be acknowledged. My Dorothy and Grayce Flanagan were having tea earlier today and, as usual, discussing things great and small. As I stopped briefly, Grayce asked a telling question about "Christian" Stoics today, an original insight with her, and here is the result.)

382

AMATEUR CHRISTIANITY

Chalcedon Report No. 193, September 1981

I was once going by a tennis court I passed from time to time, and I overheard an argument. One young man was objecting to a too faithful following of the rules, which meant that he had lost a game. "Look," he protested, "we don't have to be that particular! We're not pros!" On another occasion as I walked by, one young man made an especially bad play, and his friends on the sidelines teased him. He called back, "I'm just protecting my amateur status!"

I thought of these incidents today when I received a long letter from someone who is not on our mailing list. A friend had given him one or two *Chalcedon Reports* to read, hoping to interest him. He was writing to me to tell me why he could not be interested. We were not "relevant." What did he mean by relevant? We were asking too much of people. He said he had seen one of my books previously, so he knew whereof he spoke. You must talk, he advised, to people on their level and not expect too much of them. He was as good a Christian as any, better, to judge by his bragging, and he knew that maybe in heaven everybody would be totally faithful, but, in this life, getting them saved, and getting a trifle more out of them, was enough. Relevant Christian work has to begin where people are and move them an inch or two ahead. After all, he said, progress in history is by inches.

This man was trying to protect his amateur status as a Christian! He was saying, in effect, don't expect too much out of me, or anyone else. We can't be proficient, professional, full-time Christians, only amateur part-time "Christians" (if such is possible).

The trouble with that argument is that God does not "buy" it. From beginning to end, the Bible makes it clear that the Lord requires a total obedience, and that, having given us His covenant grace and law, and

climaxed it with the gift of the Spirit, He expects great things from us. The Lord does not call amateur Christians, only full-time professional ones. Nothing is more ridiculous than the idea of many that "full-time Christian service" means the mission field, a pastorate, or some like calling. We are all, whatever we are or wherever we are, called to a full-time Christian life and service.

Trying to protect our amateur status as Christians is like trying to protect our reprobation.

All the same, many churchmen have tried to make "amateur Christianity" into a standard. One leader of a generation ago, and the founder of a seminary, wrote: "To impose a need to surrender the life to God as an added condition of salvation is most unreasonable." Another man has gone even further, stating that, once you say "Yes" to Jesus, He is bound eternally by a contract to save you: you can "commit every sin in the Bible, plus all the others, but there is just *no way* you can go to Hell!" (see A. ten Pas, *The Lordship of Christ* [Vallecito, CA: Ross House Books], pp. 13, 19–20, for a critique of these and many more like statements).

Man is created in the image of God, in knowledge, righteousness, holiness, and with dominion (Gen. 1:26; Eph. 4:24; Col. 3:10). Our standard of relevancy cannot be man as he makes himself, but man as God made him. Man is "fearfully and wonderfully made" (Ps. 139:14). He was created to be God's dominion man over all the world, and to rule it according to God's law. To diminish man's responsibility and calling, to reduce God's law to a few vague moral precepts, and to set a minimum standard of faithfulness is evil. We cannot minimize God's law and calling. The one thing we cannot be as Christians is amateurs: it is a total calling.

However, nothing more clearly marks the modern church than a reduction of faith from God's supernatural act in us to our easy believism and casual disobedience. Early in the last century, one famous man, on his deathbed, remarked easily, when asked to repent for his many sins, "God will forgive me: That's His business."

Protestants, quick to criticize the sorry medieval doctrine of indulgences, have fashioned their own doctrine of indulgences: accept Christ, and then you are safe; if you sin, He'll have to forgive you. Easy believism offers great benefits if you buy the policy, but it delivers nothing but reprobation.

Amateur Christianity is not Christianity but a modern version of Phariseeism. Paul well describes it as "having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away" (2 Tim. 3:5). The road to hell is lined with amateur Christians.

Pick up your Bible, and take a good, studied look at the road signs!

383

THE RETREAT OF THEOLOGY

Chalcedon Report No. 152, April 1978

One of the disasters of the modern age is the retreat of theology into a narrow discipline having to do with very limited doctrines relative to the Christian synagogue or church. The roots of this retreat are very old, and evidences of it appear from the early days of church history, but never has it been more radical and thorough than now.

What is theology? Perhaps the simplest way to define it is to go to a dictionary definition. Noah Webster, in the 1828 first edition of his *Dictionary*, defined theology as that form of knowledge "which teaches the existence, character and attributes of God, his laws and government, the doctrines we are to believe, and the duties we are to practice." Now, since God is Creator of all things, and governs all things, and since there is no area of life outside of God and outside our duty to Him, it is clear that theology, the declaration of the Word of God and its meaning, must govern every area of life and thought. Our Biblical and systematic theology must set forth the requirements and implications of Scripture for the total life of man and for all of creation.

Theology is thus more than an ecclesiastical discipline. It is basic to all of life and learning. It was theology which began the university by setting forth the fact of the one (and triune) God, one universe of law and meaning, and the one faith as the key to its meaning. Paganism had usually a polytheistic faith and believed in a multiverse: no development of science was possible without a belief in the unity of creation and common laws. Some forms of paganism held to a unity of the cosmos, but their lack of a Biblical theism led them to view that cosmos as blind necessity and meaningless. Biblical theology made knowledge flourish because it held to a unified and cosmic field of meaning; as a result, the university was born.

With the rise of humanism, this faith has faltered and is waning. Clark

Kerr, then president of the University of California, in the 1950s called for a change of the university into a multiversity. In such a cosmos, all things are possible except God, truth, and meaning. As a result of such thinking, the academic community has become less and less relevant to life as man must live it and more and more productive of chaos.

Theology must speak to the whole of life. A theology which becomes an ecclesiastical discipline, and no more, denies the doctrine of creation and God's sovereignty. It treats the God of Scripture as no more than a Greek god, governing a limited community and territory, and a small cult. The theologies of the churches today are thus implicitly polytheistic and anti-Biblical.

Theology must speak to the whole of life, because God is the Creator and Lord of all things. The theology of politics must be developed, or we will have anti-Christian politics. Law has to do with good and evil, right and wrong, and nothing can be more essentially theological than this. For a theology to neglect law means to neglect the Bible and the God of the Bible.

Education means indoctrination into a way of life and the skills thereof. This means religion, and this means that, unless Christian theology governs education, our education will teach humanism or some other religion. We are today under God's curse and judgement, because we have treasonably given our children over to another faith and school. We are, together with our children, God's property, and we dare not make ourselves the possession of humanism and its schools. To do so is treason, and it is sin.

The arts and sciences are all to be under God's Word and informed by God's interpretations of all things as set forth in His Word. We cannot have, in any area, any ultimate or basic authority other than God. If the world is not God's creation, then it is ultimately meaningless, and all our learning, our arts and sciences, are a veneer on the cosmic surd. But if God is God, Creator and Lord, we cannot begin on any other foundation than that faith without ending in contradictions and absurdity.

Our vocations must be theologically governed; we must be concerned with exercising dominion, extending knowledge, righteousness, and holiness, and acting as God's priests, prophets, and kings over every area of life and thought. A theology silent about such things will be in due time silenced and judged by God.

Theology thus must assert the crown rights of Christ the King over every area of life and thought. It must set forth and clarify God's command word, the Bible, in order to arm men for action. The Bible is not a devotional manual nor an inspirational book, but a command word for

the army of God. To reduce theology to an academic or an ecclesiastical matter is to deny the God of Scripture.

If the god of our theology is merely the god of our imagination, we can confine him within the walls of the classroom and the church building, and have all kinds of room left over. But, if He be the living God, then our theology will burst at the seams as it sets forth the universal commands and demands of God the Lord.

Moreover, a theology of the living God will be a theology of joy, victory, and confidence. Our Lord declares, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. Amen." (Matt. 28:18–20).

Christ is both born and risen from the dead as victor over sin and death, King of kings, and Lord of lords. He is our Immanuel, God with us. Let His enemies tremble.

This is theology, to be taught, proclaimed, and the ground of action to victory.

384

GOD IS NOT QUEEN VICTORIA

Chalcedon Report No. 324, July 1992

We live in a time when a wide variety of serious problems mark all the world: economic troubles, the rise of various diseases and epidemics, pornography, abortion, euthanasia, cults and rival religions, and much, much more. The grimmest fact is the irrelevance of most churches and church members in the face of all this. The response of some is to say, "No cause for worry or action; the 'rapture' will rescue us any day." Of others, it is, "Things *must* get worse and worse before the end, so live with it."

At the same time, the plainspoken Word of God is replaced in too many pulpits and pews with mush and pabulum. Mush-head religion has replaced the Word of God.

I routinely receive letters complaining about the plain statements of our writers as harsh and "un-Christian." Others insist on unconditional love as the Biblical faith; this is monstrous, because our faith is *covenantal*, and God's covenant is a treaty, literally, which is both grace and law and is conditional upon covenant faithfulness. The Bible is full of promises of judgment on covenant-breakers.

Moreover, the Bible is not a *nice* book: it was not written for a Queen Victoria but for sinners, both lost and saved sinners, to set forth plainly God's Word. That plain word spares none of us: it tells the truth about God, and about us.

No translation fully or plainly gives us the clear bluntness of God's language. Two-thirds of all our Lord's words on earth are denunciations and sharp condemnations. St. Paul minced no words in Galatians 5:12; even the New English Bible is unwilling to be clear here, although closer than most. It translates the verse thus: "As for those agitators, they had better go the whole way and make eunuchs of themselves!" or, as one

commentator made clear, Paul says they should go the whole way and castrate themselves. In Philippians 3:2–3, Paul calls his enemies, who were perverting the gospel, "dogs." This is not nice language, nor would it suit the Victorians of our modern churches.

But this is not all. The prophets often used very plain language, as witness Isaiah 36:12 and Jeremiah 8:2. But the Lord God Himself is even more blunt, as witness Malachi 2:3: "Behold, I will corrupt your seed, and spread dung upon your faces . . ." Some modern versions are not as honest as the Authorized Version and translate what is given in the Authorized Version with the old fashioned word "dung" as "filth." But God was actually much more blunt; after all, He is not a Queen Victoria! (Queen Victoria was glad to welcome Darwin's theory because it relieved her of the necessity of believing much of the Bible, especially the Old Testament!)

We have now a generation of churchmen, in pulpit and pew, who are closer to Queen Victoria than to the triune God. They want to soft-pedal and mute everything that God says. (Some years ago, a woman who was a member of a major church expressed her dislike of the organist's fondness for Johann Sebastian Bach because Bach, she said, is "too loud!") Well, God speaks loudly and plainly in all His word so that sinners may be shaken out of their complacency. The superpious may not like plain-speaking; they may want only sweetness and light, and the comforting passages of Scripture. They are then not listening to God any more than the child who is deaf when summoned to his duties, but quick to hear that chocolate is available to him.

In the old Church of England in the sixteenth century, in its *The Book of Homilies*, there are, in the first book, two sermons on "Of the Misery of All Mankind." The first concludes with these powerful words:

> And our Saviour Christ saith *there is none good but God* and that *we can do nothing* that is good *without him*, nor *no man can come to the Father but by him*. He commandeth us all to say that *we be unprofitable servants, when we have done all that we can do*. He preferreth the penitent Publican before the proud, holy, and glorious Pharisee. He calleth himself *a Physician, but not to them that be whole, but to them that be sick*, and have need of his salve for their sore. He teacheth us in our prayers to reknowledge ourselves sinners, and to ask forgiveness and deliverance from all evils at our heavenly Father's hand. He declareth that the sins of our hearts do defile our own selves. He teacheth that an evil word or thought deserveth condemnation, affirming that *we shall give account for every idle word*. He saith *he came to save but the sheep that were* utterly *lost* and cast away. Therefore few of pious, just, learned, wise, perfect, and holy Pharisees were saved by him; because they

> justified themselves by their counterfeit holiness before men. Wherefore, good people, let us beware of such hypocrisy, vainglory, and justifying of ourselves. Let us look upon our feet; and then down peacock's feathers, down proud heart, down vile clay, frail and brittle vessels.

All too many people who claim to believe the Bible from cover to cover neither know it, nor obey it. To read it in all its fullness would mean a long, blunt confrontation with the Almighty. He is far more blunt and plainspoken than men, and also far more merciful, and we are not allowed to choose between God's wrath and His grace. The option is not ours. Therefore, "down peacock's feathers, proud heart, down vile clay, frail and brittle vessels." God the Lord, the living God, is not a Queen Victoria.

385

"A VAGRANT LIBERTY?"

Chalcedon Report No. 345, April 1994

St. Augustine, in his *Confessions*, speaks of "loving a vagrant liberty" (bk. 3, 5). As a boy, and then as a man, he wanted a lawless freedom. He "had no inducement to evil but the evil itself. I was foul, and I loved it. I loved to perish" (bk. 2, 9). St. Augustine was converted when God brought to his being the clear awareness of his rebellion against God and His law. He then ceased from a desire for a vagrant liberty *from* God, a lawless life, and sought instead the perfect law of liberty under God and Christ.

Augustine's conversion meant far more than settling the question of whether or not he would go to heaven. It was a confrontation with his intense desire to retain his independence from God. When Augustine became converted, he became commanded by the Lord, and gladly so.

His was a God-centered conversion. Modern revivalism seeks a man-centered conversion: its emphasis is on man's deliverance, not on God's calling and demands. Something is wrong when "saved" men make no difference to their world, when millions are "saved" in a few decades, and nothing changes, except for the worse. To be saved means to become a member of Christ's new humanity and a servant of His Kingdom. Can His church truly grow and become weaker?

"Faith" can make us feel better, and it can give us peace of mind, but unless faith can also make us faithful in the Lord's service, it is a questionable thing. I am dubious about converts who have songs in their heart and bad words in their mouths for a godly pastor. We are not called to "a vagrant liberty," but saved from it into God's service. Godly criticism is needed, but our conversion does not qualify us as instant judges! We need to place ourselves and others under the Word of God.

Augustine's conversion began with the summons to *read* God's Word, to master it and use it. We will know ourselves, and those around us

better if we begin our Christian life with a thorough reading of the Bible. It will enable us to make a better judgment of things, *most of all ourselves*!

Remember, the Bible will redirect your thinking. J. Gresham Machen, in *Christianity and Liberalism*, defined paganism thus: "Paganism is that view of life which finds the highest goal of human existence in the healthy and harmonious and joyous development of existing human faculties" (p. 65). Sadly, this is too often the definition of Christianity for too many people.

Let us begin with the Word of God. Then you and I and all others can move in the glorious liberty of the sons of God, effective in His service and powerful in His Spirit.

386

PRAYING FOR THE IMPOTENT

Chalcedon Report No. 269, December 1987

Recently, on a flight back to California from the other end of the United States, the woman seated next to me started a conversation. On learning that I was a Christian, she identified herself as one. She has a high position with a Christian organization which receives as much as $100 million a year, promotes itself greatly, cheapens the gospel, and is very well known.

She told me that the great evil in the church today is lordship and dominion preaching! She felt that an international conference should be called to deal with it. I told her that I felt lordship and dominion are basic to the Bible: the most common term for God in the Old Testament is "Lord," and the most common term applied to Jesus in the New Testament is also "Lord."

She held that lordship teaching puts a "burden" on believers and a block to "accepting Christ." She said that many or most "converts" she knew in their ministry "accepted Christ to escape hell." I questioned their salvation.

She insisted that salvation means simply being saved from hell. I said salvation is from sin and guilt to health, victory, and power in Christ.

She said that most "converts" she knew were weak and dominion was impossible for them. Many were still on drugs, in one case after thirteen years. I said that such powerlessness is not a mark of the saved.

I went into the meaning of salvation and told her that her view reduced our Lord to "a fire and life insurance agent." She greeted that term as a marvelous description of Jesus!

When I described her view as humanism, and as treating the Lord as a resource, she moved to another seat a few rows away.

Is it any wonder that so many churches are powerless? Later, in the

same week, a couple from the Northwest visited my home. They are two of the seven active Christian Reconstructionists in their city. Those seven are a strong force for the faith in several spheres, so much so that churches with great numbers of members are now preaching against the threat of reconstructionism and dominion! The pastor of a major "Bible-believing" church objected to the use of the Lord's Great Commission (Matt. 28:18–20) because "it sounds too postmillennial"!

The rage of the impotent should not trouble us. Rather, we need to pray that they know Jesus as Lord and Savior, and that they know Him as the power of God unto salvation in every sphere.

387

OUR ACTS

Chalcedon Report No. 349, August 1994

In 1945, Roger Babson and Dudley Zuver wrote a book entitled, *Can These Bones Live?* Their purpose was to call attention to the need for restoring religion to the churches, *true faith*. They pointed out that, "Religion is the organic aspect of any human society." If it is missing, it is supplanted by idealism, "a spurious and illusory form of religion. For idealism is at once an expression of human egotism and of human impotence" (p. 17). Rhetoric, i.e., the rhetoric of idealism, cannot "bring the perfect state into being" (p. 18).

Today we see idealism in its corruption, full of rhetoric but without grace. We see evil abounding and every solution proposed except the Lord's grace and His saving power. The rhetoric of humanism grows more eloquent while the world stumbles from one disaster to another and greater one.

The church has a mission to such a world, and this requires the proclamation of the full Word of God. What its message must be was indicated by Samuel G. Craig in *Christianity Rightly So Called* (1946) when he noted that Luke's intention in his book, Acts, was to describe *the acts of the risen Christ*. Luke saw Christ fully at work in and through His apostles. This is the key. If we see the church as an institution circa twenty centuries down the road from Jesus Christ, we will have a weak and diluted faith. If we see Him as the very present Lord commanding us *now* by His Word and by His Spirit, we will have an immediacy and a power. We are then not merely listeners but people awaiting marching orders from the King of kings.

Craig called attention to the fact that there are really only two doctrines of salvation. *First*, the natural or humanistic view holds that man must and can save himself and his world. *Second*, the Biblical doctrine

is that only God can save man, and He does this through Jesus Christ. Salvation is thus by a power outside of us and beyond us. It is the power of God.

Now, if God comes into our world, and into our own lives, to save us, is it not blasphemy to assume that He is then finished with us? Is it not necessary to recognize that He is ready to empower us to carry on the apostolic task of bringing everything into captivity to God in Christ? We are commanded, "Go ye unto all the world" (Matt. 28:18–20), and this means we are to assert the crown rights of our King in all spheres. To coexist with an evil world is to acknowledge failure: we have a duty to convert it.

We must therefore ask ourselves continually, "What more can we do?" James summarized it well: "faith without works is dead" (James 2:20, 26).

388

ARE YOU ASTONISHING?[1]

Chalcedon Report No. 295, February 1990

St. Peter's first letter was written to believers whom he called "strangers" or sojourners "throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia" (1 Pet. 1:1). Before their conversion, they had been drunks and spendthrifts, idolatrous and lascivious men. Now people were surprised by their conduct.

"They think it strange that ye run not with them to the same excess of riot, speaking evil of you" (1 Pet. 4:4). The Greek word (*xenizo*) translated as "strange" can also be rendered as "astonished" or "surprised."

Thus, Peter tells us, *first*, that the changed life of the new Christians seemed strange or surprising to their friends and neighbors. It came as a shock to them that these recently wild men were now so different. *Second*, instead of being happy about it, these men spoke evil of the new Christians. The godliness of the convert does not please the ungodly; instead, it creates resentment.

But notice this important fact: they could see the difference, whether they liked it or not! When I was in high school, a prominent California pastor died suddenly of a heart attack, and there was a newspaper account of his career the next day. One shocked reader was a man who worked in the mountains above us in the spring as a guide for trout fishermen, and on the lakes in the summer. He said, "I've taken him fishing for years, and I never knew he was a minister!" That was perhaps the saddest obituary I ever heard.

If people cannot see a difference in our lives, then something is wrong. Peter was happy that the people to whom he wrote were astonishing people, and also upsetting them apparently, because of the difference in their

1. This article was previously untitled. — editor

lives. If Jesus Christ does not make a difference in our lives, it is because He is not there. Your mirror will only reflect your face; your actions will reflect the presence of someone else, if He is there. Who is there in your actions?

389

WHAT IS MAN?

Chalcedon Report No. 351, October 1994

The two great facts about man stressed by the Bible are that, *first*, man is made in the image of God, in knowledge, righteousness, and holiness, with dominion over the creatures (Gen. 1:26; Eph. 4:24; Col. 3:10). *Second*, man is now a fallen creature whose original and essential sin is to be his own god, determining good and evil, law and morality, for himself (Gen. 3:5).

Now as never before, man is at war with these facts because he is at war with God. A non-Christian writer, Loren Baritz, in *The Good Life* (1989), cited the new view of mankind which has become prevalent since World War II: "*Playboy*'s world offered a single, simple message: women, like men, are in eternal and overpowering heat, live truly only through their genitals, and those who pretend otherwise merely play games designed to add fleeting and delicious preparatory tension to their inevitable surrender. The activating principle of life is female lust, providing everyman relief from a groin in flames" (p. 190). I have heard even more graphic statements of human nature. Given the prevalence of Darwinism, this should not surprise us, although it does an injustice to the animals!

Not only man but all things else must be redefined in terms of the triune God. Psalm 8 gives us a magnificent view of God's definition of man.

The Westminster Catechism gives priority to *knowledge* in citing Scripture's definition of man. The sad fact is that Christians have been very negligent in furthering knowledge, Christian scholarship. Man deforms himself when he neglects knowledge. Over the centuries, the great champions of the faith have been men of knowledge, men dedicated to learning. It is to be hoped that the Christian school and homeschool movements will restore knowledge to its proper place.

Righteousness or *justice* is basic to the image of God in man. Men

in Christ are those who hunger and thirst after righteousness or justice (Matt. 5:6). God's law is the law of justice, and the redeemed of God love His law (Ps. 119) and delight in it, because the triumph of God's justice is essential to His Kingdom. Fallen man does not want justice. If the Christian neglects God's law, there will be no justice.

Holiness means separation *from* sin *into* a total service to the Lord. Because God is holy, His people must be holy. The *Playboy* definition of man sees him as separated to sex and consumed by it; we can call this the *Playboy* doctrine of separation.

Dominion is basic also to the image of God in man. We are called to exercise dominion and to subdue the earth, to make this world the Kingdom of God. The Garden of Eden was a pilot project in dominion, and man failed the test. Now the redeemed men in Christ have a calling to bring all the world under Christ's dominion and under His kingly rule.

Our restored image in Christ gives us a new direction, life rather than death (Prov. 8:34–36). Christ's people are the people of life because He is life (John 14:6).

To be in Christ is to be in the restored image of God, the people of life and victory, not of death. The restored image of God in the believer means that he belongs to the triumphant Kingdom of God the King.

Knowledge, righteousness or justice, holiness, and dominion, this is our nature and also our calling.

390

MAN'S CREATION AND DOMINION

Chalcedon Report No. 430, May 2001

WHAT was God's purpose in creating man? David answers this question, but much earlier God, in Genesis 1:26, tells us that it is dominion, and David, in Psalm 8:6ff., restates this, saying, "Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands; thou has put all things under his feet." What God and His Word state so emphatically should be basic to the church's ministry, but it is not. In fact, one important observer has said that only Chalcedon holds to and teaches dominion theology. But David sees this dominion calling of man as a basic aspect of being "crowned . . . with glory and honor" (v. 5).

The church in the main has lost its dominion mandate and calling. As a result, instead of being the source of the world's culture, the church is a shallow reflection of humanistic culture, man-centered and not God-centered. As Psalm 8:2 makes clear, our calling and our purpose should be to "still the enemy and the avenger."

God created man to exercise dominion and to subdue the earth under Him (Gen. 1:26). When man fell into sin, God chose a people and commissioned them to this same task (Josh. 1:1ff.). But Israel failed and was replaced by the church, which was commissioned to the same task (Matt. 28:19–20). The church now, instead of wanting victory and dominion in the face of tribulation, wants rather to be raptured out of it. Will not God give rather tribulation than rapture to such a people? Should they not tremble before God and change their ways?

A strong people of God are told that the Lord even ordains strength "out of the mouth of babes and sucklings" which "still the enemy and the avenger" (Ps. 8:2). Now the mouths of famous preachers ordain weakness and retreat.

The dominion God promises to His people is total: it applies to every

sphere. The mark of God's being is absolute dominion, and this is His promise to His people.

The Lord's Prayer is, in essence, a prayer for dominion: "Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven" (Matt. 6:10). For most churchmen, the use of the Lord's Prayer is a "vain repetition" rather than marching orders. Too many churches need to pray, "God have mercy on us, for we have neither prayed nor lived as we should."

We must seek God's dominion over ourselves and our world with all our heart, mind, and being. We must recognize that no church is truly Bible-believing if it rejects God's dominion and our calling in Him to bring all things under His dominion, beginning with ourselves.

A BLOCKED OR OPEN FUTURE?

An Address by Rousas John Rushdoony at
the 1972 Chalcedon Guild Dinner
Chalcedon Report No. 88, December 1972

Some time ago I cited to some of you the results of an investigation made of hospital patients. The investigation showed that there was a very high correlation between the recovery rate in hospitals of people seriously ill and their plans for the future. If they were thinking ahead of things they intended to do, a month, a year, two years hence, their life expectancy was very good. If they had no plans for the future and were simply content to live for the moment, their life expectancy was poor. It made a difference, in other words, whether or not the patients were future-oriented. Men with vision for the future, lived for that future.

I think the point is a very obvious one. Consider the difference it would make to the United States if instead of forty million or so premillennials, we had forty million postmillennials. Instead of having forty million people who expect that the world is going to end very soon and that they are going to be raptured out of tribulation, consider the difference it would make if those forty million instead felt that they had a duty under God to conquer in Christ's name.

Just to cite the comparison makes it obvious what a difference eschatology makes. Because man is a creature created in the image of God, he is not chained to the moment. *Physically*, of course, he is; physically every man is bound to the moment — to the second — we cannot step backward in time. We cannot choose to be ten years younger in order to relive a key point in our life, nor can we jump ahead in time and say, "We have a problem here, and we would like to go to the future *beyond* this crisis." For God all things are present because God is not bound by time. Because God is the Eternal One, He sees the beginning and the end; the whole of

Creation from the first atom, on the first day of creation, to the very end of all time is open before God as clearly as the table is in front of you.

Man, having been created in the image of God, is intellectually able to do what God does eternally. Man can move backwards and forwards intellectually. We can, through our minds, turn back the clock, analyze past history, and profit by it. We are able, very definitely, to study all of the past, and profit by it, to understand it, and we are just as able to think ahead, to visualize the future under God and, in terms of God and His Word, to see the future as in a glass, darkly. Even men without faith are not chained to the moment. Though they are without faith, they can visualize things in the future and work for them, and plan and achieve certain things. Man is a creature who, while physically bound to the moment, intellectually and spiritually can range all over history, past and present. It is this aspect that marks man as having been created in the image of God, who as the Eternal One sees the beginning and the end; all things are naked and open before His sight. It is this which no other creature has.

Animals have a great deal of intelligence, far more than we sometimes recognize. Anyone who has a pet knows how very often those pets are startling in their intelligence. Dorothy and I must spell certain words around our dog because she understands, and sometimes she learns to pick up those words that we are spelling and to know what we are spelling. I believe that animals spoke in the Garden of Eden. I think we underrate animals greatly, and St. Paul tells us in Romans 8:19–23 that the animal creation itself longs and travails for the glorious liberty of the sons of God. They look forward to enjoying the New Creation with us.

But a characteristic that separates the animals from us is their inability to plan, their inability to think of past *and* future. They are bound to the moment; but not so, man. This makes it all the more tragic, when man limits his vision, when man cuts off the future, when man, having this capacity, because he is created in the image of God, to see from the beginning of time to the end of his mind's eye and to work for and to know his place in God's plan for that future, for man to limit himself; it is one of the most tragic of all circumstances. When men are without faith, they lose much of the meaning of the moment as well as the meaning of the past and future. Man must either live in terms of the future or retreat from life.

Whenever men lose a vision of the future, they have no present either. A psychiatrist, Henri F. Ellenberger, writes: "What we call the feeling of the meaning of life cannot be understood independently of the subjective feeling of experience past. Distortions of the feeling of time necessarily

result in distortions of the meaning of life. Normally we look upon the future not only for itself, but also for compensating and correcting the past and the future. We reckon on the future for paying our debts, achieving success, enjoying life, becoming good Christians. Whenever the future becomes empty, as with manic and certain psychopaths, life is a perpetual gamble and the advantage of the present minute is taken into consideration. Whenever the future is inaccessible or blocked as with the depressed, hope necessarily disappears and life loses all meaning."

That's a very important comment: "Whenever the future is inaccessible or blocked, as with the depressed, hope necessarily disappears and life loses all meaning." As a matter of fact, one of the keys to mental instability, mental problems, is precisely this fact, that those who are mentally disturbed have no future. For one reason or another they killed it in their thinking, in their living.

Another psychiatrist, E. Minkowski, in discussing the case of a schizophrenic depression, says of the patient: "There was no action or desire which emanating from the present reached out to the future, spanning the dull, similar days. As a result, each day kept an unusual independence, failing to be immersed in the perception of any life continuity. Each day began life anew like a solitary island in a great sea of passing time. What had been done, lived and spoken no longer played the same role as in our life because there seemed to be no wish to go any further. Every day was an exasperating monotony of the same words, the same complaints, until one thought that this being had lost all sense of necessary continuity. Such was the march of time for him. However, our picture is still incomplete, an essential element is missing in it — the fact that *the future was blocked* by the certainty of a destructive and terrifying event. This certainty dominated the patient's entire outlook, and absolutely all of his energy was attached to this inevitable event."

This is a very interesting statement. Minkowski felt that this inability to see a future or to see only a dread event in the future was radically destructive of the human mind. This struck me quite forcibly, because I have encountered recently a number of people, and have had telephone calls, long distance calls, from people here and there across the country who are worried about a member of the family or a relative who, because they read a certain book by Gary Allen, *None Dare Call It Conspiracy*, could only see one dread event and nothing but a horror in the future; and were so depressed they could neither work nor function and the family was afraid they were going to commit suicide.

Now let's turn to eschatology. What if eschatology, a person's doctrine of the last things, is similar? What if a person believes that all there

is ahead is tribulation and judgment? Will it not destroy their ability to think and live for the future? Will it not warp their minds and their thinking, their capacity to act?

Now we must say that the premillennials do believe in God; they do believe in heaven and in a New Creation, but all they see for the world is the Great Tribulation, and being raptured out of it, so for them, the world is futile. This leads to a contempt of history. As one very prominent premillennial preacher in Los Angeles has repeatedly said, "You don't polish brass on a sinking ship." The world is a sinking ship, so waste no time on reform, on doing anything to improve the world, or to bring about God's law order therein. No matter how fine a man says that, when any man believes it, he drops his future. You all smiled when I said, "What would happen if forty million premillennials were suddenly forty million postmillennials?" It was because you saw the point; they would have a different perspective on what needs to be done. They would *not* see "nothing but tribulation," or "nothing but a take-over" as do some people. They would see that the people of God are destined to triumph, that "Greater is he that is in us than he that is in the world."

Consider also the amillennial position, which does not even have a rapture, which sees only a steady deterioration of the world to the end. It is not surprising that the Reformed churches which have adopted this view have all been beset by a paralysis from the time they became amillennial; they have become paralyzed and are dying. Their perspective is sour, as whose would not be if all you could see was a future in which the world is going downhill? It certainly would sour me. And it is obvious that it has soured them. It has created paralysis.

The history of this country is very interesting in its relationship to eschatology. In the last few years, some scholars, none of them Christian, have been stumbling onto the fact of the relationship of eschatology to what people do. As a matter of fact, some scholars dealing with the converts in Nyasa, in Africa, who did not know what amillennialism and premillennialism and postmillennialism were until as anthropologists they began to study these converts, suddenly realized there as a world of difference. A study was published in Europe dealing with the subject. These scholars found that those who were converted to a premillennial faith withdraw from action. All the progress was due, among the black Christians in Nyasaland, to a handful of postmillennials.

Interesting. Anthropologists commented on this. But some scholars in American history, in analyzing the Colonial and Early American periods, have called attention to what eschatology has done in American history. The first Puritans who landed here were Calvinists and postmillennials.

They were the ones who laid the foundations in the Colonies. This was in the early 1600s, 1620 and thereafter. But by the end of the century the mood had changed and there was a swing away from Calvinism into Rationalism and/or Arminianism, and also premillennialism. The result was that Colonial society began to slide very drastically from the 1690s to about 1730–1735; as late as 1740 it seemed very clear at that time that the Colonies were going to lose their faith, that the whole of everything in the American Colonies was going to drift slowly and gradually into Rationalism and unbelief, or at the best into a weak, irrelevant Arminianism.

But suddenly the spirit of the times began to change. What happened was that the postmillennial faith was revived. Suddenly those who revived it began to change the complexion of the Colonies. Among those who were the earliest postmillennials was Jonathan Edwards. Now Edwards in some respects belonged to the older generation, but in his eschatology he was postmillennial. He held that the latter-day glory of the world, the worldwide reign of Christians, their conquest of every part of the world, would begin in America. And he wrote:

> It is agreeable to God's manner, when He accomplishes any glorious work in the world in order to introduce a new and more excellent state of His Church, to begin where no foundation had been already laid, that the power of God might be the more conspicuous, that the work might appear entirely God's and be more manifestly a creation out of nothing. Agreeable to Hosea 1:10, "And it shall come to pass that in the place where it was said unto them, Ye are not my people, there it shall be said unto them, Ye are the sons of the living God."
>
> When God is about to turn the earth into a paradise He does not begin His work where there is some good growth already, but in the wilderness, where nothing grows and nothing is to be seen but dry sand and barren rocks, that the light may shine out of darkness, the world be replenished from emptiness and the earth watered by springs from a droughty desert, agreeable to the many prophesies of Scripture as Isaiah 32:15, "Until the spirit be poured upon us from on high and the wilderness becomes a fruitful field," And chapter 41:18 and 19, "I will open rivers in high places, and fountains in the midst of the valleys. I will make the wilderness a pool of water and the dry land springs of water. I will plant in the wilderness the cedar, the shittah tree and the myrtle, and the oil tree; I will set in the desert the fir tree, and the pine, and the box tree together"; and chapter 43:20, "... I give waters in the wilderness, and rivers in the desert, to give drink to my people, my chosen."
>
> Now as when God is about to do some great work for His Church, His manner is to begin at the lower end so when He is about to renew the whole habitable earth, it is probable that He will begin in this upmost, meanest, youngest and weakest part of it, for the Church of God has been planted last

> of all. And so first shall be last and the last first, and that will be fulfilled in an eminent way, in Isaiah 24:16, "From the uttermost part of the earth we have heard songs, even glory to the righteous."

Joseph Bellamy, who followed Jonathan Edwards, wrote of the last days and said that when the history of the world is finished, the company of redeemed will be so great that their number as against those who are lost, will be seventeen thousand to one. He used some verses of Scripture to get to that computation; he did not say it was necessarily going to be such a ratio but it was significant of his optimism and his confidence, and this sense of victory was solidly based on Biblical thinking.

Samuel Hopkins, who also wrote about the subject at the same time and who, together with Bellamy, is beginning to be recognized as one of the two men most responsible for our War of Independence, wrote as follows, speaking of the millennium:

> But when the millennium shall begin, the inhabitants which shall be on the earth will be disposed to obey the divine command to subdue the earth and multiply until they have filled it, and they will have skill and be under all desirable advantages to do it, and the earth will soon be replenished with inhabitants and be brought to a state of high cultivation and improvement in every part of it, and will bring forth abundantly for the full supply of all, and there will be many thousand times more people than ever existed before at once in the world. Then the following prophecy which relates to that day shall be fulfilled: "A little shall become a thousand and a small one a strong nation; I the Lord will hasten it in his time."
>
> And there is reason to think the earth will be then in some degree enlarged in more ways than can now be mentioned or thought of and many thousands, hundreds of thousands, yea millions of instances, large tracts now covered by water, coves and arms of the sea may be drained or the water shut out by banks and walls so that hundreds of millions of persons may live on those places and be sustained by the produce of them which are now overflowed with water.
>
> Who can doubt this when we recollect how many millions of people now inhabit Holland and the Low Countries, the greatest part of which was once covered with the sea, or thought not to be capable of improvement. Other instances might be mentioned. Though there will be so many millions of millions of people on earth at the same time, this will not be the least inconvenience to any but the contrary, for each one will be fully supplied with all he wants and they will all be united in love as brethren of one family and will be mutual helps and blessings to each other.
>
> They will die, or rather fall asleep and pass into the invisible world and others still come on stage in their room, but death will not be attended with the same calamitous and terrible circumstances as it has been and is now, and will not be considered as an evil. It will not be brought on with long and painful

> sickness or be accompanied with any great distress of body or mind. They will be in all respects ready for it and welcome it with the greatest comfort and joy.
>
> Everyone will die at the time and in the manner which will be best for them and all with whom he is connected and death will not bring distress on surviving relatives and friends. And they will rather rejoice than mourn while they have a lively sense of the wisdom and goodness of the will of God and of the greater happiness of the invisible world to which their beloved friends are gone and where they expect soon to arrive. And so in that day death will in a great measure lose its sting and have the appearance of a friend and be welcomed by all as such.

This is an amazing thought, but Hopkins went through Scripture and collected all the verses which pointed to the end times and the glory of the day that was to come, and he imbued the people of his day with the certainty of God's triumph, the certainty of God's reign, and the fact that the whole world would be filled with the righteousness of God as the waters cover the sea.

Secular scholars who are not the least bit interested in theology — in fact, there is one writer who never uses the word "millennium," whether "post-" or "a-," in his book — tell us that it was Bellamy and Hopkins who gave the Americans a new sense of power and a new sense of freedom, and that they were responsible for the War of Independence, that had the older mentality prevailed, nobody would have resisted the encroachments of Parliament. The work of these two men and their followers changed the entire complexion of America.

Now this is an interesting witness coming from secular scholars writing in just the last year or two about their researches into the period. It is very significant that one contemporary, who was not at all favorable to what Bellamy and Hopkins were doing, expressed, in 1763, just eleven years before the War of Independence began, amazement at what had happened in the Colonies. He said that it was incredible that a few decades ago, twenty or thirty years earlier, these men were only a small handful; their work had been "Merely a religious one, merely a religious one, and they were now so powerful that they were running the government of the Colonies and the churches."

Of course, when men feel they have no future, like that schizophrenic that Minkowski wrote about, they live with a blocked future, with no capacity to build, no capacity to command — they have surrendered.

I recall, when I was just a young pastor in the old Presbyterian Church USA, now United Presbyterian, back in the late 40s and early 50s, I tried to organize the orthodox men to take over the synod of California, which at the time was becoming the wealthiest, most powerful synod in the

church; and if we could have captured it we could have turned the church around.

Consider what it would have meant to the religious situation in this country. In the key year, when all the committees were going to be named — and it would have affected the synod from one end to the other, had we captured it — I started writing letters (I was on the Indian Reservation) all over the synod, helping organize a campaign to get a certain man here in Los Angeles named moderator. We lost by just a handful of votes.

The horrible thing to me was that some premillennial pastors deliberately stayed away until the voting was over, because they disapproved of the idea of changing the situation. "Why, didn't you know that things are going downhill after the Rapture?" The movement went down the drain. If you have a blocked future, you have a blocked life, an impotent life. This is why eschatology is so important.

Postmillennialism once turned this country around. First, it established it, with the Puritans. Then with the new Puritans, Bellamy and Hopkins and their followers, it turned around again, and we gained our liberty. "Man needs a future," the researcher on hospital patients said, "or he dies." Only Christians who believe that God has summoned us to bring everything into captivity to Jesus Christ, only such people of all in our generation, have a future.

William Johnson said of Bellamy and Hopkins, "Merely a handful and merely religious." And yet, in about three decades, they had conquered the churches and the government positions in the Colonies. Three decades will take us to the end of this century, and to a different society. Why? Because we are the ones with no blocked future; we know that Jesus Christ is the Alpha and the Omega, the Beginning and the End, He who was and is and is to come, the Almighty. And the future is in His hands and under His control — and it is ours in Him.

A final word: one major denomination discourages interest in eschatology, and, in particular, in the book of Revelation, on the part of its members. This view its clergy regards as a virtue! Yet Revelation is that book of the Bible which specifically pronounces a blessing on those who read and "keep" (intelligently put into practice) its prophetic declaration (Rev. 1:3; 22:7). For a church to discourage interest in Revelation is to sin, and to deny to itself and its members the promised blessings. It means advocating a blocked and unblessed future. Is your future a blocked one or a blessed one?

(The quotations from Ellenberger and Minkowski are from Rollo May, Ernest Angel, Henri F. Ellenberger, eds., *Existence: A New Dimension in Psychiatry and Psychology* [New York: Basic Books, 1959].)

392

CLIPPER SHIPS

Chalcedon Report No. 276, July 1988

It was in 1932 that I first read John Gould Fletcher's beautiful poem, in polyphonic prose, "Clipper Ships," now forgotten by most because Fletcher was too emphatically and happily American to suit our day. Fletcher, in "Clipper Ships," celebrated the exuberant and triumphant days of the clipper ships, perhaps the most amazing sea vessels ever to sail the seas. Frederick Jackson Turner, an historian often criticized today, was accurate in catching the "optimistic and creative" temper of America then, dealing with things "in an original, practical, and determined way and on a grand scale."

John Lofton recently gave me a lovely booklet on clipper ships, *Heralds of Their Age* (1972), designed by Emma Landau and edited by Peter Stanford. In the preface, Robert G. Albion noted, "The Clipper ship was the supreme expression of the emotional enthusiasm that swept over the American maritime world in mid-nineteenth century." Americans believed they could, Stanford notes, "go anywhere, do anything, be anything."

The clipper ships were expensive and less profitable than the "square riggers on schedule," but they had an amazing speed and a breathtaking beauty. Earlier ships bore the names of women, often the owner's or captain's wife: *Mary Ann*, *Adelaine*, and so on; now ships have very prosaic and dull names. The clipper ships were given exciting names: *Lightning*, *Sovereign of the Seas*, *Challenge*, *Flying Cloud*, *Stag Hound*, *Glad Tidings*, *Invincible*, *Defiance*, *Great Republic*, *Intrepid*, *Flying Arrow*, *Hotspur*, *Romance of the Seas*, *Sparkling Wave*, *Dashing Wave*, *Ocean Spray*, *Skylark*, *Golden Eagle*, *Gazelle*, and so on and on. They left other ships in their wake, and, from the sail, would come a proud cry to the passed ship, as reproduced by Fletcher: "Challenge is our name: America our nation: Bully Waterman our master: We can beat Creation."

After a glorious decade, 1847–1857, the clipper ships began to go; before long, the ironclad ships replaced them. They represented in their day the temper of a segment of American free enterprise, confident, exuberant, and placing achievement and glory ahead of profits. Some of the clipper-ship captains pushed sails, timber, and men to their limits to demonstrate what Americans could do. The clipper-ship men, like Donald McKay, were the American frontiersmen of the seas. Other men took their places, small and mean-spirited men.

Yet, in the 1930s, Pan American briefly caught the American eye with their trans-Pacific planes, called "Clipper Ships." In the next decade, a group of men created Raytheon and brought remarkable inventions into the market. Some years later, a number of young men started the computer industry. The clipper-ship men were not all gone, but both political parties and Washington, D.C., Congress especially, were closer to the slave ships in spirit than anything else.

The clipper-ship mentality had not been confined to the seas. In 1780, America had three million people, of whom 900,000 were Scots and 400,000 were English. We began as a Scottish country, and a British agent called the War of Independence, "a Scottish-Irish-Presbyterian rebellion." A Basque saying in the American West has it that, when the Armenians came to America, the first thing they did was to build a church, while the Basques built a hotel (to eat and have fellowship therein). We can add that the Scots built colleges everywhere, in the newly settled wilderness, with a conquering hope for the future. We are very much in need again of clipper-ship men and their exuberant confidence in victory.

Last night I dreamt happily of the magnificence of the clipper ships in the high seas and their triumphant passage forward. I woke up with this sentence in mind: "A saved man is God's clipper ship in history."

The storm clouds are very real and dark, but, like clipper ships, we shall ride through them.

393

THE CULTURE OF DUTIES

Chalcedon Report No. 340, November 1993

One of our Lord's most telling parables is in Luke 17:7–10. A master whose servant is working in the field will not wait on the servant to feed him, when the day is over. Rather, he orders the servant to prepare the master's meal first and then to eat. "So likewise ye, when ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants: we have done that which was our duty to do" (Luke 17:10).

We live in a generation foreign to this text. We constantly expect at least a pat on the back, if not rewards and banquets, for doing our duty. But we are God's creatures, made to serve Him, not be treated like visiting royalty. Having done *all* that He commands us as His creatures, we must recognize that we have only done our duty. We can never build up credits with God.

But men want God to owe them something. They expect a credit rating with God for everything, great or small. To say that we are unprofitable servants is to confess that His grace has made us whole, and His grace works His will in us to do whatever is good and holy.

R. C. Trench said that the question, "Doth he thank that servant?" can be rendered, "Doth he count himself especially beholden to that servant?" This parable stresses God's grace. Man wants every penny to count with God, and God says that *total* obedience to Him and His commandments is only His due. We must recognize His grace, and the necessity for our obedience. We can never build up credits, or points, with God. We therefore rejoice, not in our status, but in His grace.

We tend to overestimate ourselves and our work for the Lord, and this means we have underestimated His work and grace.

Both patience and humility are taught by this parable, and a waiting on the Lord. We are God's creatures, and we cannot do more than rejoice in His grace and obey Him.

God can and does bless men, and He can and does reward them when He wills. But, in all this, man has no claim against God, only a duty.

Failure to understand this parable has led to serious problems, such as the idea I have heard indirectly expressed of *rights* from God. When men deny God His due, they will deny the claims of parents and employers, of church and state, and they will create a sphere of anarchy wherever they are. If God is denied His due, no authority will then survive long in any human sphere. The culture of rights replaces the culture of duties. Is this what you want?

394

SIN DEFINED

Chalcedon Report No. 368, March 1996

Sin is defined for us in 1 John 3:4 in these words: "Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law: for sin is the transgression of the law."

The New Testament gives us two key words for sin that refine the definition. They appear in 1 John 3:4, which can be rendered, "Whoever practices sin, *hamartia* [i.e., is habitual in his sinning] also practices iniquity, *anomia* [lawlessness]." *Hamartia* means missing the mark; we are aiming in the right direction, but are faulty and careless. *Anomia* means against the law, anti-law. The unregenerate do not direct their lives at God's law-word as their standard: their goal is in the opposite direction. They are anti-law because they are anti-God. They hate God, and therefore they hate His law.

The godly man is not sinless, but his sinning is not based on a war against God and His law, but is a failure morally to meet the standard he knows God requires of him. He aims at the mark, but he misses. This is *hamartia*.

This basic distinction is violated by antinomians because they deny the validity and the application of God's law. They have removed the standard and denied the target.

Failure to appreciate the seriousness of sin means, in turn, a failure to understand the meaning of salvation and our Savior. We are dead to all that is godly in our sins and trespasses, and only Christ's regenerating power, making us a new creation, enables us to become righteous or just in our walk and ways.

Sin is a total fact, an infection of all our being. The doctrine of total depravity simply says that the extent of sin is such that it taints and governs every aspect of our lives; no area of our being is immune to it.

To hold, as some do, that man's reason is not fallen, posits salvation by reasoning. It means believing that men can be saved by their autonomous reasoning rather than by Jesus Christ.

Man is prone to insist, even in his Christian context, that somehow he contributed to his salvation, if no more than to say "yes" to Jesus, if not, in some cases, to credit his reason with discovering the truth of God. Such arrogance is much too commonplace.

If we define sin properly, we are spared this waywardness. We know, then, that in all our being, we were anti-God before being redeemed by grace, that our direction was false, wrong, and evil. We were guilty of *anomia*; it is hostile to God and His law and therefore does not truly understand the scope, power, and mercy that grace means. Grace supplants the human ego and reason with God's Spirit and motivating power.

Sin infects and corrupts us all. Only when we fully understand its power and its delusionary nature can we begin to appreciate what Jesus Christ and salvation mean.

Jesus Christ was in all points tempted as we are, yet without sin (Heb. 4:15). The word for *sin* here is *hamartia*: our Lord never missed the mark, nor was He ever lawless. As the last Adam, head of God's new human race, He is without sin (1 Cor. 15:45ff.). As His new creation, a new humanity, we must understand what we are redeemed from, and also that as the people of the greater Adam, it is now our duty to exercise dominion (Gen. 1:26), and we must occupy till He comes (Luke 19:13).

395

ABOMINATIONS

Chalcedon Report No. 379, February 1997

I no sooner learned to read than I began reading the Bible. It was for me a wonderful adventure into realms of amazing stories, awe-inspiring laws, and new words. One new word that especially caught my attention was *abomination*. I once counted the various forms of the word used in the Bible, close to two hundred.

The word told me that God wants us to regard certain things with a holy dread. These included idolatry, lawlessness, unclean foods, moral irresponsibility, and more.

In some instances, as in Ezekiel 7:3ff., God declares that the corrupt life of the nation is an *abomination* to Him, and He will bring judgment on the whole people because they have become a people without *shame*. A people without shame are a disgraced people who find virtue in their shame. A people without shame are blinded by their sin.

When I was young, the word *shameless* was commonly used to describe people who flaunted their sin as though it were a virtue. It describes much of our culture now, and too many people.

Similarly, a sense of guilt is no longer prominent in our culture because sin has been denied and guilt is seen, in Freudian terms, as simply a relic of a primordial past.

Guilt and shame have been replaced by self-esteem, a highly prized late twentieth-century virtue. Self-esteem goes hand in hand with irresponsibility and victimhood. When Adam was confronted by God with his sin, his answer was to blame God and the woman: "The woman whom *thou* gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree, and I did eat" (Gen. 3:12). Adam saw himself as the innocent victim of a conspiracy by God and Eve! Eve's response was similar; she was a poor innocent woman who was beguiled by the evil one (Gen. 3:13). Self-esteem goes

hand in hand with irresponsibility because it presupposes man's natural goodness. Given this good, or, at worst, neutral state of man's moral being, it then follows that when man does wrong something outside him is to blame.

But this moral goodness, or moral neutrality, of man is basic to humanism. As a result, sin and evil are due to things outside man, God, nature, the family, the environment, and so on and on. Humanism leads inevitably to a morally irresponsible society. We read of AIDS "victims," as though they are casualties of a war!

The word *abomination* tells us that God requires us to view certain things with a holy dread because they destroy the moral fabric of men and society. But the word *abomination* has become almost obsolete outside the Bible, and the holy dread of offending God is all but gone. People who claim to be Christians can disagree casually with what God has said on a variety of things as though the Bible is only ratified and valid when a man agrees with it! This, too, is an *abomination*.

We need to take stock of ourselves. If what God calls an *abomination* is a matter of indifference to us, something is seriously wrong with us, not with God nor the Bible. Are we making of ourselves an *abomination* in God's sight?

We should regard every instance of the use of the word in Scripture as a warning from God.

396

ON BEING HOLIER THAN GOD

Chalcedon Report No. 357, April 1995

More than half a century ago, I met a pastor at annual church meetings who impressed me for his professed faithfulness to the Bible. I was therefore shocked when I heard him discuss what he felt was a "trying experience." His church body allowed for divorce for adultery and desertion. A young woman, a very able and dedicated teacher and church worker, had a divorce on both grounds from a sadistic man of good family and appearance. The pastor had refused to allow her to remarry, nor, of course, did he perform the service, on the grounds that all divorce is "a dirty business," and he wanted nothing to do with it in his congregation. He wanted "a holy people." My shocked response was, "You're trying to be holier than God." God allows it in His law, speaks of divorcing His people for faithlessness, and recognizes that sin requires a stand on our part, and separation from it. Our relationship ended that day.

I began, painfully, to recognize that men's feelings govern the church more than God's Word does. Over and over again, I have seen condemnation of widows and widowers for marrying less than a year after the death of their spouse. In one instance, a pastor's wife was dying, slowly. There were three very young daughters. The pastor exhausted his savings and more in hiring help. His sister-in-law, seeing his situation on a visit, stayed to care for her sister and nieces. She used her savings to rent a nearby apartment and to act as nurse, housekeeper, and mother to the children. Six months after the wife's death, the pastor and the sister-in-law married; both were out of money, and the marriage was more practical and religious than romantic. The church fired him for not waiting a full year! I was not surprised that the church soon went modernist. Human considerations outweighed everything else for them. It was, after all, God who said, "It is not good that the man should be alone" (Gen. 2:18).

The Puritans felt so strongly about the family's needs that a widow would receive proposals at the graveyard when the committal ended.

But now God's Word is outweighed routinely by human considerations and conventions, demands for "heart" religion, romanticism, spiritual masochism, and so on and on. All kinds of non-Biblical ideas prevail over the faith.

Consider the case of John Wesley. His quest for holiness led to strange results. He was more than once, while in the colonies, engaged to a beautiful young woman, but he broke off the relationship, fearing her beauty would not be conducive to his holiness! When she married another man, Wesley behaved badly in performing the ceremony and had to leave the colony. In England, he married an older and unattractive woman who was so jealous of Wesley that she constantly accused that innocent man of affairs, beat him, pulled out his hair, and more! "Spiritual religion" sometimes has sad results!

The prophet Micah spoke out against false holiness and stated clearly what true holiness is: "He hath shown thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the LORD require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" (Mic. 6:8). In Matthew 19:16–22, our Lord tells a young man who wants to inherit eternal life to obey God and His law. This was not enough for the young man, so our Lord told him to sell all and give to the poor. The young man apparently wanted to be told of some spiritual exercises he should follow.

All of us at some time or other long for more faithfulness to our Lord, and a closer walk with Him. This is a *good* desire, and not to be discouraged. But, remember, if you had godly parents, when were you closest to them? Was it not when you most obeyed God, and then your parents? There was no shortcut to closeness. As Amos 3:3 tells us, "Can two walk together, except they be agreed?" Can we walk together with God or man on any other terms?

Looking back over nearly eight decades of life, I can recall all too many instances of people with unhappy relations to God and to man where a troubling factor intervenes.

Remember, you and I are not God. God is totally self-determining: nothing can influence Him. That is not true of us. I normally sleep very well, but now and then I have a sleepless and bad night. Someone or something has distressed me greatly. It is then that I tell myself the words of W. W. Borden, who died on the mission field in Africa in 1913, a very young man. In his freshman year at Yale, he wrote in a notebook, "Lord Jesus, I take my hands off, as far as my life is concerned." If we are determined to chart our course, God may let us do so, to our disaster.

Of course, we are very troubled at times. We are baffled and spiritually at sea. If we try to make sense of our situation, we are in trouble, because we are not that wise nor knowledgeable. Back in the 1940s, a fellow pastor, C. Harold Van Zee, made a statement I have never forgotten: "The just shall live by faith in God, not in their understanding of all His ways." Holiness comes by obeying our Lord. None of us are capable of understanding God's ways. In His Word, He tells us all we need to know. Remember Samuel's words: "Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice" (1 Sam. 15:22). To seek holiness by going beyond the plain words of Scripture is wrong. What God has said we must believe, and we must obey Him. Someone has said. "There are three important facts: There is a God: He has spoken to us in the Bible: He means what He says." Amen.

397

THE FAITHFUL

Chalcedon Report No. 350, September 1994

One of the distressing facts about most Christians is their relationship to the Bible. Many rarely read it, and too many who do read it selectively, looking for texts to meet their needs rather than the commanding and prescriptive Word of God.

Take, for example, Revelation 12:17. Now, Revelation is a favorite book with many, but they pass over everything which does not meet their predetermined views. That text tells us, "And the dragon was wroth with the woman, and went to make war with the remnant of her seed, which keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ."

Revelation 20:2 tells us that the "dragon" refers to Satan. "The woman" is commonly identified as the church. "The remnant of her seed" are the faithful believers. These are they "which keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ." The Greek word translated as "commandments" is *entole*, which means the law, the Torah, God's revealed prescriptions for us. "The testimony of Jesus Christ" is the testimony He bore concerning God the Father, His law, and Himself.

Could anything be more plain? The Christian is one who believes that Jesus Christ is He whom He says He is, and One who must be obeyed when He requires obedience to the law "till heaven and earth pass away" (Matt. 5:17–20).

Those whom the enemy, Satan, wages war against are those who receive Christ on His own terms, together with God's law-word. The rest are not worth his time: they are already in partial surrender.

Herman Hoeksema, not a postmillennialist, still said of this text, that Christians, "In every sphere of life they claim . . . they must live according to the principles of the Word of God, that they must keep His commandments, and that they must proclaim that Jesus Christ is King over

all. They have been brought up in the commandments of God by their mother, the church; and they have learned to embrace and keep the testimony of Jesus" (H. Hoeksema, *Behold, He Cometh*, p. 449).

Revelation 12 thus tells us that the great target of satanic forces is the faithful, those who know Jesus as the Christ and who obey God's law. These are also the ones who overcome because of their faith and testimony (Rev. 12:11).

Plainly, those whose faith cannot be described in terms of Revelation 12:17 are no threat. They do not cause the enemies of God any serious problems. They see no mandate in Scripture to obey God's law, to provide Christian or home schooling for their children, to tithe, or to apply God's Word to every sphere of life and thought. God's enemies need not waste time fighting them. The grim question is, how much time will God give them?

Revelation 12 tells us that history is a long warfare between God and His enemies, a war He cannot lose. We cannot be bystanders in that war.

Why is this text so much neglected?

398

CAN WE FORCE GOD'S HAND?

Chalcedon Report No. 327, October 1992

In the 1850s, in South Africa, the pagan Xhosa peoples believed a prophecy that, if they would kill all their cattle, and destroy all their food, heaven would bless them, drive out the white men, and return their cattle and food. Tens of thousands then starved to death.

In the same era, American Indians listened to prophecies that declared a great wind would carry all white men into the ocean, the game would be more plentiful than ever, and the Indian would prosper as never before. What was required were certain sacrifices, purity, and dancing the Ghost Dance. For all their dancing, nothing happened, although the movement rose and waned over a half a century. One Indian woman who had lost her nose for adultery (cut off by her angry husband) expected a new nose as her reward for dancing the Ghost Dance.

These people were not Christians, of course, nor were the Cargo Cult peoples of the South Pacific, who still have a like hope.

Are there church people like them? A couple, dedicated evangelicals and very active in their church, have a son and a daughter, both in their very early twenties. Both are wild, promiscuous, good candidates for AIDS and more, in attendance at church, and undisciplined. They are spoiled and indulged by their well-to-do parents.

The parents' answer? Everyone is asked to pray for the two children! Nothing is done to deprive them of money and family-provided automobiles; neither is ordered out of the house, nor reprimanded. Yet, somehow, God is expected to perform a miracle and save their children and spare them shame. Their attitude is, Jesus can do anything. The Lord, however, will not perform miracles of grace to cover their shame. He will not concern Himself with these unrebuked children.

What the parents' perspective represents is blasphemy. They have

dishonored God by despising His Word; they have insisted that God must bless them for their much praying. Faced again and again with very ungodly and immoral conduct by their children, they neither rebuke nor chastise nor withhold anything. Instead, they call up the church's prayer chain. They allow no criticism of their children; they insist that they are really good children who need prayer and some settling down. Their pastor has prayed with them, and they love him for his concern. The pastor, of course, has never confronted either the children or the parents for their sin. The parents insist on believing that their prayers, and the church's prayers, will lead God to save their children. They hope to force God's hand by much praying.

We are told of David, with respect to his son Adonijah, that he had not displeased him at any time in saying, "Why hast thou done so?" (1 Kings 1:6). The fact that David was greatly loved by God made no difference to God in this respect: David and his family paid a price for the spoiling of Adonijah.

We cannot force the hand of God. And why should God bless us for our sinning? If David received no blessing for his sins, how can we expect to be blessed for our sins? We cannot force God's hand, but we can be punished by it.

399

CHRISTIAN RECONSTRUCTION

Chalcedon Report No. 24, September 1, 1967

It is urgently important that we think now of *Christian Reconstruction*, but our thinking cannot be idle talk: it must be both Biblical and also practically applied in our daily life. There are many people ready to eliminate statism, but they have nothing but wishing to replace it. How, then, will independent schools, private welfare, and individual initiative deal with the vast complex of our social problems? Already most of our Christian conservative causes, and Christian schools, are continually short of funds. What is the answer?

In any advanced social order, social financing is a major public necessity. The social order cannot exist without a vast network of social institutions which require financing and support. If a Christian concept of social financing is lacking, then the state moves in quickly to supply the lack and gain the social control which results. Social financing means social power.

The Bible provides, as the foundation law, in the practical realm, of a godly social order, the law of the *tithe*. To understand the tithe, it is important to know that Biblical law has *no property tax*; the right to tax real property is implicitly denied to the state, because the state has no title to the earth. Repeatedly, the Bible declares, "The earth is the LORD's" (Exod. 9:29; Deut. 10:14; Ps. 24:1; 1 Cor. 10:26, etc.); therefore, only God can tax the earth. For the state to claim the right to tax the earth is for the state to make itself the god and creator of the earth, whereas the state is instead God's ministry of justice (Rom. 13:1–8).

The immunity of land from taxation by the state meant liberty. A man could not be dispossessed of his land: every man had a basic security in his property. As H. B. Rand, in his *Digest of the Divine Law* pointed out, "It was impossible to dispossess men of their inheritance under the law

of the Lord as no taxes were levied against land. Regardless of a man's personal commitments he could not disinherit his family by being dispossessed of his land forever." The land is not the property of the state, and no state therefore has the right under God to levy taxes against God's possessions. The Bible cites it as a sign of tyranny when the state claims the right to take as much as God, i.e., a tithe, or 10 percent of one's increase. Thus, Samuel said of the tyrant, "He will, besides, take a tenth of your grain crop and of your vineyards and give it to his officers and to his servants . . . He will appropriate a tenth of your flocks, too, and you yourselves will become his servants" (1 Sam. 8:15, 17, Berkeley Version). Today, civil government takes more than a tenth of our income: it takes about 45 percent!

When America was colonized, the settlers in every colony made Biblical law their basic law. There was no tax on property: this was basic to Biblical liberty. The inscription on the Liberty Bell is taken from the Biblical land law: "proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof (Lev. 25:10). In the first session of the Continental Congress in 1774, Congress denied that Parliament could tax real property. Gottfried Dietze has summarized the American opinion then: "As to property, the delegates felt it should be free from seizure and taxation." The property tax came in very slowly, and it appeared first in New England, coinciding with the spread of Deism and Unitarianism, as well as atheism. Such anti-Christian men saw the state as man's savior, and as a result, they favored placing more and more in the hands of the state. The South was the last area to accept the property tax, and it was largely forced on the South by post-Civil War Reconstruction. Moreover, as far as possible, when the property tax was adopted in the pre-Civil War era, conservative elements limited it to the county and retained the legal requirement that only owners of real property could vote on the county level.

Today, the property tax is in effect a rent for the use of our own land; the state has the power of confiscation for nonpayment, and also the "right" of eminent domain. This is, in terms of the Bible, a mark of tyranny, as both the law, and the story of Naboth's vineyard, makes clear.

The tithe is God's tax for the use of the earth; it is *not* a gift to God. Only when the giving exceeds ten percent is it called a gift and a "freewill offering" (Exod. 36:3; Lev. 22:21; Deut. 16:10–11, etc.). The tithe is required of *all* men by God. Failure to pay the tithe brings on God's curse; yielding God His due results in so great "a blessing, that there shall not be room enough to receive it" (Mal. 3:8–10).

The tithe was used for a variety of purposes. It supported the religious and educational institutions of Israel, and also of colonial and early

America. In fact, in the United States, the tithe was for many years legally binding on all men, and failure to pay it was a civil offense. The tithe supported the churches, Christian schools, and colleges. When Virginia repealed such a law, which made payment of the tithe mandatory, George Washington expressed his disapproval in a letter to George Mason, October 3, 1785. He believed, he said, in "making people pay toward the support of that which they profess." The position Washington took was one which the early church had established as soon as any country became Christian. State laws began to require tithes from the fourth century on, because it was believed that a country could only deny God His tax at its peril, and therefore the various civil governments required all their citizens to pay tithes, not to the state but to the church. From the end of the eighteenth century, and especially in the last century, such laws have steadily disappeared as a result of the atheistic and revolutionary movements of our times.

In the early years of this country, virtually the only taxing power of the federal government was duties and excise taxes; the taxing powers of the states and counties were also exceedingly small. The total take in taxes was originally scarcely more than 1 percent. The functions of civil government were very limited: justice and defense, mainly, plus the mails. The tithe and giving took care of most religious and social needs, voluntarily and economically.

Before going further, let us examine the Biblical law concerning the tithe. The tithe is described in Leviticus 27:30–33. A tenth of all produce or production was claimed by God as His due and was holy or set apart for Him. If the owner wanted to retain this tenth in its original form, i.e., as fruit or grain, he could do so by paying its value plus a fifth.

This tithe belongs to God, not to the church, nor to the producer. It cannot be given to an apostate church without being given thereby *against* God, not to Him. It must be given, therefore, to godly causes. The priests and Levites, to whom it was originally given, had charge of religion, education, and various other functions. The tithe was paid six years in seven, the seventh being a rest for the land and the people.

But there was a second tithe, called also the festival tithe (Deut. 14:22–27; 16:3, 13, 16). The purpose of this tithe was to rejoice before the Lord, "and thou shalt bestow the money for whatsoever thy soul desireth" in order to "rejoice, thou and thy household: and the Levite that is within thy gates." This second tax required by God was thus for the family's pleasure.

There was also a third tithe (Deut. 14:28–29), every third year, or twice in seven years. Some scholars feel that the correct reading makes

this a substitute for the second tithe in the appointed year. Henry Lansdell, in *The Tithe in Scripture* called attention to 1 Tobit 1:6–8 (in the Apocrypha), and to Josephus (*Antiquities*, bk. 4), as well as to Jerome (*Commentary on Ezekiel*, chap. 14, sec. 1, 565) and Chrysostom (*Homily* 64, on Matt. 19:21), to hold that a tithe in addition to the first two was meant. Maimonides in the twelfth century held that this third tithe was the second tithe shared, but Abraham Ibn Ezra disagreed. This tithe was a kind of social welfare tithe, to be shared with lowly foreigners, not as a handout, but in common feasting and rejoicing before the Lord. As Lansdell pointed out, Christ did not repeal the law of tithing (pp. 117–126). Jesus did not condemn the Pharisees for tithings: "these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone," that is, "the weightier matters of the law, judgment [justice], mercy, and faith" (Matt. 23:23). Chrysostom declared, "If under the law it were dangerous to neglect tithes, consider how great a danger there is now" (*Homily* 4, on Eph. 2). Joseph Bingham, in *The Antiquities of the Christian Church*, wrote of the early church, that "the ancients believed the law about tithes not to be merely a ceremonial or political command, but of moral and perpetual obligation" (v. 1).

Now, what did the tithe do? *First* of all, the tithe was an admission that the earth is the Lord's, not the state's, and the only legitimate tax on land is by Almighty God. The tithe established property as a right and privilege under God. As Rand noted, "Nowhere in the Bible is there any indication that property rights are to ever be abolished. On the contrary, such rights are emphasized and safeguards are placed around that property to protect a man and his possessions. Liberty for the individual is nonexistent apart from freedom of possession and the protection of personal holdings and property, with adequate compensation for its loss or destruction."

Second, when men forsake God's law and His sovereign claim as Lord of the earth, they are cursed by Him and sold into bondage (1 Sam. 8, Mal. 3:8–10). What belongs to God must be rendered to God. We cannot have God's blessing if we deny Him His due, the first tithe in particular. To be blessed by God, we must obey God.

Third, the tithe made a free society possible. If every true Christian tithed today, we could build vast numbers of new and truly Christian churches, and Christian schools and colleges, and we could counteract socialism by Christian Reconstruction, by creating Christian institutions and a growing area of Christian independence. Consider the resources for Christian Reconstruction if only twenty-five families tithed faithfully! Socialism grows as Christian independence declines. As long as

people are slaves within, they will demand slavery in their social order. The alternative to a godly society, as God made clear to Samuel, is one in which men, having forsaken God, make man their lord. And, when their decision finally comes home to them, and they cry out to God, God refuses at that late date to hear them (1 Sam. 8:18). The time for repentance and reconstruction is before judgment strikes. Conscientious and intelligently administered tithing by even a small minority can do much to reconstruct a land.

Fourth, the tithe is thus the financial basis of reconstruction. Good wishes, votes, letter writing, attendance at meetings, all have their place, but they are not enough. Reconstruction requires a financial foundation, and this the tithe provides. The tithe can re-create the necessary Christian institutions.

Fifth, the tithe restores the necessary economic basis to society: it asserts the absolute lordship and ownership of God over the earth, and the God-given nature of private ownership under God. To pay the tithe is to deny the foundations of statism. To pay the tithe means therefore, also, not only the practical steps possible towards Christian Reconstruction, but also the sure blessing of God in our battle against socialism. Having now sided with God, we have sided with victory.

Sixth, the tithe restores the necessary spiritual basis to Christian action. Today, many people do give generously to various causes, but their giving is impulsive and emotional. They like to give to a church or program which provides excitement and glamour, and the result is irresponsible stewardship. The person who provides the best Hollywoodish production, and the best press-agentry, gets the money. When people are disillusioned with such a project, they move on to look for another exciting and glamorous action. But the law of the tithe makes it clear that it is God's money and must go to God's causes, to Christian worship, education, outreach, and reconstruction. The tithe cannot be channeled to "exciting" causes but to godly causes, to solid, steady, consistently Biblical causes. And the tithe must bear the whole burden of Christian Reconstruction. Conservative giving goes much of the time to fighting against the inroads of the enemy, which is, of course, necessary; the tithe goes for reconstruction.

Seventh, the tithe restores power to the little man. Today, it is the rich man who dominates most causes — his money counts; he can donate a hundred thousand or a million and make his influence felt. But a thousand little men who tithe can far outweigh the rich man. They can keep a Christian cause from being dominated by a handful. Tithing is the way for the little man to have power with God's blessing. A hundred men

paying an average tithe of $100 a month means $10,000 monthly, which means that a relatively small group is capable of great things and will gain God's blessing in the process. Socialism has filled a void vacated by Christians. The spread of Unitarianism and atheism in the United States was closely followed by the spread of socialism. It was not by accident that the early American socialists of 1800–1860 attacked the tithe. To break down tithing meant that another source of social financing had to be forthcoming, the central civil government. And it was the total social impact of the little man's tithe that was so overpowering: the millionaires were few, but the little people were many. Make no mistake about it: social financing is a social necessity. It will either be done by an irresponsible and godless state, subsidizing irresponsibility and godlessness and penalizing the godly, or it will be done by godly men, who, through Biblically grounded administration and godly wisdom, will further social order, true churches, Christian education, and a society flourishing in liberty under God.

You vote here with your pocketbook. Take your choice: or have you already made it?

400

SOCIAL FINANCING

Chalcedon Report No. 43, March 1, 1969

In an earlier newsletter (no. 24, September 1967) the subject of Christian Reconstruction was discussed. It was pointed out that, in any advanced social order, social financing is a major public necessity in order to maintain a vast network of social institutions which require financing and support.

Historically, there have been in the main two means of social financing: *first*, by state taxation and then state control and maintenance of the various social institutions which must be maintained, and, *second*, by the law of the tithe, whereby the tithe, as God's tax, is used to maintain education, welfare, religious institutions, and a variety of social functions.

Earlier, the tithe barn was a familiar aspect of the Western world. Religious foundations (lay and religious orders) ministered to a variety of needs, providing welfare, education, hospitals, orphanages, grants to the arts, and much more. Until World War II, gleaning was a familiar part of American rural life in some areas. Organizations like Goodwill Industries had applied the gleaning principle to urban life. Education as a state function is a relatively modern concept. Through the depression of 1907, welfare in the United States was taken care of by churches, foundations, and various similar agencies; it was Pendergast, in Kansas City, who saw the political potentialities of welfare as an instrument of political power and instituted the first tax-supported welfare program. Other civil units saw the possibilities of political power in welfare and quickly followed suit.

The law of the tithe was gradually eliminated in America (over Washington's disagreement), and gradually replaced by state taxes, in particular the previously unknown property tax. The revolutionary ferment from Europe was largely behind the desire for state action. After 1860,

this revolutionary influence merged with still another influence, Darwin's doctrine of evolution.

Social Darwinism led to the application of ruthless egoism (as against Christian individualism) to the economic world, and the "robber barons" emerged. In a congressional investigation during President Buchanan's term, members of Congress referred to Vanderbilt, *not* as a capitalist, in fact, they denied him that title: he was a government manipulator, i.e., his wealth came from government contracts gained by manipulating politicians. But with social Darwinism, the new breed began to deny all social responsibility and formed a working alliance with the state in order to exploit the people and all natural resources. Since then, this socialistic alliance of big business with big government has added to itself big labor, big foundations, and statist education to make up our modern establishment, with the big churches as the chaplains of this new order. We are dealing with amoral power today, power which allies itself with power against the weak. As a result, socialism is the best means ever devised to give more power to the powerful, and to make the rich richer. There are, incidentally, more millionaires in the Soviet Union today than in Russia under the czars, but the middle class is gone, and the workers are far poorer.

Social Darwinism meant a denial of social responsibilities by the socialistic industrialists. When the demand for these social functions became too great, the answer of social Darwinism was to tax the middle classes and the poor to maintain education, welfare, and all things else. The middle classes are being now steadily expropriated in their possessions on the plea that the needs of the people require it.

True. The needs of the people do require something, but the statist "something" is the destruction, *first*, of the middle classes to provide for the lower classes, *second*, the destruction of the lower classes to provide for the state, and, *third*, civil war within the establishment as social cannibalism sets in. Socialism, moreover, because it is by nature a parasitic economy, is also imperialistic. It exercises an imperial confiscation towards its people, and it must also expand and gut fresh territories in order to gain fresh resources. The Soviet Union has been and must continue to be a ruthlessly imperialistic power to survive. Moreover, the more the United States becomes socialistic, the more it will require imperialism to survive. A parasite, when it destroys one host body, requires another to survive.

The social functions of statism, of socialism, are thus aspects of its imperialism and parasitism. When the state assumes social functions, its purpose is statist; the state is more concerned with its survival than with the survival of some people, or a class of people. The statist assumption

of social functions removes responsibility from the people and promotes social isolation. The statist talks largely about loving mankind but acts in actual contempt of man. He accuses the orthodox Christian of holding to a low view of man, because the Christian believes man is a sinner, but Christians hold that man is a *responsible* sinner, not a conditioned reflex. It is the Christian who requires man to be responsible, whereas the statist makes the state responsible.

The tithe has a major social function which needs restoring. It is futile to rail against statism if we have no alternative to the state assumption of social responsibilities. The Christian who tithes, and sees that his tithe goes to godly causes, is engaged in true social reconstruction. By his tithe money and its activity, he makes possible the development of Christian churches, schools, colleges, welfare agencies, and other necessary social functions. The negativists, who have merely campaigned against statism, have steadily lost ground since 1950. Those Christians who have concerned themselves with Christian Reconstruction have since 1950 established a vast number of Christian schools as well as other agencies. Within fifteen years, almost 30 percent of America's grade school children were no longer in the statist schools.

What we must do is, *first*, to tithe, and, *second*, to allocate our tithe to godly agencies. Godly agencies means far more than the church. In the Old Testament, the tithe went to the priests and Levites. The priests and Levites had a variety of functions in Israel: religious in the sense of ministering in the sanctuary, and religious in the sense of providing godly education, music, welfare, and necessary godly assistance to civil authorities. The realm of the godly, of the Christian, is broader than the church. To limit Christ's realm to the church is not Biblical; it is pietism, a surrender of Christ's kingship over the world. The purpose of the tithe must be to establish that kingship.

This means stewardship. We are not our own: we belong to God, and all our possessions and wealth are a trust from Him.

This trust means, *first*, a responsibility to care for our own, our families. We have a responsibility under God to care for our parents, and for our children. The family is the world's greatest welfare agency, and the most successful. What the federal government has done in welfare is small and trifling compared to what the families of America do daily, caring for their own, relieving family distresses, providing mental care and education for one another, and so on. No civil government could begin to finance what the families underwrite daily. The family's welfare program, for all its failures from time to time, is proportionately the world's most successful operation by an incomparable margin.

Beyond a certain point, however, the family cannot care for its own without sin. If children are delinquent and reject authority, or if they grow up and depart from the faith, we cannot subsidize them in their sin without sharing in their guilt. They cannot be partakers or heirs of what is the Lord's inheritance. But, within the circle of faith, the family must care for its own.

Second, as we go outside the family, the *minimum* requirement of God's law is the tithe, God's tax on man. The tithe can be used as we, under God, feel led to use it, provided always the receiving agencies are doing the Lord's work in their areas. We need to assess the need for Christian Reconstruction and then conscientiously support those agencies which we believe best further it: a church, an organization dedicated to creationism, or the cause of Christian education, missions, Christian scholarship, and so on.

In all this, we must be mindful that the cause is reconstruction. We have an obligation under God to bring all things into captivity to Christ, and under His dominion, to establish Christian order. Too many Christians are engaged in fighting a local, small battle, if they are fighting at all. But we are in the midst of total war and must be engaged with total dedication and a total plan. Without this perspective, we waste much of our time, activity, and money.

There are many who say, how can I pay my taxes and still tithe? (Incidentally, many who are rich and many who are poor *are* tithing and still paying their taxes.) But you have *no* other alternative. Are you going to wait for the state to lower its taxes? The state will never lower its taxes, nor will the people permit it to, as long as the necessary social functions are left in the hands of the state. We have higher taxes because most people demand them, and they demand the services the taxes provide. People only oppose higher taxes for themselves; they favor "soaking the rich," soaking the unions, the railroads, the gas companies, the telephone company, anyone and everyone except themselves. The problem most legislators face is the unrelenting pressure for higher taxes from people who are demanding new services for themselves at public expense, and this always means taxes.

We cannot wait for taxes to be lowered. We must begin now, *not* merely to tithe but to begin Christian Reconstruction with our tithe, to reestablish the necessary social functions as Christian action.

We need to do this in delight and anticipation of a godly order; we also need to do it in fear of the consequences if we do not. Either we work to establish a godly order, or we go down into the hell of total statism. We need, moreover, to fear God. Most people are afraid of prison if they fail

to pay their taxes, or of confiscation of property at the least. They need to fear God also for all their sins of commission and omission. The God of love has been preached so long that we have forgotten the sovereign and almighty God whom we must fear as well as love. Shall we rob this God of His tithe, the tithe which is His ordinance for our own prosperity in terms of godly order? Yet we rob Him when we deny Him the tithe (Mal. 3:8–12). Let us therefore serve God in that true love which fears to offend His love, and let us work for Christian Reconstruction in every sphere of our lives and our world.

401

TIPPING

Chalcedon Report No. 200, April 1982

TIPPING is a form of rewarding service. If a waiter serves us well, we give him a generous tip; if his service is indifferent or poor, we either do not tip him, or we give him a very trifling tip. A tip is from a superior to an inferior. It is normally to someone who is poorly paid and must depend on tips to make a reasonable salary.

Most tipping is perfunctory; we do it because it is expected of us, not because we are strongly motivated to do so. It is a social form we abide by, whether we like it or not.

Most giving to God is simply a form of tipping, a perfunctory act we feel obligated to perform. We are more often motivated by what others expect of us than what God requires. Too few tithe to God. A tithe is a tax paid to the sovereign God: it is His due. We cannot give a gift to God unless it is above and over the tithe, because anything other than that is simply a debt and an obligation.

If we try to tip God, we incur His wrath and judgment because we treat Him then as an underling, not as the sovereign. We are then thieves, trying to rob God of His due tax, and Malachi 3:8–12 makes clear the kind of judgment God brings upon all such thieves. Men know that the state takes very seriously any tax evasion; can they imagine that God is any the less angry when men evade His due tax?

Our giving puts a price on God's government. We say in effect, when we refuse God His tax, that the government is much better left on our shoulders. We say that we can put the money to better use than God can, and that our rule is the primary and essential one. We make clear, by our refusal to tithe, that we are humanists.

We also deny God's power and Word. We say in effect that the promises of blessings and curses pronounced in Malachi 3:8–12 and Deuteronomy 28

are not to be taken seriously, and that God's Word is not as important in our lives as our own word and will. We doubt God's statement, too, that our disobedience can carry us to a point where He will not hear us (1 Sam. 8:18).

How we give makes clear who is the lord in our lives, the triune God, or ourselves. It manifests whether we are idolaters or believers.

402

THE GOOD LIFE

Chalcedon Report No. 345, April 1994

THE *good life* has long been an object of man's desiring all over the world. In this century, this goal has been democratized and popularized, so that countless numbers of peoples regard *the good life* as a human right.

In our time, the good life has been defined in economic terms, whether by Marxists or by the believers in democracy. All men should have the "right" to freedom from want and from other human problems. Whereas once the attainment of such economic sufficiency was seen as a result of work and thrift, it has been in this era detached from character. It is a "human right" which the state is supposed to guarantee. The state has attempted to do so; it has been an easy road to power, but it is now a rapidly approaching terminal bankruptcy.

The quest has marked Europe and North America, and it has spread to Asia, Africa, Central and South America, and elsewhere. The illusion that what character and work can sometimes give, the state can always give, is very widespread.

The great expeditor of this economic *dream* of the good life has been held to be the state. The modern state no longer offers justice: it offers the good life, economic security. In the process, it is destroying its economy and also the character of its peoples. The politico-economic attainment of the good life is a fool's hope. However, just as people are ready to "invest" in get-rich-quick schemes, whose promoters make millions, they are ready to believe that the good life can be handed to them as a political grant.

The will to be deceived is very great. Because men are sinners, they are easily deceived because their lives are based on a delusion, the faith that they can be their own god and determine good and evil for themselves

(Gen. 3:5). Men having begun with so great a delusion are readily victimized by lesser ones. It is no wonder that the Biblical book of Proverbs has so much to say about fools.

How can you avoid being conned? You can begin with the humble premise, "I am a fool," and, apart from God's Word and grace, very prone to straying. If we lack the humility of grace, we are easily fooled.

Our sin makes us insatiable. It is almost unheard of for anyone to believe he is wealthy enough, owns enough land and other assets, and can rest contented. "I want, I want," is the great refrain of man's being.

As long as man seeks the good life outside of the Lord, he is likely to be insatiable. When I lived in Nevada about fifty years ago, a man who worked at a major gambling casino said that he personally had seen only one gambler end the night ahead, and that was because he passed out, drunk, while still winning! Perhaps more left winners, but he was in substance correct. Insatiability led people to gamble until they lost. Their "good life" was a very sorry one.

How we define the good life tells much about ourselves. The definition of it is a mental exercise that leaves most of us wanting in any Christian sense. We ask for the fleshpots of Egypt rather than the Promised Land.

We are told, in John 14:6, that Jesus told Thomas, "I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father but by me." Now, this being true, the world as a whole is choosing the bad life. Moreover, too many people want the bad life and yet, as churchmen, want it with God's blessing! They believe that faith exempts them from God's law and judgment.

The good life does not require asceticism, but it does mean that we seek first, or above all else, the Kingdom of God and His righteousness or justice (Matt. 6:33). It means that our life's focus is not on ourselves but on the Kingdom of God.

The Pharisees of old shifted the focus, and the Pharisees of our time do also. They see their own salvation as the goal: they seek first their salvation and little more. This supplants Christ and His Kingdom with ourselves, a serious offense.

Our priorities are all wrong if we see our salvation as the heart of the gospel! Our conversion means being regenerated to be a new creature, a member of the last Adam's new human race (1 Cor. 15:45–57; 2 Cor. 5:17). As members of Christ's new humanity, we have Adam's task, to exercise dominion and to subdue all things under our Lord's Kingship (Gen. 1:26–28).

We have a great task to do, the conquest of a world to Christ, and the good life is one lived in Him in terms of this great calling. "He shall have

dominion also from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth" (Ps. 72:8). Our calling to the good life is to work and pray for this great and assured Kingdom.

403

DEBT AND FEAR

Chalcedon Report No. 8, May 2, 1966

I have been asked to discuss two subjects in this newsletter, debt and fear. There is a connection between these two things.

The world of the Bible is a very different one in many respects from the world around us, not because it represents a more "primitive" culture, but because it is deliberately designed on different foundations.

Debt was as important a factor in ancient culture as it is today, and a highly developed system of commercial credit existed in the major empires. Assyria and Babylon, in fact, built their empire as Rome did later, in part on the expansion of influence and power through commercial credit. Before the Assyrian and Babylonian armies marched into an area, it was usually already heavily in debt to them, and its moral fiber was sapped through debt living. When the prophet Nahum wrote of Assyria that "thou hast multiplied thy merchants above the stars of heaven" (Nah. 3:16), he used a word for merchant that meant a government agent who was a moneylender and trader.

The Bible shows no trace of any system of commercial credit because its perspective on debt is that it is to be avoided and is only a recourse for emergencies and special needs. Solomon stated the Biblical principle very briefly: "the borrower is servant [or slave] to the lender" (Prov. 22:7). Debt is a form of slavery; it gives another man power over us, it involves borrowing against our future, and thus it is not to be entered into lightly. To live in terms of debt is a way of life for unbelievers, but believers have no right to mortgage their futures or their children's future: their lives belong to God. Unbelievers cannot be asked to live in terms of this standard, since their way of life is different. Christians can therefore lend on long terms to unbelievers, but, for themselves, the conditions are different.

Many passages deal with the subject of debt, but perhaps some of the

central requirements are summed up most succinctly in Deuteronomy 15:1–6. In the Berkeley translation, used here for clarity and modernity of language, these principles appear:

1. Debts by believers are not to be extended beyond the sabbatical or seventh year and since they begin after the previous sabbatical year, are for six years in essence. "At the end of every seven years there must be a canceling of debts" (Deut. 15:1). "A foreigner you may press for payment, but whatever of yours was due from a brother [an Israelite] you shall cancel" (Deut. 15:3). Loans to fellow believers and by believers were thus limited to what could be payable within the six-year spans.

2. The surest way to prosperity and to the abolition of poverty is the observance of God's law in this and every other regard. "Owe no man anything but to love one another" (Rom. 13:8), "however, there should be no poor among you, for the Lord your God will abundantly bless You in the land He will give you to possess as a heritage, if you listen to the Lord your God and rightly observe all these commandments which today I am enjoining upon you. When the Lord your God blesses you as He promised you then you shall lend to many nations, but not borrow; you shall rule many nations, but they shall not rule over you" (Deut. 15:4–6).

3. It is thus clear that the Bible presupposes that the principle of blessing is not in any humanistic standard but in obedience to God. We are not to move in terms of human advantage but in terms of God's law. Thus, it is a real temptation to take advantage of inflation and buy on long terms and pay off with increasingly cheaper and more worthless money. This, of course, involves assuming that inflation will continue forever; it also involves a questionable moral premise, and, finally, it involves setting aside God's law concerning debt. A Christian moves in terms of God's law, not merely when it is convenient to do so, but at all times.

One of the reasons cited by the prophets for the Babylonian captivity was the popular disregard for these laws. As a result, when Nehemiah re-established Jerusalem, among the laws which he required of the people to avoid God's judgment was the observance of the time limit on debt (Neh. 10:31). (Another important rule, incidentally, was the prohibition of mixed marriages, Neh. 10:30.) This law was for some time taken very seriously. In a work of Hebrew literature from the period between the Old and New Testaments, Ben Sirach wrote, "Do not be impoverished from feasting on borrowed money when you have nothing in your purse" (18:33).

The point of all this is that our lives must be lived in conformity to God and His Word rather than in terms of conformity to man and man's ways. Our age is given to being group-directed, to being governed by

what the group does or thinks. The Bible says, "Thou shalt not follow a multitude to do evil" (Exod. 23:2). Moreover, "The fear of man bringeth a snare: but whoso putteth his trust in the LORD shall be safe" (Prov. 29:25). The latter part of this verse can also be translated, "whoever trusts in the LORD will be lifted up" (Berkeley Version). Moreover, our Lord declared, "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell" (Matt. 10:28).

A great deal of nonsense is written about fear. One man has said, "We have nothing to fear but fear itself," implying that fear is an evil. Fear can be good or evil, depending on what it is that we fear. We are told that the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom (Ps. 111:10; Prov. 1:7, etc.). Solomon said, "Fear God, and keep his commandments: for this is the whole duty of man" (Eccles. 12:13).

What is it that men *usually* fear? Men fear, first, that which they neither understand nor can control, and which threatens their existence, or else, second, they fear out of a bad conscience, because they are afraid of the consequences of their sin.

Fear is a natural consequence of sin and of guilt. Solomon said, "The wicked flee when no man pursueth: but the righteous are bold as a lion" (Prov. 28:1). And in the fourth century B.C., in *The Fables of Pilpay*, it is observed that "Guilty consciences always make people cowards." Shakespeare in *Hamlet* (Act 3, Sc. 1.83) wrote, "Conscience doth make cowards of us all."

The other common form of fear is in the presence of a danger which we cannot understand or control. Very clearly, our world today is seeing the rising power of evil men whose purpose it is to control us and to destroy us if we threaten their plans and control. It would be foolish to understate or underestimate that fact. On the other hand, we dare not overestimate that fact. The world is still totally in God's hands. It is Satanism to believe that evil governs history. In the battle against evil, the casualties are often heavy, although the victory is assured. We need to ask ourselves: whom do we believe is the lord of history, God or man? The one we fear most is the one we believe to be in control.

According to the Bible, the fear of man is to be overcome by faith in God. Of the man of faith, it is written, "He shall not be afraid of evil tidings: his heart is fixed, trusting in the LORD. His heart is established, he shall not be afraid, until he sees his desire upon his enemies" (Ps. 112:7–8). God knows our very real fears, but he summons us to faith, and to the confidence that He is God, the sovereign Lord of all history. In Revelation 21:8, "the fearful, and unbelieving" are numbered with the

most grievous sinners, "The abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars."

The word *fear* is *very closely* related to the word "worship," and this relationship is apparent in 2 Kings 17:35–36, as well as in studies of worship. When we fear something, we are thus in effect worshipping it as either a basic or ultimate power in the universe, or as something closely related to that power. All duly constituted authorities are thus linked by the Bible to that clean fear, the fear of God and His orders of authority. Thus when we move in terms of the fear of man, we are in effect worshipping man; when we move in terms of the fear of evil, we are in effect worshipping evil. We are to exercise godly caution and protect ourselves against evil, but the object of worship must be the triune God alone. It is significant that in the book of Acts, one of the terms for Christians or believers is "one that feareth God." Those who move in terms of the holy confidence of faith are those who believe in God and obey Him. Let us believe and obey him in matters spiritual and material, monetary and personal, so that our hearts may remain firm, fully trusting in the Lord.

404

A DEATH WISH?

Chalcedon Report No. 328, November 1992

Malcolm Muggeridge in 1972 observed that much of our civilization had at work in its heart a death wish: the economists and banks promote inflation; the "educationalists" create moral and intellectual chaos; moralists undermine morality; and our theologians dismantle the faith they are supposed to promote.

Things have not improved in the twenty years since Muggeridge made that statement. Even worse, too often the churches have joined forces with the enemies of Christ. All too much preaching and teaching is designed for the mentally lazy or the retarded; it is so meager and childish. People do not want to think nor to grow, and they prefer clergymen who give them pap, not strong food. As a result, the church is spiritually anemic.

A walk into most evangelical bookstores is distressing. The serious books are few. The Bible "study" books and guides are so elementary that they are embarrassing. Is the church appealing only to mindless people?

The reality is that the people in the pews are the substantial and better educated people of the United States. The caliber of their intelligence and their education are both very high. Why are people who are so industrious and productive in society so lazy in the church? How can we exercise dominion when we park our desire to grow outside the church door? There are some Christian periodicals which publish sermons and articles of superior insights and of substantial merit, but these are the ones with low numbers of subscribers and readers. Have churches joined the world in its death wish?

In Proverbs 8:35–36, we are told that Wisdom says,

> For whose findeth me findeth life, and shall obtain favour of the Lord. But he that sinneth against me wrongeth his own soul: all they that hate me love death.

We are to seek wisdom and to pursue it. Our Lord says also that we must "hunger and thirst after righteousness" or justice (Matt. 5:6) if we are to be members of His Kingdom. In Psalm 69:9, we read, "the zeal of thine house hath eaten me up," words which John 2:17 says found their fullness in Christ. If we are members of His new humanity, then there should be some zeal in us to grow and to serve! Because Jesus Christ is *the life* (John 14:6), we, His new human race, should manifest a will to life, not to death!

405

THE LONELY GRAVE

Chalcedon Report No. 347, June 1994

YESTERDAY, as we drove down into the valley, we passed a small, stonewall-enclosed spot, some hundred yards off the road. An expensive gravestone stands within it. This site is many miles from the nearest town or ranch. The grave marks the consideration given to a lone Englishman in the 1849 gold rush in our Calaveras County. Because the man was far from home and alone, the other miners honored him as they had not done to one of their own.

I cite this as an example of the character of the miners and pioneers. With very few exceptions, the frontier country was largely settled by hardworking, God-fearing men. The miners spent their Sabbaths reading their Bibles and writing letters home. More than a few historians have called attention to the fact that the frontier was not what fiction, film, and television have made it to be.

Why this dishonesty? Why the persistent misrepresentation of the Old West? Indians, blacks, Hispanics, and foreigners were usually fairly and justly treated. Christianity was practiced. Order prevailed.

But people are busy trying to dirty up our past as a way of justifying their evil present. They find evil more interesting than godliness. They prefer sin to virtue.

Whenever I go by that Englishman's grave, I think with respect of those miners. The Englishman was dead; he was new there, and he had no friends yet, nor relatives nearby. He could not know what his fellow miners were doing for him, but they did it. They did more for him than for one another because he was a stranger, and they went the extra mile to show their concern.

We once had many volunteer Christian groups caring for the stranger. I am glad to say they are again reappearing in our midst. We must once

again become Christian people in word and deed.

The goal of our salvation is not ourselves but the Kingdom of God (Matt. 6:33). We have too often acted as though we are the goal, and we assume that God's purpose is to serve us rather than we Him. No wonder we are in trouble.

406

WORK AND CULTURE

Chalcedon Report No. 114, February 1975

The modern state, having divorced itself from Biblical faith, has not only lost the criterion for truth, but it has also lost the ability to create a working society. Work in the Bible is God's ordained means whereby man gains dominion. Work for modern man is an ugly necessity which takes away time from the pursuit of pleasure. In turning from work to pleasure, modern man has chosen the pleasure principle over the reality principle as the operating standard for life.

The inability of most cultures to advance beyond a limited degree is due to their distaste for work. Work is regarded in most of history, as well as in much of the modern world, as a degrading and distasteful necessity, to be required by force of the lower classes.

A college girl, a relative, shared an apartment with three other girls, one of them from Latin America. Although the Latin American girl came from a family of somewhat less means than the other three, who were of the American middle class, in terms of her country she belonged to the upper class. She never picked up a dish. In the bathroom or bedroom, she dropped her clothing to the floor in the expectation that someone should pick them up for her. She obviously expected a full-time servant to feed her, pick up after her, and be at her beck and call. Work was something which should not be expected of her: her dignity placed her beyond work.

This attitude with respect to work is in increasing evidence. In the Soviet Union, the first generation had the background of disciplined work because of their upbringing in old Russia. With a third generation, this discipline is waning, and work is regarded with contempt and production suffers. All over the world, a growing element, products of the humanistic state and its culture, regard work as an evil. Significant sectors of the

New Left believe that machines and automation can eliminate work and "free" man, and only the evil conspiracies of the capitalists prevent this.

This is their goal, to be "free" from work. But, *first* of all, freedom from work is a surrender of dominion. Work was and is the God-ordained means to dominion. In spite of all its political stupidities, the United States remains the world leader because of its still remarkable productive abilities, a continuing consequence of the Puritan work ethic. Man cannot escape work. He will either work as a man gaining and exercising dominion, or he will work as a whipped slave, but he will work.

Second, a godly work ethic is time-conscious and respects time. Much contempt is expressed today for people who are clock-conscious, as though freedom means despising time. But time is life; it is man's most precious commodity. Time lost cannot be recovered, nor can time be boarded up. To despise time and clocks is to be suicidal. A godly work ethic practices the most basic conservation of all, the conservation of time and life.

Third, work is a theological fact: it is God-ordained for the creature who alone is created in God's image, man. It is God's appointed way for man to realize the implications of that image, namely, righteousness, holiness, knowledge, and dominion. By means of work, man is able to fulfill God's creation mandate and calling, and to become a ruler over himself, his calling, his household, and the world around him.

Basic to the dream of the humanistic state is the creation of a new world order, one in which man supposedly "finds" himself without God's help. The realization of man and history is seen as the rebirth of man as the new god and the death of the God of Scripture. This is to be the freedom of man.

This statist dream is not only antinomian, i.e., hostile to God's law, but also anti-work. Man's liberation is seen as freedom from God, law, and work. But life cannot be redefined. The conditions of life are given by God, life is God's creation, and its conditions are also totally God created. No more than man can live without breathing and eating can he live without law and work, nor can he live without God, without thereby choosing death. As Wisdom declared, ages ago, "all they that hate me love death" (Prov. 8:36). The conditions of life require the fountain of life.

The modern state, however, has by its humanism cut itself off from the fountain of life. It no longer has the ability to provide meaning to life, nor can it give work any enduring meaning. Social cohesiveness is waning, and the city becomes less and less a community and more and more a battleground between classes, races, and gangs. Modern man is rootless and cynical; he has trouble living with himself, and to live and work with others is for him a great burden.

A few generations ago, one of the most popular and common proverbs of the Western world held that "Every man is the son of his own works," i.e., a man could not blame others for his own failures. Increasingly, however, this belief has given way to the approach of classical Greek tragedy, namely, that man is a prisoner of his past. Classical and modern humanism are agreed on this radical environmentalist position: work is futile, for the past has doomed us. Humanism, then and now, ends up hostile to life and to man.

The future, like the past, will be dominated by those cultures which can work with purpose, ability, and zeal. Oratory can command votes, but purposive work commands history.

407

WORK

Chalcedon Report No. 122, October 1975

Modern man has often little pleasure in *work* because he has no sense of *estate* and *calling*. Without this, work for him is meaningless, and simply a chore to be performed.

The changed view of work was rather sharply manifested in Massachusetts, once the home of the Puritans and their dedication to work, in a senatorial election of the 1960s. One candidate was Edward Moore (Ted) Kennedy. An opponent charged that Kennedy had never worked a day in his life, an accurate statement and one which he felt would disqualify Kennedy in the minds of voters. The next day, an Irish workingman expressed a popular sentiment to Kennedy: "Teddy, me boy, you haven't missed a thing." As Olsen reports, "The election was a runaway. The opponent learned too late that Edward Moore Kennedy's appeal was *precisely* that he had never worked a day in his life." This placed him on a higher and princely plane (Jack Olsen, *The Bridge at Chappaquiddick* [New York, NY: Ace Books, 1970], p. 9).

In nineteenth-century America, men who retired in good health or lived off inherited income often left the United States, because the contempt for nonworking able-bodied men was very great. In twentieth-century America, such men became presidents and presidential candidates. The change is indeed a dramatic one.

It is also an evidence of a radically different religious situation. The reality principle has given way to a pleasure principle. Men live to enjoy themselves, and work is an ugly necessity which, hopefully, civilization will eliminate. Remember, all over the world during the 1960s, rioting students charged that work was unnecessary and constituted a form of conspiracy to keep man enslaved.

The lack of Christian faith has meant not only a decline in purposive

activity or work, but also a radical lack of elementary standards. James Bacon commented this year in his column on the insanity resulting from a lack of standards, as it appears in "sex magazines," heavily produced now in Europe and America. An advertisement in the "personals" column of one such periodical read: "Couple who dig whips, branding irons, handcuffs and snakes wants to meet new friends. No weirdos, please" (*Los Angeles Herald-Examiner*, June 9, 1975, p. A-10).

Where standards are gone, meaning is gone, and, without meaning, work is pointless. Not surprisingly, the ancient proverb, "It is better to work for nothing than to sit idle," is very much forgotten today. Such a statement has meaning only in a world where purpose and activity can have meaning.

All of this means that people find a candidate who does not need to work very appealing, having all the romance of Camelot and storybook princes, as Olsen noted of Kennedy. It means that work begins to loom in their minds as a form of oppression. For the early socialists, such as Marx and Engels, the working man was by definition an oppressed man because he had to work for his living. This attitude has since become commonplace.

Such an attitude towards work leads to a decline in productivity. It also leads to an evasion of work, to welfarism and drifting. In the United States, in 1974 and 1975, the number of Americans supported by taxes (government employees, the disabled, servicemen, the unemployed, those on welfare, and those on Social Security) comes to 80.65 million. Workers in the private sector number 71.65 million, and many of these are in services rather than production.

As work declines in importance, and the workers decline in numbers, society has two alternatives. The first, already in operation, is to compel, by taxation and sometimes by totalitarian measures as well, the minority to support the majority, or to put the nonworking majority to work by compulsion. In the Soviet Union, the latter course prevails: there is, technically, no unemployment, but there is not much production either. Without the help of the West, the Soviet Union would collapse. The second possibility is radical collapse, as the whole society falls apart because it is both ungovernable and nonworking. Both alternatives are ugly ones. The first is now operative, and the second a growing possibility.

Neither offers any solution. Only by a return to a theology of work, i.e., of estate and calling, and a theology of rest, or of the sabbath, can man be both productive and relaxed. This makes all the more urgent the reconstruction of all things in terms of a Biblical faith, with a restored doctrine of estate and calling.

Work is the key to dominion, and, ultimately, the productive and competent will survive and command. The modern perspective, which lionizes the nonworking (F. D. Roosevelt, the Kennedys, Rockefeller, etc.), is without a future. Its menace is that it can command people and their allegiance. Its failure is that it destroys productivity.

To believe that the immediate future is a troubled one is common sense; to believe that the future is a doomed one for man is practical atheism: it is a denial that God's order governs creation and makes, in the long run, any condition of life untenable other than that which conforms to the law of God. We have been called, not to defeat nor to slavery, but to victory and dominion.

408

MILD ATHEISM

Chalcedon News #4, Winter 1984

In a thoughtful article, Donald E. Demray wrote, in the summer 1982 edition of *The Asbury Theological Seminary Herald*, on "Mild Atheism." Borrowing the term from Bryon S. Lawson, he defined worry, distrust, doubt, and a weak faith as mild atheism. Perhaps a better term might be practical atheism; at any rate, the point is a good one.

The term is a very fitting one for what we see all around us today. In late 1982, Pastor Everett Siliven was very much in the news; because he refused to allow the state of Nebraska to control the teaching ministry of the church of which he is pastor, he was arrested and jailed. At the same time, similar trials were under way, or decisions pending, in several other states. I was a witness at many of these trials.

The sad fact is that many of the fellow pastors of these men on trial did not stand with them. For a variety of reasons, they chose to separate themselves and to be critical. In some instances their fears of state reprisals were most evident. Now, let us concede at once that the state is very powerful; moreover, the modern state is especially militant, not in dealing with crime, but in crushing any threat to its sovereignty. There are very good reasons for being afraid of the state!

There is, however, a more serious consideration. However much at times we may be afraid of men, we need all the more to be afraid of God. We are plainly told by God's law-word, "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God" (Heb. 10:31). If we are more afraid of men than of God, we manifest a practical atheism. The Bible tells us plainly, "The fear of the Lord tendeth to life: and he that hath it shall abide satisfied; he shall not be visited with evil" (Prov. 19:23). Again, "The fear of man bringeth a snare: but whoso putteth his trust in the Lord shall be safe" (Prov. 29:25).

Some time ago, at a meeting of scholars attended by Otto Scott, one of the speakers was Dr. Milton Friedman, the Nobel Laureate economist. Friedman described the present time as a transition era, and he saw three possibilities for the future. *First*, "We seem to be moving toward a limping welfare state." *Second*, "We may go all the way to totalitarianism." *Third*, the powers of the federal government "will be either cut back or spread"; any prospect of cutting is somewhat dimmed at the present.

Let us add a fourth possibility. Either Christians will apply the law-word of God to every area of life and thought and conquer in Christ, or, as salt that has lost its savor, they will be thrown out by Christ, "to be trodden under foot of men" (Matt. 5:13). It is Christ who pronounces and who executes this word of judgment. Practical atheism pays a fearful price.

This is why Christian Reconstruction is so burning a passion and concern with us. The Lord summons us to be either the salt and the light of the world (Matt. 5:14), or be cast out by Him to be trampled underfoot by the forces of judgment. When we are ruled by the fear of men, the Lord God gives us over to that fear in a total way: "And upon them that are left alive of you I will send a faintness into their hearts in the lands of their enemies; and the sound of the shaken leaf shall chase them; and they shall flee, as fleeing from a sword; and they shall fall when none pursueth" (Lev. 26:36).

When Franky Schaeffer produced the film, *Whatever Happened to the Human Race?* the reaction of many pastors matched the description of Leviticus 26:36. They were already in captivity to the fear of man. What hope can they expect from God without repentance? There was obviously with each of these men "no fear of God before his eyes" (Ps. 36:1).

Few of us are naturally courageous, and natural courage or boldness is not the issue here, but faith and a holy boldness. We cannot have this godly courage if we do not pray for it and cultivate it.

We will be governed by fear, either the fear of God or the fear of man. We will stand up to and deny someone, either God or man. Most of us dislike confrontations, but God requires them, and life is a continual confrontation with problems, with evil, and with opportunities. All confrontations are opportunities if we meet them in Christ, who makes all things work together for good to them that love Him, to all who are the called in Christ (Rom. 8:28).

409

TRUSTING GOD

Chalcedon Report No. 237, April 1985

One of the amazing facts about most church members is their implicit atheism. They believe that all things in this world are stronger than God, and that God's Word is least to be trusted. For example, God says, in Isaiah 41:10, "Fear thou not; for I am with thee: be not dismayed; for I am thy God: I will strengthen thee; yea, I will help thee; yea, I will uphold thee with the right hand of my righteousness." We are plainly told that God is our defender, and that He will never leave us nor forsake us (Heb. 13:5–6). God does not promise us an easy life, but He does assure us of a justified and victorious life. He upholds us with His "righteousness." The word in Hebrew is *tsedeq*: it means justice, and it has a legal connotation, but most translations give us a watered-down reading.

We trust so many idiocies, including ourselves. Why not take God at His word and trust Him? If we do not believe that God is true to His Word, how can we believe that God will be true to us who distrust Him? One of the church's greatest sins is its refusal to trust in the Lord. How can God honor such a people?

410

STRESS

Chalcedon Report No. 370, May 1996

Prior to perhaps 1950, the word *stress* was primarily an engineering term, and older dictionaries gave detailed, technical, and scientific definitions of its meaning. Since then, the meaning of stress more commonly refers to the tensions felt by persons, both emotionally and intellectually.

A major industry has arisen to alleviate human stress: psychoanalysts, psychiatrists, psychologists, tranquilizers and various other drugs, counselors, drug companies, self-help books, magazine articles, ministries both in and out of the church to cultivate peace of mind, and more. In all too many churches, modernist and evangelical, the goal seems to be the alleviation of stress, not salvation. Moreover, the peace promised by such agencies differs from that promised by Jesus Christ in John 14:27. His peace is not of this world, and it is given to us in the midst of tribulation (John 16:33).

How should a Christian think about stress? Is it Christian to want a stress-free life? Is something wrong with stress? Obviously, grief and concern marked many a Biblical saint, often to startling degrees. Did they seek a stress-free life, or was something else their concern?

We cannot think realistically about stress unless we recognize that, in a sinful, fallen world, it is inescapable. Because men are sinful, and because this fallen world is full of evils, we will experience stress commonly and routinely. The easiest escape from stress is death, a route some take. With others, it leads to an escape from responsibilities. I recall some forty-five years ago, a woman who, at the slightest frustration, went into an emotional tailspin, carried on, blamed everyone in sight for her "condition," and then went to bed. Her husband was not much better.

Sin creates stress, because it damages human relationships, hurts people, and introduces hatred and evil where love should prevail. To long for

a stress-free life in a sinful world is itself sinful because we are avoiding the real problem, sin in others — and in ourselves. About thirty-five years ago, I knew an intelligent and talented person who remained in a darkened room, prayed much and spoke of having two or three visions, but never took up normal duties because the stress was too oppressive. This person's "suffering" made others suffer.

Today stress is little tolerated. With more than a few, it leads to temper tantrums if their quest for a kind of nirvana is interrupted. They see their sensitivity to stress as a higher spirituality, and themselves on a higher spiritual plane.

If we look at the Biblical saints whose lives were full of suffering, Abraham, Moses, David, Jeremiah, Paul, and others, we see no flight from stress but rather an insistent faithfulness to their calling. They were never victims of stress but always "more than conquerors" in Christ (Rom. 8:37).

When in 1828 Noah Webster published his first dictionary, he briefly defined *stress* in its psychological sense but spoke of it as little used. Freud and Jung, however much they contributed to the modern usage, did not speak of *stress* but of various neuroses and like conditions. The idea of *stress* as itself the problem is rather new.

As we have seen, *stress* as *commonly* experienced is a sinful, retreatest response to a sinful world. It is true that people have at times been subjected to vicious treatments, to tortures, and to sadistic evils. Such persons are not usually the victims of stress, however great their sufferings. They have experienced *evils*.

We should be fearful, therefore, of succumbing to the feeling of stress. Ours is a God-created world, and all experiences are God-ordained. Paul tells us, "There hath no temptation taken you but such as is common to man: but God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able; but will with the temptation also make a way to escape, that ye may be able to bear it" (1 Cor. 10:13).

A high percentage of stress is personally created, by brooding over a problem, by resentment against certain persons, by seeing ourselves as deserving better at the hands of God and man, by brooding over the fact that our husband, wife, or children are a disappointment, by resenting our lot in life, and so on and on.

Someone wisely compared stress to me recently as comparable to a fever. A fever tells us that something is wrong with us, and it serves as a warning. Stress can also in most cases tell us that we are taking ourselves too seriously, and God not seriously enough.

Stress is a sickness of our times. I recall as a child and in my youth, meeting and knowing many who had survived massacres, wars, famines,

slave labor camps, and the like, and the memory of them sometimes still shames me when I think of their great peace — and my impatience. My brother Haig met in Bulgaria in this decade a pastor's widow who spent sixteen years in prison, under horrible conditions, for teaching women the Bible. Haig describes this woman, in her late eighties, as radiant and peaceful: she has never felt sorry for herself, only grateful that the Lord has used her. Stress was not a part of her experience; faith and victory were and are.

We in the Western world live in luxury and peace compared to the rest of the world, but we are most full of complaints perhaps, and certainly more subject to stress than others. This is an aspect of our departure from Christ. We can have no part of Him if we want a stress-free life. In fact, He *promises* us tribulation when He says, "These things I have spoken unto you, that in me ye might have peace. In the world ye shall have tribulation: but be of good cheer; I have overcome the world" (John 16:33).

It is time that we *religiously* accept stress as a fact of life and a test of our faith. By avoiding stress, we avoid necessary moral stands, and we certainly are then unwilling to express righteous indignation, which is most stressful. The fear of stress leads to moral compromise and to a departure from the courage and conviction which are essential to sound morality. The flight from stress can be a flight from morality.

When the Great Depression began in 1929, it was interesting to see what happened. Crime decreased and church attendance increased. What would now be called a stressful era became a time of reassessment for many, and youth then took adversity better than youth since 1960 has taken prosperity. Instead of being a recipe for disaster, stress was for many a prescription for growth and maturity. Nowadays, too many avoid maturity by avoiding stress.

411

TESTING

Chalcedon Report No. 346, May 1994

MANY years ago, as a student, I first encountered Thomas Paine's words, "These are the times that try men's souls." My immediate reaction was one of a strongly favorable response, but almost at once a negative temper set in. I realized that all life is a testing in one way or another. With some, it is a harsh and bitterly cruel, as with my parents and relatives on their death march; the survivors were not many. But I knew also many a person living a quiet, unruffled life of comfort whose life was being tested in other ways. None can escape God's testing; it comes in various ways, dramatically or quietly.

But testing, trials, and troubles are a problem to this generation as perhaps never before. We have had a pervasive temper, created by what John Dewey's educational philosophy represented, which is hostile to testing. This hostility means "social promotions" in the schools. It means all kinds of restraints on firing or punishment for the incompetent. It means, as a godless woman once told me, "A true Christian *never* hurts anyone's feelings." It means freedom from judgment, freedom from failing, freedom, in short, to be evil, unpleasant, and hostile. It means freedom to sin with impunity.

In a fallen world, however, all of life is a God-ordained testing: no testing, no heaven, because we remain satisfied with our sins, and we treat the Lord as no more than a fire and life insurance agent: we remain unconverted.

As a young man, I heard a pastor, a very ordinary one, pray a great prayer; one sentence has remained with me ever since. He prayed, "We thank Thee for all our yesterdays." My immediate reaction was one of shock: how could I be grateful for all my yesterdays? But, as I thought about it, I recognized the meaning of Romans 8:28: "And we know that

all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose."

This testing never ends in our lifetime, because its purposes include time and eternity. One of my father's favorite texts was Romans 5:1–9, wherein Paul glories in all his tribulations because, knowing God, he knows what the end result will be.

To hunger for a life without testing is to hunger for hell without knowing it. Our growth, our sanctification, is by means of testing, among other things. Of course these are times that test men's souls; all history is a time of testing. Those who reject testing are the failures of life.

412

PATIENCE

Chalcedon Report No. 388, November 1997

A few years ago, a comic strip showed a minister on his knees, praying for patience. After his "amen," feeling no surge of patience, he looked up to heaven, demanding, "Well?!"

We miss the point, in any study of patience, if we forget that patience is presented to us first of all as an aspect of God's dealings with us. Many texts such as Exodus 34:6 and Numbers 14:18 tell us that patience is primarily an aspect of God's own being and nature. God is very patient with us who constantly try His patience. His attitude is often called "long-suffering," an accurate term for His readiness to wait for us to repent and to change.

This is why our impatience towards one another and towards God is so ugly a vice. And to be impatient is a vice. Too many of us are easily testy and impatient, and we act as though this is a sign of higher standards on our part. Impatient people are a trial to be around because their demands take priority over courtesy and respect.

God is spoken of as "the God of patience and consolation," and it is Paul's prayer that we be "likeminded one toward another according to Christ Jesus" (Rom. 15:5). In Revelation 13:10, John speaks of "the patience and the faith of the saints," and many texts make it clear that patience is a mark of faith. Too many people seem to think that their impatience means a superior faith! R. Gregor Smith rightly spoke of patience as "a lively outgoing power of faith, an active energy rather than a passive resignation."

Too many impatient people act as though their impatience is a mark of superior virtue as they put up with miserable sinners! Such people act as if their discourtesy and rudeness are marks of a higher moral status, and they seem to feel martyred at putting up with the rest of us! The impatient

are not peaceful people. They create storms with their demands. And they are shocked when someone calls attention to their bad conduct.

Peace, together with patience, should be our normal behavior. Because God has been and is supremely patient with us, we must be patient towards one another.

The impatient may not always be wrong on issues, but they are almost always wrong in their attitudes. All one needs to do is to examine one's relationship to the Lord to realize that our own sins and shortcomings are very real. Our criticisms are rarely effectual, and too often, unasked critiques only hurt, irritate, or anger. Prayer can be more effectual in making changes. Of course, the change then is not our doing, nor a plus to our credit, so impatient and hard words come more readily to us!

We live in an impatient age, one whose demand too long has been, "Utopia Now!" Usually, the only thing that comes that quickly is hell on earth. Apparently too many people want hell now because they certainly work to create it! How about you?

413

WAITING ON GOD

Chalcedon Report No. 359, June 1995

Some years ago, when I was undergoing a particularly ugly time of hostilities and attacks, my father sent me a note, with a verse jotted down on it: "But they that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength; they shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run, and not be weary; and they shall walk, and not faint" (Isa. 40:31).

I have used that verse often since he asked me to stand firmly in terms of it. It was then the mid-1950s, and now, in the mid-1990s, forty years later, I still rely on that tested word.

Our faith is about renewal of church, state, and culture, the renewal of all things and of all creation in Christ.

If therefore we look at this present evil world, and our present evil predicament, and, in terms of that, lose heart, we are sinning. Despair is a sin because it distrusts God.

In Isaiah 40:30, Isaiah tells us, "Even the youths shall faint and be weary, and the young men shall utterly fall." It is not a natural matter, and young energy is not enough. As against the strong and the young, those who wait upon God shall renew their strength effortlessly. Just as an eagle soars without effort, so, too, the waiters on God shall rise up with easy strength. To demonstrate the results of waiting on the Lord, Isaiah gives us three descriptions of what happens to the waiters on God: they shall walk, run, and fly! Now, flying is not natural to man, so what he is saying is that our strength will be more than normal when we wait on the Lord. We will go from strength to strength.

J. A. Alexander said of this verse, "The class of persons meant to be described are those who show their confidence in God's ability and willingness to execute his promises, by patiently awaiting their fulfillment."

Back in the 1960s, in an early issue of the *Chalcedon Report*, I called

attention to the saying, "Why pray when you can worry?" Too often we act as though God's order will collapse if we fail to put in our self-required amount of worrying! As our Lord tells us "Which of you by taking thought [or, being anxious] can add one cubit unto his stature?" (Matt. 6:27). Much of our worrying is due to our insistence on doing God's thinking for Him, as though our future depended on it! We forget that God managed things quite well before we, and our generation, came along.

Therefore do your duty, and wait on the Lord. Worrying and fretting can never renew our strength, and we will wake up in the morning very much the worse for it. "Wait, I say, on the Lord" (Ps. 27:14).

414

THE PSALMS

Chalcedon Report No. 402, January 1999

I feel sorry for those who have not made, apart from other readings in the Bible, the Psalms their constant reading and companion. Psalm 1 begins (vv. 1–2) by declaring *blessed* the man whose "delight is in the law of the Lord; and in his law doth he meditate day and night." Our lives, we are told, depend on this, and our prospering in the Lord.

Because we live in a sinful world, we shall face no light adversities for our stand, but God knows us and guides us to the end. Because we are known of the Lord, we share in His victory over the forces of darkness.

The Psalms are good bedtime reading and meditating: "commune with your own heart upon your bed, and be still" (Ps. 4:4). The peace of such meditation gives strength to all our days.

The writers of the Psalms did not lack troubles and persecution, but they came out victorious because they were allied to God who is the victory.

Why, then, neglect the Psalms? What other reason can there be other than a sinful laziness? When we know the grace so readily given by the Lord, to neglect it becomes sinfulness itself.

I grew up as a member of a poor and much-persecuted people, and yet a happy one. The Psalms were often on their lips and crept into everyday speech in their early years in the United States. Prosperity tended in some to do what persecution could not.

The Psalms were written by men living like us in a fallen world, and they thus speak to us also. For years, I dreamed of writing a book on some of the neglected Psalms, but now I am too old to think of it.

I can, however, speak of the joy, peace, and strength they have given me, and how, in the trying days of my life, I turn to them to hear God speak to me as my Shepherd and to know, therefore, that I shall not want

(Ps. 23:1). In this century, we have gone from being a country where every school child knew Psalm 23 by heart to one in which few do today. We are the poorer for it.

We can begin to change the world by changing ourselves. Begin reading the Psalms tonight.

415

THOUGH HE SLAY ME

Chalcedon Report No. 426, January 2001

One of the greatest lessons of my life was to recognize the absolute priority of God and His law and His Word, which is what Calvinism is about. I never doubted the Bible, but, as a child, the Lord was there like my parents for me to love and obey and for them to help me. As I matured, I began to understand the faith better when I reread Job, a decisive experience for me. A key verse was Job 13:15, "Though he slay me, yet will I trust in him." I suddenly saw the true meaning of our faith. God has absolute priority. I live only to serve Him, and it is a sin to put oneself at the center of things.

No matter what, I must trust the Lord. I am simply His creature. I live to serve Him, not me. The heart of the faith is not what the Lord can do for me, but what I *must* do for Him.

My faith must be God-centered, not self-centered. To the very end, I must love, obey, and praise Him with all my being.

We can never take precedence over the Lord. It is a sin to make our hopes too important. "Though he slay me, yet will I trust in him." Nothing in my life can take precedence over that faith.

We are not Calvinists until we affirm that faith. The Reformed faith is not merely assent to certain sound doctrines, but radical submission to the God who is absolutely Lord over us. I have wanted so much in my life that I did not get, but I have gotten what the Lord has willed that I should get. Not all of this has pleased me, but it has pleased and has served His holy purpose.

My word has meant nothing to God. Again and again, He has driven me to His Word. It is a blessed word, but sometimes a terrifying word as it undercuts my hopes and my word.

It is not easy to trust in the Lord when He is destroying our hopes and

undercutting our stands, but the alternative is terrifying. We can safely stand only on God's ground.

Memorize that simple sentence of Job 13:15 and repeat it in your private trials. It will give you strength because it will teach you true trust. It is a verse to live and die by.

That verse tells us who is God, and how to serve Him. It speaks of the priority of God and confounds our pretensions. Believe and obey; believe and live.

416

"GOD IS NO BUTTERCUP"

Chalcedon Report No. 322, May 1992

During World War II, Otto Scott was in the Merchant Marine, the most dangerous branch of the service and with the highest casualties. During one fierce North Atlantic storm, a boatswain was swept overboard; a moment later, a high wave threw up his body, frozen stiff as a board, and then he disappeared forever. After another very savage storm, Scott, of Scottish origin, concluded, "God is no buttercup."

In November 1990, Dorothy and I were given a guided tour of Edinburgh, Scotland, by Chalcedon's Quentin and Pamela Johnston. Next to Greyfriar's Church, where the Solemn League and Covenant was signed by Calvinists, was an old prison, heavy stone walls and iron doors, but no roof. Guards walked along the top of the walls, where the prisoners, awaiting trial, often died of exposure or froze to death. Nearby is a stone marker in the churchyard commemorating the 17,000 martyrs to the vengeance of the bloody Stuarts on the throne. "God is no buttercup." The Covenanters' judge died in bed.

At present, the armies of Turkey and Azerbaijan (the Azeri Turks) are massed on the Armenian border; their dream is of a Pan-Turanian or Pan-Turkish empire, from West China, through the Caucasus, and into the Balkans, with no Christians left alive. The White House is indifferent to this. After all, in the war in Iraq (i.e., the Gulf War), we bombed the churches of Iraq out of existence, but no mosques. Why not? We were there to help two evil Islamic powers, Saudi Arabia and Kuwait. Only the rival pan-Islamic dreams of Saudi Arabia and Iran restrain the Turkish move against Armenia today. (There is now a rival Islamic parliament in Britain; Islam is moving into Spain again, and also Italy, France, Germany, and elsewhere by migration and dreams of power.) "God is no buttercup." You stand for the faith or die.

Some years ago, a wealthy couple issued me an ultimatum: turn premillennial or pretribulationist, or they would leave the church. Mrs. B. said indignantly, "I refuse to believe that a God of love would put me through the tribulation. After all, I gave up smoking and dancing, which I adored, for Him!" My one grandfather, a businessman, was killed for his faith by Turks. My paternal grandfather was blinded by them because he preached the gospel. When he memorized vast portions of Scripture and continued to preach, he was killed. "God is no buttercup." The Bs left the church.

Two friends and supporters, James and Angel Bilezikian, called last night. They are in prayer, like me, about the dangers facing Armenia. They observed that criminals are motivated by a desire for instant gratification. So too, they said, are all too many church people, especially the "rapture" pretribulationists. But "God is no buttercup."

We are told in 1 John 4:8 that "God is love." In 1 John 1:5, "God is light." In Hebrews 12:29, we are told "our God is a consuming fire." In Exodus 34:14, we read, "for the Lord, whose name is Jealous, is a jealous God." We are told many, many more things about God; all true, but none totally encompass His meaning. Only the rationalists are fools enough to believe that God is totally comprehensible.

What we cannot do is to define God, especially in terms of our present-oriented concerns. God thinks and plans for us, in terms of all eternity. And He does His own defining: He defines Himself in Christ and His atonement. The God who gives so much of Himself to us in Christ has no use for our present-oriented, buttercup-oriented thinking. The God of the imagination of many church people has never existed. The God who is the living God is alone to be believed and obeyed. "God is no buttercup." We live in a sin-filled world, and we want peace therein and peace with that world. No way!

417

FAITH

Chalcedon Report No. 351, October 1994

At breakfast, Dorothy made a remarkable comment about Hebrews 11:6: "But without faith it is impossible to please him [God]: for he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him." There are three remarkable statements in this sentence, and the final one is the telling one, as Dorothy noted.

First, we cannot please God except by faith, a faith with works. After all, the devils believe that there is a God, and tremble (James 2:19).

Second, we must come to God believing that He is, that He is Lord and Creator, and our Redeemer and Judge.

Third, but, above all, we must seek and believe that "he is the rewarder of them that diligently seek Him." We expect to be rewarded for the work we do at our workplace. Similarly, we *must* believe that God is the best and most faithful Paymaster in all creation. We dare not treat Him as a faithless Lord to His people.

John Newton, in one of his greatest hymns ("Come, My Soul, Thy Suit Prepare"), wrote:

> Thou art coming to a King,
> Large petitions with thee bring;
> For his grace and power are such,
> None can ever ask too much;
> None can ever ask too much.

Our life should be one of faithful service and great expectations. Remember, we do serve the great King of kings.

418

PRAYER

Chalcedon Report No. 25, October 1, 1967

Why pray, when you can worry? Some years ago, Dr. O. Hallesby told the amusing story of a not too bright old woman in his rural Norway. She trudged to and from town with her sack of groceries. When a neighboring farmer offered her a lift home one day in his wagon, Mary climbed up beside the farmer, but she still clutched her heavy bag over her shoulder. "Put your bag down in the back, Mary," suggested the farmer. But Mary refused: "The least I can do to help, when you've been so good to me, is to carry my own load." As Hallesby pointed out, most of us are like old Mary in relation to God: we clutch our own load, as though He were not carrying us and all that we have.

In the days ahead, we must be prompt to act, and prompt to pray. But how do we pray?

First of all, as St. Paul made clear, "he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him" (Heb. 11:6). It is useless to pray if we do not believe that God is the absolute sovereign, able to answer our prayers, and in His righteousness, given to a strict accounting, yet loving and gracious to His own. The first premise of successful prayer is thus faith, and the obedience of faith.

Second, prayer is simply talking with God. Theologians have defined the forms of prayer, and the ingredients of prayer (confession, praise, thanksgiving, petition, etc.), but our concern here is elementary, and not liturgical. Prayer, then, is our conversation with God. But conversation dies when it is one-sided. Nothing is more trying than to maintain a formal, polite attitude of conversation with persons we dislike or cannot talk to. On the other hand, two very good friends can spend hours together and talk freely and endlessly and with pleasure. It is impossible for us to talk freely and easily with God if we are not listening to Him and

have very little idea of what He has to say. God's side of the conversation is the Bible. To speak with God freely and successfully, it is important first of all to hear Him. Regular, daily Bible reading is the best and surest stimulus to prayer, and also a necessity for our spiritual and moral growth. Family Bible reading, a chapter after dinner, with prayer, is an excellent and much needed practice.

Third, the manner of prayer is a question in the minds of many. When our prayers are more deliberate, or with the family, we need to remember all God's mercies and blessings and to express our gratitude as well as our needs. But another type of prayer needs to have a major part in our lives also; brief, silent, sentence prayers throughout the day. If you must deal with a difficult problem, pray quickly first, "Lord, I don't know how to handle this situation. Give me wisdom to cope with it. In Jesus's name, Amen." If a trying person must be met during the day, pray, "Lord, give me patience, firmness, or whatever I need to face this person." And so on. These sentence prayers, by the dozen, should dot our day, and they will make it an easier day for us.

With respect to table graces, there are many forms, but I like in particular the Anglican form:

> Father: The eyes of all wait upon Thee, O Lord.
> Family: And Thou givest them their meat in due season.
> Father: Thou openest Thy hand,
> Family: And fillest all things living with plenteousness.
> Father: Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost,
> All: As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end, Amen.
> Father: Bless, O Father, this food to strengthen our bodies. Bless us to Thy loving service. In Jesus' name, Amen.

Instead of the concluding formal prayer by the father, I prefer an informal, spontaneous prayer in terms of daily needs.

Fourth, prayer should be "in Jesus' name." We approach God, not in our righteousness, but in His righteousness as declared unto us in Jesus Christ. As members of Jesus Christ, we have access to God through His person. Hence, we pray in His name, because we stand in His righteousness and in His grace. Because our salvation is the work of Christ, our merit and standing in God's sight are also of Christ.

Fifth, we must remember that God is absolute Lord over all things. The tendency to limit God's power to things spiritual is a Manichean heresy. God is able to give us things material and spiritual. The Bible is very plainspoken in its promises: Jesus said, "Therefore I say unto you, What things soever ye desire, when ye pray, believe that ye receive them, and

ye shall have them" (Mark 11:24). "And whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, that will I do; that the Father may be glorified in the Son" (John 14:13). "Verily, verily I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give it you" (John 16:23). "Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you . . . that ye should go and bring forth fruit, and that your fruit should remain: that whatsoever ye shall ask of the Father in my name, he may give it you" (John 15:16). St. John wrote, "And whatsoever we ask, we receive of him, because we keep his commandments, and do those things that are pleasing in his sight" (1 John 3:22). "And if we know that he hears us, whatsoever we ask, we know that we have the petitions that we desired of Him" (1 John 5:15).

These verses make it clear that prayers which are full of vague statements are meaningless. God has given every man a calling, responsibilities and duties under Him in Christ, and He expects us to discharge those duties and challenges. And, in the process of meeting our responsibilities, we must rely on His help by prayer. I have heard prayers by ministers which are really an insult to God: these so-called prayers are full of flowery compliments but say nothing and ask nothing. The man is apparently too sure of his own ability to handle every problem to ask God's help specifically and concretely. But if God is sovereign, we cannot function without Him. "In him we live, and move, and have our being" (Acts 17:28). If we have nothing to ask of the absolute Sovereign, it is because we feel ourselves to be sovereign. We ask, because we cannot live without Him and His help, because God's grace, mercy, blessing, and providential care are the ground of our being and the safety and prosperity of our lives. We ask "in Jesus' name," in terms of His person and our godly responsibilities and fulfillment in Him.

Sixth, our prayers must be concerned about our own real needs, as well as the needs of the church as a whole, or of the world. Prayer must be personal, but there is a difference between personal petition and greedy petition. We can ask for much without being greedy, and ask for little and be greedy. As St. James said, "Ye ask, and receive not, because ye ask amiss" (James 4:3). We cannot treat the world and God as though all things exist for our sake, as though all things have to justify themselves by serving our goals and purposes, our own desires. The first petition of the Lord's Prayer says, "Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven" (Matt. 6:10). Our Lord said, concerning all the necessities and normal hopes of this life, "But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you" (Matt. 6:33). Prayer must be personal, but it must be in Christ and in terms of the calling of God, and our responsibilities, needs, and hopes in Him.

Seventh, some writers have much to say about the "mistakes" in praying, but, very simply, the biggest mistake is not praying. We need not trouble ourselves about mistakes in praying. If we read the Bible and persevere in prayer, the mistakes take care of themselves, even as a child's language grows in maturity with schooling. I like the story of the small boy who wrote his first letter, to his father who was away on business: "Dear Daddy, I luv you and mis you. When are you comeing hom. Are you bringing me a pressent. Your luving son." The letter was faulty, but it was still perfect: it expressed a love and dependence which delighted the father. Our prayers are often like that. God views the prayer of faith with grace, righteousness, and love, not with the human nitpicking attitude.

Eighth, central to our Lord's teaching on prayer was the emphasis on perseverance: "men ought always to pray, and not to faint" (Luke 18:1). "With God all things are possible" (Matt. 19:26), and whatever our petitions are, if they can be prayed "in Jesus' name," we are encouraged to persevere in prayer.

Ninth, all our petitions save one are conditional upon God's grace, but one petition has as its only condition *faith*. We can, if we have faith, ask God for wisdom, "and it shall be given" (James 1:5–6). Wisdom we all need in these days, and we need to pray for it. Obviously, not many are praying for it.

Prayer is inescapable. Man is not omnipotent, nor is man self-sufficient. For a man to feel self-sufficient means that he is self-deluded and insane; life has a bitter disillusionment in store for him. Men with any sense of reality *know* their limitations, sins, and shortcomings as they face the problems of this world and of their own being. They will look to a higher power. Most men make the state that higher power, and their prayer, in effect, is that "The socialist kingdom come, and the will of the state be done," so that they may have this day their socialist security and bread. In this respect, the socialists have more common sense than the anarchistic libertarians who dispense with God and the state. We are all familiar with the emotional instabilities and problems of these deluded peoples. But the socialists, in trusting in the state, are only trusting in man magnified; the state has vastly more power than themselves, but also less wisdom. Take your choice: pray to yourself as your own god, pray to the state as most men are now doing, or pray to God. Your life and your future depend on your answer.

419

HOW NOT TO PRAY

Chalcedon Report No. 320, March 1992

I believe strongly in the need for prayer; most people do not pray enough. The problem is that too many prayers ask for miracles from God when what is needed is faith, courage, and work on their part.

In the Bible itself, the miracles are few, except mainly in three eras: the time of Moses; the time of Elijah and Elisha; and in the time of our Lord and the apostles. Even then, God did not allow prayer to replace practical action.

Thus, we are told that King Herod had decided to kill the Christ child (Matt. 2:16–23). God did not tell Joseph and Mary that He would deliver them miraculously; rather, He told Joseph and Mary to make a run for it to Egypt, and to stay there until Herod died. In other words, God did not work a miracle to deliver the infant Jesus: He ordered commonsense action.

Why should He work miracles to deliver us when work, common sense, and faith can supply the answer?

A woman whose son and daughter both became promiscuous, called up everyone on her "prayer chain" to ask for prayers for her dear children. Nothing good happened, of course. What God required of her was that she ground them, take away their sports cars, cut off their allowances, and apply some godly discipline. Long before that, she should have placed them in a Christian school.

I believe all the sweet ladies on that "prayer chain" were guilty of blasphemy, as was the mother. They were taking the name of the Lord in vain, and by prayer, to make matters worse.

If God did not work a miracle to save the infant Jesus when practical action was the right step, why should He give you preferential treatment? The second temptation of our Lord by Satan was to ask God for a miracle

where none was needed (Matt. 4:5–7), and our Lord's answer was, "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God." Most prayers tempt God: they demand miracles where faith, courage, and work are needed.

We are commanded to pray, and our Lord gives us the model prayer. It begins: "Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven" (Matt. 6:9–10). Only after this are the simple requests in order.

Who has the priority in your prayer? Christ's Kingdom and work, or your own desire for miracles instead of faith, courage, and work? What kind of prayer do you think God answers?

420

PRAYING AGAINST GOD

Chalcedon Report No. 386, September 1997

Over the years, a certain type of problem has been encountered so often that my memory of each particular one is blurred. This is what happens: someone, a husband or wife, a father or mother, is faced with an ugly situation. The spouse is an unbeliever, often adulterous, or the teenage children are hostile to the faith, involved in illegal activities which can jeopardize the property, and so on and on. St. Paul says, "But if the unbelieving depart, let him depart" (1 Cor. 7:15). Of lawless youths in the family, the godly parents must be on the side of the law (Deut. 21:18–21).

Do these people listen to God? No. Instead, they pray to God for a conversion but then act in terms of the absolute certainty of that hope rather than God's Word! They assume that their prayers are especially holy and carry more weight than God's Word. They expect God to answer their prayers when they pay no attention to God's Word.

Our love for an ungodly spouse or child cannot sanctify our refusal to obey God's Word. In too many cases, the spouse whose sin and presence is tolerated in love corrupts the children. Have we done well by our stubborn insistence that our wishes and prayers must outweigh God's Word?

Too often, such praying people insist on seeing their position as the holy one. They will say that, in spite of their pastor's counsel and the word of friends, they have clung to their prayers for the spouse's or child's conversion. But their persistence is evidence of sin, not grace. If conversion later occurs, well and good (though it rarely does), but they must act in terms of God's law, and not in terms of their hopes nor their prayers. In one instance, I asked, what would you do, if you were on a jury, and another person's son were on trial for murder? What if you knew that that young man's mother and father were praying for his conversion? Would you convict, or vote for acquittal to help the mother? The answer was acquittal.

But this is evil. It is the enthronement of sentimentality over God's law. It is not a sign of grace but of depravity to place our feelings and wishes above the law-word of God.

We are in deep trouble because too many people in the churches are praying against God and His Word. They have exalted their feelings and their prayers to a position of ascendancy over God Himself, and against His Word, and they call their position a holy one.

There are times when God forbids us to pray about certain persons (1 John 5:16). There are certain persons we are not to help (2 John 10–11). God does not say He does nothing in such cases. Rather, He places limits on our freedom to pray.

Too often, praying is a way of saying, "My will be done." One determined mother routinely asked friends to pray with her for her very wayward son, saying, "I am determined that he come to know the Lord." She was in effect saying, "My will be done," and she was determined to nag God into compliance. Her prayers were not answered, and she became more and more a caricature of a Christian.

Prayer is no substitute for obeying God: it cannot replace obedience. More than one man or woman has told me that his or her spouse's stubborn insistence that his or her prayer be answered has done damage to the relationship. If you are disregarding God's plain word to pray for a miracle, do not be surprised if His answer is your judgment.

421

PRAYING BY THE YARD

Chalcedon Report No. 324, July 1992

Some generations ago, when Dwight L. Moody was holding a revival meeting in England, the meeting was opened with prayer by a local pastor. Moody saw a group of university students enter and sit in the back, obviously there out of curiosity. After the praying pastor droned on for ten or fifteen minutes, the students got up to leave. Noticing this, Moody jumped to his feet and asked the congregation to unite in a familiar hymn while their brother finished his report to God! Amused and delighted, the students sat down. One of them, who was converted that night, became one of the greatest of missionaries, Sir Wilfred Thomason Grenfell (1865–1940). On another occasion, when Moody arrived at an American city to hold a series of meetings, a delegation met to invite him to lead an all-night prayer meeting for souls to be saved. Moody patted the leader on the back and said that he planned to go to his hotel, eat a good meal, and after a brief two or three sentence prayer, get into bed for a good night's sleep.

Our Lord ridiculed the Pharisees for their long public prayers, and He gave us the model prayer, a very short one, the Lord's Prayer (Matt. 6:6–15). Praying by the yard or by the hour He saw as a mark of Phariseeism.

This should have settled the matter, but it did not! In one church, I saw the self-appointed pillars of the church pray long prayers at prayer meetings, trying to outdo one another in pious gush. I ended this by returning to bidding prayers: all the prayer requests and needs were either collected or given to me verbally; they were then sorted, so that all the names of the sick were together, and all similar concerns put into one. Then I read off the names, for example, of the sick and asked all to unite *silently* in prayer for them, I asked one person to lead us all in prayer for them. Two minutes were allotted to the silent praying, and then voiced prayer. These

bidding prayers offended the self-appointed pillars, but they revitalized and gave focus to the prayer meeting.

Now, in spite of our Lord's words, there are too many in the church who believe that long prayers, nagging prayers, are most effective with God, as though He were hard of hearing! They believe that prayers by the gross (quick: call everybody on the prayer chain, and maybe we can accomplish this!) are necessary, and they have turned prayer into a form of works instead of an approach by grace to the throne. Such praying does not honor God.

"But when ye pray, use not vain repetitions, *as the heathens do: for they think that they shall be heard for their much speaking.* Be not ye therefore like unto them: for your Father knoweth what things ye have need of, before ye ask him" (Matt. 6:7–8).

The false prophets or preachers of Baal and Jezebel (1 Kings 18:19), eight hundred and fifty in number, prayed from morning to late afternoon without avail. Elijah prayed to God in *less* than seventy words, and a great miracle took place. In dealing with the living God, there is no necessity for "much speaking," and it is time the church learned this. Neither long prayers, long-winded sermons, and long services, are efficacious with God.

Leave wordiness to the politicians: *they need it to confuse us.*

422

FOR HIS MERCY ENDURETH FOREVER

Chalcedon Report No. 415, February 2000

One of my favorite psalms, one I used to enjoy reading aloud, is Psalm 136. Every verse ends with the joyful refrain, "for his mercy endureth for ever." How long does our mercy endure? How long do we show grace to those who wrong us or offend us?

God's wrath is no uncertain matter, nor His law one that He forgets. But God's mercy is an everlasting one, and we need to rely on it and to trust in it. Moreover, we must show God's mercy towards those who sin against us.

We tend to overlook God's mercy, and we forget how much Christians in the past relied on it. Remember, "Mercy" was often given as a name to girls.

A forgotten theme of Christian piety in earlier years was God's mercy. Few people now feel a need for God's mercy. They come to Him in the confidence of a happy reception, forgetting how much they need grace, and how deeply they stand in the fact of God's mercy. We are never in His favor because of our superior works.

Psalm 136 thus summons us to give continual thanks to God for His mercy. Too often, when we pray, we forget to thank God for His mercy. We fall into the sin of expecting mercy and believing that we deserve it. This is why the reading of Psalm 136 is so wholesome.

Mercy is grace and good gifts to the undeserving. Mercy is inseparable from grace because it means goodness to the undeserving, God's goodness out of sheer grace.

The Bible speaks more often of God's grace and mercy than we do. We want God, as someone observed in the 1930s, as a spare tire, important to have in case of a flat tire, but nothing to think about otherwise. We should instead "give thanks unto the God of heaven: for his mercy endureth for ever" (Ps. 136:26).

423

BEING "EVIL SPOKEN OF"

Chalcedon Report No. 311, June 1991

A very fine friend recently found himself in St. Paul's predicament, being "evil spoken of" precisely for the good he was doing. Churchmen saw him as a poacher on their terrain. Even though it was work they were not doing, his works of mercy were resented. The ungodly also were hostile.

This is written for him, and others like him, who suffer unjustly. Sadly, this is not uncommon. Too often, also, lies go uncorrected in this life.

But remember Joseph. He was falsely accused of and imprisoned for attempted rape; his innocence had enraged Potiphar's wife. There is no record in Scripture that Joseph's file was ever expunged, and with reason. In antiquity, god-kings and their officers were never wrong; the ruler could be "merciful," but the innocent party remained uncleared. Joseph lived and died a great man with his besmirched past!

Yet God vindicated and blessed Joseph mightily. Let us look, therefore, in all things to our Savior and our vindicator when falsely accused. His justice finally governs, as does His grace.

424

RESPECTABLE "CHRISTIANITY"

Chalcedon Report No. 348, July 1994

It is a problem I hear about so often that it is one where I find myself able to supply the general outlines almost at once. A man and woman are under attack because their family and friends feel that their dedication to home schooling, or to a Christian school, or their practice of tithing, their faithfulness to God's law, and so on, constitute foolishness, cultism, an embarrassing fanaticism, or just plain silliness on their part. Their critics, usually their family and close friends, are moral, churchgoing people, but they resent such "fanatical" practices. They equate patriotism and churchianity with Christianity, and they regard any deviation as cultism. The even threaten their children with disinheritance if they continue their course.

We must remember that the respectable and leading churchmen of our Lord's day were shocked by His ministry and claims, so they crucified Him. The petty hostilities we incur are very small by comparison.

Respectable Christianity assumes that God's purpose is to save and serve us. They love to cite Philippians 4:19, "But my God shall supply all your needs according to his riches in glory by Christ Jesus." But a text without a context is a pretext. Some years ago, J. J. Muller commented on this text's meaning in these words, "Not only Paul, but also the Philippians have their needs. And in the same way as they supplied Paul's needs by the gifts they sent him, so God with His gifts and blessings will supply all their needs" (J. J. Muller, *The Epistles of Paul to the Philippians and to Philemon* [1955], p. 152). Calvin's reading was similar.

We are not the focal point of the faith: the Kingdom of God is (Matt. 6:33). God does not exist to serve us, but we, Him. Our Lord did not endure the shame of the cross (Heb. 12:2) to indulge our shame at homeschooling or tithing. As for being disinherited, it is better to be

disinherited by one's family than by God Almighty. Remember, our Lord's most fearful contempt in His letter to the seven (i.e., the fullness of all) the churches is for the Laodiceans, who were "neither cold nor hot: I would thou wert cold or hot. So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spew thee out of my mouth" (Rev. 3:15–16). Odd, is it not, that in our time so many people are lukewarm about God and "hot" over sports, styles, fads, and the like!

Listening to some of the wise men of television recently, it came very clearly to me that for these pundits, civilization means leniency towards criminals. Their tolerance towards evil was high, but their reaction to Biblical faith was harsh.

Respectability is the mark of a dying church which will not risk unpopular stances, no matter how godly they are. Such a respectable church will value highly the opinions of respectable members, but will pay only lip service to Christ and His Word. The church is being strangled with too much respectability!

Remember, the church of his day was embarrassed by St. Athanasius: he was "too controversial." He was charged with rape and murder, both proven false and malicious, but they served their purpose. Most churchmen separated themselves from Athanasius for years: he was not respectable, and he was "quarrelsome." But it was Athanasius's willingness to fight that preserved the church. A book could be written on how much we owe over the centuries to saints who were not very good at public relations! A generation bent on respectability will always frown on God's best servants.

Examine yourselves, and your priorities. What is most important for you? Making a clear-cut stand for the faith does not mean being unpleasant or unkind. After all, David said, "I am for peace: but when I speak, they are for war" (Ps. 120:7). Our faith is offensive to sinners; we should not mask the challenge of God's Word by our foolishness and our wrongs.

To stand for the faith means that our primary purpose is to please God, not men, and we should not substitute for the offense of the cross our offensiveness.

We are surrounded by respectable Christianity, but we can *by God's grace* convert it. We need faith with works, for "faith without works is dead" (James 2:20, 26). We need a vigorous and faithful Christianity striving to bring every area of life and thought, and all peoples, tribes, tongues, and nations into the faith. Shall we do it?

425

THE VALLEY OF MISERY

Chalcedon Report No. 326, September 1992

One of the Ten Commandments reads, "Honour thy father and thy mother, as the Lord thy God hath commanded thee; that thy days may be prolonged, and that it may go well with thee, in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee" (Deut. 5:16). Humanism would say, love your parents, if they deserve it. God says, *honor*; He is speaking to adults. The word to children is, "obey your parents in the Lord: for this is right" (Eph. 6:1).

Parents may not be deserving of love, but we are commanded to honor them, and this is a commandment with the promise of life for obedience (Eph. 6:2). If we obey it, we will be blessed.

Why? This law is given especial prominence as the means to a longer and better life. The meaning is a simple one: Respect your past, learn from it. Those who do not learn from history are doomed to repeat it.

But how can we honor evil and ungodly parents? I have had this question asked by people who have undergone hell at parental hands. Their experiences have at times been too pornographic for repetition. How can such a person honor their parents?

Whatever else we have suffered at their hands, they are our human source of life. To honor them in Christ is to respect His ordination of family life and His purpose in creating us *for time and eternity*. His scope far exceeds our limited vision.

To honor our parents is to respect our past, to learn from it, and it means growing in terms of that knowledge. If we are firmly tied to our parents by hatred, we are by that animosity tied to our past and unable to go forward. I have known people deeply and intensely resentful of their father, or mother, or both, and their lives are sometimes reduced to sterility by that hatred. They cannot grow. Invisible chains limit and warp their lives.

To honor our parents is to know how to grow. This Biblical mandate of respect is not to be compared with the past-bound outlook of ancestor worship. As Christians, our requirement is to honor the past, but our hope is not in our ancestors or forebears but in regeneration by God's grace. Past, present, and future are then recognized as aspects of God's providential purpose and plan for us.

Troubles are not pleasing to us, but they are aspects of God's schooling for us. Some of us, of course, are sent to God's graduate school again and again in terms of His sovereign purpose, not because we like it, but because He ordains it.

It is not easy being the child of evil or mean-spirited parents. As I was once told by one such person, "Every time I looked into a mirror, I saw my father and my mother, and I hated it." But, with regeneration, things changed. "Now, when I look into the mirror, I know that I am a child of God, and what I was, and am, is now used by God."

This is what Romans 8:28 is about: "And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose." There is always far more in our lives than we ourselves can ever see; there is always the LORD.

This has not been an easy thing for me to write, because, with respect to my family, my parents and my relatives, I have been very privileged. But I also know how much I have been made the richer by people whose lives with their parents ranged from poor to hellish; by God's grace, they have become remarkable people, very much so.

One of the very wonderful texts of Scripture is Psalm 84:5–7:

> Blessed is the man whose strength is in thee; in whose heart are the ways of them. Who passing through the valley of Baca make it a well; the rain also filleth the pools. They go from strength to strength, every one of them in Zion appeareth before God.

The valley of Baca was a dry and desert area, known as the valley of misery. A man whose strength is in the Lord passes through the desert place and turns it into a place of refreshing, of pools of water and a good well. Such a man goes from strength to strength and has a place in God's presence.

I have known such people. They do not use their past and present griefs to beat us all over the head, but as a means of growth towards becoming a blessing under God towards all who touch their lives. We all have our valley of Baca, sooner or later, and often again and again. We must pass through it. What happens to us when we do?

426

LOVE AND HATE

Chalcedon Report No. 10, July 2, 1968

Johnny Hart, in his comic strip "B.C.," had some interesting observations last November 4 on how hate can be successfully abolished from this world. The strip read:

"You know what I hate?"
"What?"
"Hatred."
"Me too!"
"Let's wipe out hatred!"
"How do we do that?"
"Outlaw love!"

The reverse is equally true: if you want *to abolish love* from the world, *outlaw hate*. If a man truly loves a thing, he does not love its opposite. If a man loves his country, he will hate treason. If he loves God, he will hate evil, heresy, and all anti-Christian activities. If a man loves God's law and order, he will hate and resent all lawlessness. There is always an exclusiveness about love: love cherishes the thing loved and excludes its antithesis. Every attempt, therefore, to abolish hate by telling men they must love all things is an attempt to abolish love: it is a summons not to love but to hate. Universal love is an impossibility: a man cannot at one and the same time love Christ and love every evil and satanic thing. Our Lord said, "No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon" (Matt. 6:24). When we are asked to have this universal love for all things, we are asked to *tolerate evil*. If a man's attitude towards a criminal and towards a saint be the same, then he is saying there is no difference between the two; by his

tolerance of evil he is discounting righteousness and acting intolerantly towards the claim of God that they who fear Him must depart from evil (Prov. 3:7). The idea of world brotherhood means a worldwide tolerance of evil and a discounting of the good.

When our Lord asked us to love our enemies and our neighbors, He made it clear, as Matthew 19 and Romans 13 reveal, that love is the fulfilling of the second table of the law. Love in this sense is the keeper of the law: it means respecting every man's right to life ("Thou shalt not kill"), home ("Thou shalt not commit adultery"), property ("Thou shalt not steal"), reputation ("Thou shalt not bear false witness"), and these God-given rights must be kept in thought ("Thou shalt not covet") as well as word and deed. *Love in this sense is keeping the law*, living by law. *In the modern sense, when we are asked to love, we are asked to set aside the law.*

When I was in seminary, most students were prone to use a little poem which met us at every turn. I still know the words, and most ministers, even the soundest, often err by using them. Edwin Markham's little poem reads:

> He drew a circle that shut me out,
> Heretic, rebel, a thing to flout.
> But Love and I had the wit to win:
> We drew a circle that took him in.

It is easy to confuse this sentiment with the evangelical "passion for souls," with the desire to redeem men from their sins and to make known to them the saving power of God. The Christian attitude is one of grace towards men, but a realization that, apart from Christ, they are lost sinners. Markham's attitude was that all men, as they are, irrespective of what they believe and do, must be loved. If you like Markham's idea, then invite murderers, rapists, blasphemers, traitors, and pornographers into your home. The result will be *revolution*, if practiced on a large scale, the overthrow of godly law and order and the corruption of Christian families. And *revolution* was what Markham wanted. He wrote the outstanding revolutionary poem of the twentieth century, which many of us were taught in school: "The Man with the Hoe." For Markham, the worker is plundered, profaned, and disinherited. Markham said that the rulers should either do something for the workers or face a worldwide revolution.

> When whirlwinds of rebellion shake all shores
> How will it be with kingdoms and with kings—
> With those who shaped him to the thing he is—

When this dumb Terror shall rise to judge the world,
After the silence of the centuries?

In other words, surrender to or appease the workers, or face a world revolution in which the worker will be the world judge and "Terror"!

Where is Markham's love now? Exactly at its logical conclusion: revolution. Total love means a total tolerance of evil and a departure from God.

Then what about the verse, "Judge not, that ye be not judged. For with what judgement ye judge, ye shall be judged: and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again" (Matt. 7:1–2). These words are from the Sermon on the Mount. Christ presented true righteousness as against pharisaic self-righteousness, God's law as against man's law. We have no right to judge on purely personal terms. Scripture gives us endless laws and precepts to enable us to discern and judge between good and evil. We shall be judged, Jesus said, with "what measure ye judge." If our standard is God's law, then we have the defense and security of God's law, which has already judged, condemned, and freed us in Jesus Christ. If we judge within God's law, we have the protection of God's law; if we judge outside God's law, we have, not its protection but its wrath.

The heresy of love is a major menace of our time. "Love" is presented as another way of salvation than Jesus Christ. We are told that people are going to be made new creatures and changed if we love them enough. This is a totally humanistic plan of salvation. It makes man the savior rather than Jesus Christ. It is a departure from the faith. But the heresy of love sounds so noble and good that few see it for what it is: a demand that evil be accepted and loved and a revolution against godly law and order be promoted. The real result of these demands for universal love will be the death of love and the rise of revolution and the isolation of man into the faceless and silent proletariat of socialism.

427

LOVE THY NEIGHBOR: WHAT DOES IT MEAN?

Originally a brochure produced for Coast Federal Savings in the late 1960s, this article was published with Rushdoony's other brochures as part of a two-sided paper titled "Comments in Brief" with Chalcedon Report No. 225, April 1984.

A familiar Bible verse is often used by many to justify socialism and to attack the defense of property as "selfish." But does the commandment, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," call for sharing the wealth, for welfare programs, and for one-world unity?

The main Biblical passages explaining this verse are Leviticus 19:15–18, 33–37; Matthew 19:18–19; 22:34–40, and Romans 13:8–10. What do they tell us?

First, who is thy neighbor? In Leviticus 19:33–37, Moses made it clear that our neighbor means anyone and everyone we associate with, including our enemy, and Jesus emphasized this in the parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10:29–37), citing the Samaritan's mercy toward an enemy, a Jew.

Second, what does the Bible mean by *love*? The word *love* today is a term concerning feeling, feeling which is stronger than the "bonds" of law. The Biblical word *love* "is the fulfilling the law" (Romans 13:10). Moreover, love has reference to the fulfilling primarily of God's law; it relates to justice in the Bible, and it refers to God's law and God's court of law. The modern man who breaks either sexual or property laws in the name of love is thus lacking in love from the Biblical perspective, for love "is the fulfilling of the law."

Third, what laws are involved in loving your neighbor? According to Jesus (Matt. 19:18–19), and again emphasized by Paul (Rom. 13:8–10), to love our neighbor means to keep the second table of the Ten Commandments

in relationship to him. This means, "Thou shalt not kill," or take the law into your own hands, but must respect your neighbor's God-given right to life. "Thou shalt not commit adultery" means we must respect the sanctity of our neighbor's home and family. "Thou shalt not steal" means we must respect our neighbor's (or enemy's) God-given right to property. "Thou shalt not bear false witness" means we must respect his reputation. And "Thou shalt not covet" requires an obedience to these laws in thought as well as in word and deed.

To "love thy neighbor as *thyself*" is thus the basis of true civil liberty in the Western world. It requires us to respect in all men *and in ourselves* the rights of life, home, property, and reputation, in word, thought, and deed. The Biblical word "love" has nothing to do with erotic love, which is anti-law. Biblical love "is the fulfilling of the law" in relationship to all men. It does not ask us to like all men, or to take them into our families or circles, or to share our wealth with them. The Bible simply says: love friend, enemy, and self by respecting and defending these God-given rights to life, home, property, and reputation for all. Modern "humanitarians" are thus too often guilty of breaking God's law in the name of an anarchistic love. Biblical love keeps the law.

428

LIVING BY DISGUST

Chalcedon Report No. 55, March 2, 1970

One of the more delightful comic strips, "Eb and Flo," in its February 6, 1970, number has a very telling point. When Mabel comes to visit Flo, she learns that Flo's husband, Eb, has gone to a big youth rally in town. Mabel asks: "Youth Rally? You mean all those hippies, Hell's Angels and skinheads? Why? Is he thinking of joining them?!" Flo answers: "Never! He just goes to their meetings to keep his disgust fresh!" Here the humorist has put his finger on the essence of much religion and morality today: it lacks any real faith; it is essentially negative, and its main impetus is disgust.

More than a few prominent religious figures who present themselves as bold warriors of the Lord have really only one essential purpose: to keep disgust fresh. They publish by press, books, radio, and sometimes television, as well as in person, a stream of exposures about the menaces to church and state. Their purpose is essentially to freshen disgust. Beyond that, they have little in the way of a gospel to present, and their morality is often suspect.

The same is true of many political commentators of the right and the left. There is a continual turnover of periodicals, newsletters, and radio programs as both sides trot out their horror stories and then give way to someone else who is better at keeping disgust fresh.

Take away fresh disgust, and you rob a vast number of people of the most important part of their intellectual, religious, and moral diet. With many, it becomes their whole life. In one so-called "evangelical" church, one of the largest, movie attendance is forbidden to members; a prominent woman in the church regularly sees and reviews all the worst films before a large church midweek gathering to freshen their sanctimonious disgust. A man now in his fifties, to cite another case, is still busy, when

last heard from, collecting clippings and data to prove to his comrades that a fascist revolution is about to capture America; he began his task in the 1940s. He feels it is his duty to keep the faith by freshening disgust.

What lies behind this kind of mentality? It is certainly very prevalent on all sides and is a basic motive with many people. Many members who stay in churches riddled with modernism, the new morality, and revolutionary doctrines, will not leave, nor can they be interested in sound theology; their sorry churches are a delight to them, because their disgust is kept continually fresh. Similarly, many who have left the modernist churches make it their life to review the horrors of the old church: their gospel is fresh disgust.

What lies behind this kind of mentality is Phariseeism. A Catholic woman, no better than she had to be, loved calling attention to her priest's flagrant sins. Her attitude was this: "If he's a Christian, I'm a saint." A Presbyterian layman, of sorry character, delighted secretly in the bad character of his pastor: "I'm a lot better Christian than he is." Neither one was ever happy with a good pastor: the bad ones pleased them, the bad pastors gave them grounds for fresh disgust. Their mentality was exactly that of the Pharisee of whom Christ spoke, whose prayer was in essence simply this: "God, I thank thee, that I am not as other men are, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even as this publican" (Luke 18:11).

Here is the heart of the matter. The Pharisee needs a continual tale of evil, a steady recital of the depravity of men and movements around him in order to feel a moral glow. His self-justification is the sight of fresh evil in others. Hence, such people need and demand fresh evil. Is the new movie worse than any before, a fresh departure in evil? They attend it to freshen their disgust and keep their moral glow. Are their new exposures of corruption in politics? Millions of voters find it a wonderful means of self-justification: the nasty, evil men are plotting them into evil and corruption; it is not their own corruption writ large.

One brilliant professor at a major university spent an evening reciting the tales of perversion and degeneracy within his circles, amazing accounts of the moral bankruptcy of a group of scholars. His stories were true, but, subsequent events proved, his own activities were equally degenerate and brought about his own destruction. His self-justification had been to freshen his disgust at his colleagues' similar degeneracy. Much historical "debunking" has rested on shaky moral foundations.

Is the answer positive thinking? God forbid. Man cannot live by bread alone, nor by fresh disgust, nor by positive thinking. "I think only positive thoughts," a woman told me: "anything negative mars life and ages a person." Her husband had to do the negative thinking with respect to the

children and every other family responsibility. Every positive thinker is a parasite and requires some family member or associate to do the negative thinking which is inescapable in life. Progress requires its "nay" as well as its "yea."

Am I suggesting that we refuse to expose evil, or to examine it? On the contrary, the only valid ground for examining evil is that positive action be taken, and this involves more than mere negation. Mere counteraction leaves the initiative to evil. A pharisaic "tut, tut," is not improved if millions of people are organized to say "tut, tut," together.

Our Lord declared, "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God" (Matt. 4:4). Now, the word of God is not a sterile word, most churches to the contrary: it is a creative Word. When man lives by every word of God, he begins to remake the world around him in terms of that creative word.

Is a man living by that creative word? Then he is at work establishing godly institutions, not in looking for fresh disgust. Those who have no creative word hate those who live by it. One man who has established three new churches in a few years, and a truly great Christian school, was recently the target of trouble from these living dead men. They tried vainly to freshen their disgust by finding fault with him. The Pharisee must be able to say, "God, I thank thee, that I am not as other men are." He needs the scoundrels to keep his disgust fresh and his self-righteousness flourishing. His greatest enemy, a constant affront to him, is the godly man who, in terms of the creative word, is actively engaged in godly reconstruction. Against all such, the hand of the Pharisee is forever raised.

The Pharisee claims to be the only true believer, the only activist, and the only person "alive to the issues." Can anyone else compile a like record for "exposing" evil, for nosing out the living men and demanding they be disciplined for accomplishing something, and for getting ever greater responses of fresh disgust? The Pharisee needs evil: it is the air he breaths.

Men who live by the creative word of God know the reality of evil all around: it was there when they were born, and it will be there when they die. For them, the important question is this: will they have extended the boundaries of the Kingdom of God a little further before they die? Will they have exercised dominion under God and subdued the earth in terms of His creation mandate? The world was not empty when we came in to it; we must add more than a pharisaic "tut, tut," to it before we leave.

The church in the apostolic and post-apostolic age was not a great force numerically, it did not even possess a church building for probably two centuries. Yet Rome felt it necessary to wage a war unto death

against these "followers of the way." By their family life and their sexual morality, by their quiet stand against things like abortion, by their strict obedience to the law of God, and by their strong sense of charity and mutual care of one another, these "followers of the way," members of Jesus Christ, were creating a new social order in the midst of an old one.

Let the dead bury the dead. The living must follow their King in the task of making all things new. But if you want to keep your disgust fresh, move over into Sodom, and take out your citizenship papers. You'll be happy there.

429

THE "OMNIPOTENCE OF CRITICISM"

Chalcedon Report No. 164, April 1979

One of the fundamental beliefs of the Enlightenment was in what Peter Gay termed "the omnipotence of criticism." Few doctrines have been more influential on the modern mind; we are all, to some degree, infected by it. Belief in the omnipotence of criticism means a belief in the power of criticism, the critical word; it means that the solution to problems is seen as a judgment or a law.

This belief rests on original sin, man's belief that he can be and is his own god, able to determine and create good and evil for himself (Gen. 3:5; cf. Isa. 45:7). God's Word is omnipotent: He says the Word, and creation appears; He passes the word of judgment, and heaven and earth pass away, His word declares. God's word is law: when He says, "Thou shalt not steal," all theft is judged with an eternal judgment. Hell is a witness to the omnipotence of God's critical word.

With the Enlightenment, and with existentialism today, man's belief in the omnipotence of criticism has developed rapidly. The impotence of the modern intellectual and of his community (the college, university, and seminary) is due to his illusion that his criticism is potentially or actually omnipotent. The "solution" to problems is thus critical analysis. (Perhaps no other *Chalcedon Report* has stirred more hostility than No. 138, wherein I discussed critical analysis; the anger of many academicians was intense.) This belief in the omnipotence of criticism has led to an age of judgmental churchmen, whose solution to problems is not Christian Reconstruction but critical analysis.

Politics has been the art of criticism by lawmaking. Hearings are held, legislation framed and passed embodying a series of judgments, and the problem is supposedly on its way to solution. After one major piece of restrictive legislation was passed several years ago, a legislator, interviewed

briefly on television, declared that a major step had been taken towards solving a serious problem. The problem has not been solved; it has become more pressing since then, because man's fiat word has no creative power; man's criticisms, his laws, have no omnipotence. Instead of producing or bringing forth something new and better, they inhibit, alienate, or destroy.

The growing curse of the modern world is the belief that criticism and fiat legislation can be creative and productive. Criticism and judgment are replacing thought and work as the supposed means of productivity. God's Word and judgments are creative and productive because He is the almighty and omnipotent one. His laws have behind them His power and government. When man stands in terms of God's law-word, he stands within the power and government of the Almighty. When man trusts in the omnipotence of his word, he commits suicide.

But this trust in the omnipotence of criticism is basic to our culture and to our time. When I speak, I find that the commonest type of question rests on a faith that criticism is the answer. Many of the letters which come to us daily rest on the same faith. Depending on whether they are liberal or conservative, questioners will demand that I criticize colonialism, racism, democracy, the illuminati, the communists, the fascists, the military-industrial complex, and so on and on. Again, I will be asked to pass judgment on this or that sentence that one of my associates has written. The "test" is not faithful Christian action but criticism. This demand, however, is an invitation to impotence, to sit on the sidelines as a perpetual judge.

I recall, as a university student, the tremendous pride of the Trotskyites; they were the critics of Stalin, of fascism, of capitalism, and of everything else. This made them, in their own eyes, the purest of the pure, because they were the supercritics! All too many liberal, conservative, Christian, and non-Christian persons and groups today (i.e., all of us, to some degree) are victims of the same sin in us, a faith in the omnipotence and virtue of criticism.

God's command to Adam was not to critique the Garden of Eden but to exercise dominion and to subdue the earth, to dress the garden and to keep it, to care for it (Gen. 1:26–28; 2:15). Man fell when he turned from his calling to subject God to criticism (Gen. 3:1–6). One immediate consequence of the fall was that Adam then subjected both God and Eve to his criticism (Gen. 3:12), a sure mark of sin.

Since the death of Trotsky, the world of the Trotskyites has been a very revealing one. Only in one country, Ceylon, have they had any important role. The Trotskyites began as the purest of the pure, judging everyone

else, and, step by step, they so refined their criticism, that they were soon criticizing one another. This, of course, is not an unusual course of events. Wherever the Enlightenment doctrine of the omnipotence of criticism takes hold, virtue becomes a matter of judging others and isolating yourself from their corruption. The result is the fragmentation and atomization of every cause; it is the collapse of movements into cannibalism, mutual self-destruction.

Our calling in Jesus Christ is not to critical analysis, to a seat of judgment from whence to judge all others, but to serve and obey the Lord in faith. He is the Lord, the only wise judge, and it is His Word that must govern us. It is sin in all of us, and we are all prone to it, to sit in judgment. Nothing creates more havoc on the mission field, among hardworking and able men, than this proneness to pass sentence on one another. Similarly, nothing creates more tensions in churches and other groups than this same fact. In the world of nations, it makes us prone to see lawmaking as the solution to our problems. But humanistic laws rest in a trust in the omnipotence of criticism, in man's law-word, a judgmental, critical word, as the problem-solving word. However, in all of history since man submitted to the critical, "problem-solving" word of the tempter (Gen. 3:1–5), man's problems have only increased. There's no omnipotence in criticism, only impotence.

430

JUDGMENT

Chalcedon Report No. 342, January 1994

One of the most misused texts of Scripture is Matthew 7:1–2: "Judge not, that ye be not judged. For with what judgement ye judge, ye shall be judged: and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again." Contrary to popular opinion, our Lord does *not* forbid judgment. After all, He is the one who insists, "Judge not according to appearance, but judge righteous judgment" (John 7:24).

What our Lord condemns is judgment on personal or non-Biblical grounds. We *must* judge *righteous* judgment. The standard we use will be used against us if we judge on grounds other than God's law. The humanistic measures we judge by will be used by God and man against us. We must judge righteous or just judgment, which means that the law of God is our standard.

Those who say, "Don't be judgmental," are saying, "No standards allowed." If there can be no standards in society, nor in church nor state, we then have the abolition of all law and morality. We have the world of the Marquis de Sade, in which "anything goes," and in which all things are lawful except the Word of God.

To say, "Don't be judgmental," is to outlaw the Bible, which gives us God's law whereby we must live in Christ. An anti-judgmental stance means moral anarchism and decay. Is it coincidental that a generation that insists on being nonjudgmental is also the most lawless in our history? Our murder rate has increased exponentially; the *reported* rapes have in a generation or so gone up 700 percent! Many thefts are no longer reported because more "serious" crimes get what little attention is possible. Added to this is the arrogant judgment of Christians by the ungodly, by criminals, and by degenerates.

Judgment never leaves a society. If the righteous do not exercise godly

judgment, the ungodly will make their evil a standard to judge all people by.

There is no escaping judgment or standards in any sphere of life. If we insist that our children do not drink poison, is it wrong to teach them to judge between good and evil? If we insist that people drive their automobiles on the required side of the road, *we are judgmental*, for their welfare and ours. Then why is it not equally necessary to insist on following standards in the moral sphere?

The statement, "Don't be judgmental," where moral and safety standards are concerned, is morally wrong. It is godly and utterly necessary to insist that God's law-word be the basis of all judgment. Our *personal* standards and tastes are irrelevant; God's Word is mandatory.

With all this "Don't be judgmental" heresy, is it any wonder that the churches are antinomian and that the Last Judgment has dropped out of Christian life and thought? I wonder, with all of this foolishness so commonplace, will some of these people, at the Last Judgment, start screaming at the Lord, "Stop being so judgmental"?

431

PHARISEEISM

Chalcedon Report No. 329, December 1992

It is impossible to read the New Testament without recognizing that the main target of our Lord's scathing and vitriolic attacks was the group known as the Pharisees. For Him, the Pharisees, more than anyone else, were the enemies of God. At the same time, the Pharisees regarded themselves as the great defenders of the faith, the friends of God, and the elect element in Israel.

Why, then, the unceasing attack by our Lord? The Pharisees regarded themselves as the moral elite of their day, and some have argued that indeed they were precisely that. Why then did our Lord declare, "For I say unto you, That except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. 5:20). It is important for us to know what this means, lest we walk in the way of the Pharisees also.

First, the Pharisees stressed the *traditions* of the fathers, the *Halakhah*, which were God's laws and amplifications of them, as were the *Mishna* and other writings. Alfred Edersheim said of the *Halakhah*, "They provided for every possible and impossible case, entering into every detail of private, family, and public life; and with iron logic, unbending rigour, and most minute analysis pursued and dominated man, turn whither he might, laying on him a yoke which was truly unbearable" (*The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, vol. 1, p. 98ff.). The governing part of the law soon became rabbinic additions more than God's Word. Our Lord condemned the Pharisees, saying, "Thus have ye made the commandment of God of none effect by your tradition" (Matt. 15:6). This was the *first* great evil of Phariseeism.

But, *second*, the multiplicity of man-made rules led to the replacement of theology with regulations. People in the synagogue, as too often now

in the churches, are governed more by church-created rules than by God's law and Biblical theology. Where theology is downplayed or neglected, externalism replaces faith, and the life of the people becomes a superficial resemblance to Christianity while alien to it. Such people, in Paul's words, have a "form of godliness but lack the power thereof" (2 Tim. 3:5; Paul says, "from such turn away").

Third, Phariseeism led to an externalism in morals. As our Lord said, and the Pharisees were offended that He said so, "not that which goeth into the mouth defileth a man; but that which cometh out of the mouth, this defileth a man" (Matt. 15:11). *Moral* defilement is from the heart; it often reveals itself in speech. Bad food can harm us, but it does not defile us *morally*. This reduction of things to the physical level is an aspect of the neglect of sound theology.

Fourth, the Pharisees were aloof, and they disdained the people. They were conscious of their "superiority." Luke 16:14 tells us they "derided" Jesus, or, literally, turned up their noses at Him. The Pharisee is quick to show or express his contempt for other people. He is conscious of his "superiority," and he is very impatient with other men. The Pharisees were thus not a popular group, and it was a sorry development when in time they captured Judaism. "The chosen people" in the Old Testament meant a people whose only real merit was that God's grace had been revealed in and to them. With its apostasy, Judaism altered "the chosen people" concept, abandoning the old meaning to an important degree, to mean a superior people. By doing so, they only aggravated their departure from true faith.

Fifth, our Lord warns His disciples against "the leaven of the Pharisees" (Matt. 16:6–11), meaning thereby their doctrine and its implicit lack of faith in what must be the object of faith, the Lord Himself. The lack of faith was rather a false faith. The Pharisees believed intensely in their own rules and regulations, as do many men both in and out of the churches today, but not in Christ nor His infallible Word. We have too many people today who strongly believe in faith, not in God and His Scriptures. The "leaven" of the Pharisees introduces a differing premise and center into the lives of ostensible believers.

Sixth, the emphasis on externalism meant that a surface conformity replaced true faith, and the Pharisees became known as hypocrites. This was our Lord's common charge against them. The words *pharisee* and *hypocrite* have become almost synonymous. Our Lord ridiculed their long and pretentious public prayers. Their pietism was an aspect of their externalism. It was continually on public display, supposedly to set a public example, but, even more, to demonstrate that theirs was a life on a higher spiritual plane than others.

Seventh, an important aspect of this hypocrisy and externalism was a hyper-scrupulousness to obey pharisaic rules. For example, Edersheim cited incidents coming from our Lord's day, such as the refusal to save a woman from drowning for fear of touching a female, or waiting to put off the phylacteries before stretching out a hand to rescue a child from the water (*Sketches of Jewish Social Life in the Days of Christ*, p. 216).

Enough has been said to give a picture of the Pharisee. He is a man who believes, like Job's friends, that the truth was born with him and may well die with him (Job 12:1–2). He goes beyond God to a supposedly higher morality.

Phariseeism has perhaps never been more popular than in the twentieth century. Beginning with President Woodrow Wilson, evil politics and evil wars have been waged with high-minded "moral" rhetoric, especially by the United States. The war in Iraq (i.e., Gulf War) is an example. What makes Iraq worse than most states in the United Nations? Did not the United States, with its war against the civilians of Iraq, do far more evil than Serbia, a year later, would be accused of doing? Where was the moral justification for attacking Iraq rather than many other dictatorships, Marxists or otherwise?

And what about the churches, with their antinomianism? Or their modernism, their approval of abortion and homosexuality, all in the name of a "higher" morality than God's law?

Philip Bean and Joy Melville, in *Lost Children of the Empire* (London, England: Unwin Hyman, 1989), report the forcible relocation of children from England throughout the Empire for 350 years, ending only in 1967. These were sent to colonial America, Canada, Africa, New Zealand, and Australia in great numbers. After World War II, more than 30,000 were shipped to Australia. Many were no better than slave labor. Some were sexually molested. Churches, Catholic and Protestant, cooperated, as well as non-church agencies. Why? Because the "plan" was rationally sound. The empire needed people, the children needed "homes." Neither they nor their relatives were normally consulted.

On paper, it was a marvelous plan. In life, like Woodrow Wilson's plans for world peace, it was monstrous and evil practice. And this is what Phariseeism is. It sets aside, in some fashion, God's law. It believes its "wisdom" is better than God's wisdom. It works to redeem men and nations in terms of man's wisdom and man's law.

Phariseeism reigns today in politics and churches, in schools, the media, and "higher" education. Phariseeism is the "wisdom of this world" of which St. Paul speaks in 1 Corinthians 1:19–29. It is common to all peoples and nations, but never more deadly than when it calls itself

Christian. Phariseeism believes that it has the answers. It supplants or corrects God.

Our Lord's fiercest denunciations were of the Pharisees. Why, then, are we honoring them with leadership in church, state, academia, and every other sphere? Could it be that the Pharisees are not only all around us, but in our own circles?

432

FAITH AND PETTINESS

Chalcedon Report No. 315, October 1991

I heard not too long ago that a friend has resigned from his pastorate to retire. Since he was many years younger than I, this concerned me. Was he seriously ill? He had started a Christian school and church where none had existed. A very lovely set of buildings had been erected. He had trained a series of assistant pastors so that all save one were now themselves successfully pastoring fine congregations. What had happened? Was he ill?

He telephoned me about another matter, and I questioned him on his resignation. He intended now to supply pulpits here and there, and he was already doing so each Sunday.

But what had happened? No serious problem, no conflicts, and the members were fine people. But he was near collapse from exhaustion. Serious problems would have challenged him; what wore him out was the massive pettiness of so many good people: trifling complaints against one another, trifling complaints about the general conduct of the ministry —trifles and pettiness from people who should have known better.

I knew whereof he spoke. We get complaining letters from people who often make mountains out of molehills. At least we don't face this pettiness person to person!

I am afraid that, before long, the Lord will give this generation some real grounds for grief. In their pettiness, too many demand perfection of pastors, of husbands, of wives, and of others when all they themselves can deliver are demands and a spirit of pettiness.

A basic meaning of *petty* is *small-minded*. Paul speaks of this in Philippians 4:2, where he pleads with two women in that church to "be of the same mind in the Lord." Earlier, in summoning believers to be Christ-minded, Paul says,

> Look not every man on his own things, but every man also on the things of others. Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: But made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. (Phil. 2:4–8)

To be Christ-minded does not mean a show of sanctimonious piety but rather humility, service, and grace. Both are sadly lacking among many professing Christians today.

I once had a man write a raging letter, attacking one of our writers, claiming he could do better than that man; he was honest enough to send an article, daring me to publish it. I read it through twice but could not make sense of it; I tried earnestly to understand it and could not. It was painfully embarrassing to read it and to realize how self-deluded the man was. It seems now that every man is an authority on everything!

Turning again to the exhausted pastor who resigned, I feel it necessary to say a few things. How long has it been since you expressed gratitude to your pastor for his faithful ministry? And how long since you told your husband or your wife how much you love and appreciate him or her? (Start such comments gradually, lest you give your spouse a heart attack!)

Before you open your mouth, ask yourself, am I being petty or small-minded?

We need a return to civility. Our media, films, and televisions are teaching one and all uncivil and ugly ways of behaving and speaking, and we are becoming an uncivil and small-minded people.

A memorable experience of my childhood, I believe I was then nine years old, occurred when a widow and her son were visiting us, in fact, staying with us for a time. The boy, a few years older than myself, went into my stamp collection and stole some stamps. I found this out just before we sat down for our noon dinner. I angrily accused him of theft, and my father took me to the barn, to stand there among the cows, until I was ready to behave civilly. The proper thing to do, he said, was for me to tell him of the theft quietly, and he would then quietly take it up with the boy's mother. When I agreed finally, I returned to the dinner table. Later, my stamps were returned to me. What the widow did to her son, I do not know, and my father said it was not our concern. We had a duty to behave as Christians.

Perhaps this is all a trifling matter to write about, but most of our lives are a vast accumulation of trifles, and, if we bring grace and patience to bear on them, our lives will be the better for it. And so, too, will be the lives of those around us. Pettiness is not an expression of Christian faith but an unconcern for it.

433

COARSENESS

Chalcedon Report No. 316, November 1991

Some years ago, I was in a church away from home, standing not too far from the pastor as he spoke to the last of departing parishioners before we went to his house for dinner. A woman in her mid-thirties, with a woman, her mother, going ahead of her and daubing at her tear-filled eyes, stopped to say quietly but firmly to the startled pastor, "*Never* use Psalm 23 again in a service, and Mother can never hear it without falling apart." Afterwards, I thought of several things that needed saying, and the pastor told me that he did also, but, at the moment, we were both too amazed to say anything.

On hearing from some pastors of late, I have remembered that episode because the same spirit is too prevalent now. People seem to have forgotten that it is not the will nor the word of man that should govern the church (nor the word and will of the pastor), but the Word of God.

A few years later, when I again saw that pastor, I asked if there were any further problems with the two women. He did not want to say more than that they had gone elsewhere and felt that he lacked "sensitivity." We hear much about the hypersensitivity of people today. We should be speaking rather of the growing *coarseness*. When people feel that they can rebuke a faithful pastor over trifles, as they do from coast to coast, they are obviously too coarse of mind to understand what God has to say, and too coarse to recognize their disrespect for others. They want to impose their will on others, and they will only tolerate that which they like.

I am regularly amazed, as I read the mail that comes to us, and the "Letters to the Editor" in various Christian periodicals, how many people refuse to tolerate any deviation from their opinions. There can be no perfect agreement, nor perfect knowledge, in this world. Husbands and wives disagree on many things. Church members disagree. We all

disagree on something! There is no perfect agreement on all issues among our staff members, but we work in harmony under a common Lord, as we all must.

I submit that it is a mark of coarseness, not sensitivity, to demand that a pastor please us rather than the Lord. Remember, Paul himself did not please all the churches, and the church of His day crucified our Lord. The church should get out of the crucifixion business; church members should begin to serve the Lord, not themselves.

After the incident at the church door, I wondered about the woman who, because of her mother, wanted no more use of Psalm 23; her husband was obviously not with her. What was the problem? Her kind of "faith" was hardly a good witness. Maybe my imagination was getting a bit too free, but I feel sorry for him.

434

DEMANDING THE BEST

Chalcedon Report No. 319, February 1992

My editorial on "Coarseness" produced quite a reaction: some angry letters from church members, and some very sad ones from pastors. One thing was clear from some of the letters from laymen: they demand the best from a minister.

Back in the 1930s, a fictional letter from a pulpit committee to St. Paul circulated among pastors; the pulpit committee rejected St. Paul as a pastor for a variety of reasons, as I recall it: bad tempered, given to long, involved sentences, short of stature and somewhat beaten up, too controversial, and so on. Things are worse now: Jesus Christ would be rejected at once as a bad-tempered troublemaker!

One of my favorite (and true) stories concerns Queen Victoria and Gladstone, the prime minister of the moment. Queen Victoria told Gladstone, when faced with a vacancy at St. Paul's, that she hoped a *good* preacher would be chosen for a change. Gladstone answered, Madam, there are not that many good anythings! How true! We all want the best of others but are rarely ready to give the best of ourselves.

Another problem is the definition of *the best*. Too often, our idea of it is one governed by the world. I must confess my own sin here. When Chalcedon began, I was determined, as far as possible, to help the superior minds in the Christian community. I, through Chalcedon, helped several students through seminary and graduate studies, and it was largely money wasted; I don't even remember the names of some! When I became controversial, they forgot me! Only one has been grateful, and a blessing: David Chilton. In the course of all this, I met one seminary student, was twice invited to dinner at his home, and once preached for him. He was unforgettable because what he had was not intellectual claims or showmanship, but solid Christian character, and a pastor's heart. His name:

Byron Snapp, a pastor, I believe, in the P.C.A. How much he agrees with me, I don't know, but that he is in line with the Lord is obvious. He issues a newsletter: you might send a gift to him, and see what he has to say. I learned the expensive way that the mind does not make the man: the faithfulness to Jesus Christ does. It is "holiness without which no man shall see the Lord" (Heb. 12:14).

The church is too full of pew jockeys, demanding but not giving the best. Scripture compares the church to a body; are you a sick liver, an ailing lung, or lazy legs that will not move?

Perhaps your complaints about the pulpit have some validity. The clergy, even when they do their best, are not perfectly sanctified, and perhaps some of you would try the patience of a saint! I once knew a couple who sorely tried each other's patience, and they let everyone know it, but they never could understand why the pastor was avoiding them; they felt there was a "need" for a "better man" in the pulpit! Their lives were not a song of love but a long whine of complaints.

As a student, on occasion I went with a professor, a psychiatrist, Dr. Anton Boisen, M.D., when he lectured to various groups, and I took charge of his book table. Dr. Boisen had lost an arm in World War I, and it had left him mentally shattered. He recovered and did some remarkable work among the "mentally sick." Although a modernist of sorts, he compiled a hymnal of some of the great hymns of the ages and started a choir among the asylum inmates. His only "problem" with his chapel choir was that the choir members would quickly graduate out of the asylum into health! He had found that a grateful and rejoicing heart is quickly healed, and that Paul's words are strength and healing when he says: "Rejoice in the Lord always: and again I say, Rejoice. Let your moderation (or, forbearance) be known unto all men. The Lord is at hand (or, is near). Be careful (or, anxious) for nothing; but in every thing by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving let your requests be made known unto God" (Phil. 4:4–6). It is only then, Paul says, that "the peace of God, which passeth all understanding" (v. 7) will sustain us.

How long since you last prayed for your pastor, or for your congregation?

Dr. Boisen's patients gave themselves to the music praising God, and they gained sanity. We must give to get. Our Lord tells us, "Give, and it shall be given unto you; good measure, pressed down, and shaken together, and running over, shall men give into your bosom. For with the same measure that ye mete withal it shall be measured to you again" (Luke 6:38).

Now, before you sit down to write me a foul-mouthed and anonymous letter, take stock of yourself. Your pastor may not be perfect, but neither

are you. And God knows what you write and think, and He knows who and what you are better than you do. (By the way, thanks to zip codes on letter cancellations, and to computers, we know who sends anonymous, trashy letters!)

We are all the soul of patience with ourselves. Why not be patient one with another? We are full, too full, of self-love. How about love for the brethren, and Christ's undershepherds?

We have enough wars to fight in the world. In our local church community we need to further communion, grace, and love. David's counsel is wise: "Depart from evil, and do good; seek peace, and pursue it" (Ps. 34:14). St. Paul, the warrior, says all the same, "If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men" (Rom. 12:18). Here we have two great warriors of the faith in agreement. Is it not time that we agreed with them?

Start demanding the best of yourself.

435

GOOD GUYS, BAD GUYS

Chalcedon Report No. 258, January 1987

One of the basic facts of life is that there is a moral division in life and men between good and evil. Few things are more suicidal than the neglect of that fact. Life is inescapably made up of moral decisions, and to deny that fact is to lose hold on life. In our Lord's day, it was a great source of strength to the Pharisees that they were so insistent on this fact and on the division between good and evil.

Their great error came from two sources. *First*, they redefined good and evil in terms of their perspective and their cultural context. Their "tradition of the elders" was not without merit and telling perceptions, but it substituted the wisdom of men for the law of God. As a result, it deserved the scathing denunciations of Jesus Christ. By their traditions, they made the law of God "of none effect."

Their *second* error was to divide men into two classes, the good and the bad, and then to adjudicate virtue to themselves as the good. Our Lord indicted the Pharisee's prayer, "I thank thee that I am not as one of these," as epitomizing this evil. *The Pharisees saw their moral good as a personal attribute and not as a result of God's grace, His gift.*

Phariseeism leads to the good guy/bad guy syndrome. Many people, liberals, radicals, and conservatives, gain no small following by appealing to people in terms of this syndrome: "We are the good guys; they are the bad guys." This is a good fundraising ploy! The barbarians are at the gate! Send us your money and help us fight them!

For people to identify their problem thus is a major handicap to solutions. The good/bad guy syndrome reduces the answer to problems to a simple dimension: oppose the bad guys (the Christians, humanists, Marxists, liberals, conservatives, or whatever name one gives to the enemy).

Such cheap answers are destroying the world. For example, many

people oppose humanism who will not support Christian schools! *Virtue is not merely words but life and action.* What answers and actions do we have with respect to education, the poor, the sick, the lost, the lonely, and so on?

Our Lord says, "By their fruits ye shall know them" (Matt. 7:20). Paul says, "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law" (Rom. 3:31). James says, "faith without works is dead" (James 2:26). From the beginning to end, Scripture requires us to link faith and works. Their separation is not Biblical. It leads to hypocrisy and a negation of faith.

When Paul was converted on the road to Damascus, he did not say to God the Son, "I thank thee for making me one of the good guys." Instead, he said, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" (Acts 9:6). All of his life, this was St. Paul's concern. It must be ours also: action, not judgments on others, is required by our Lord.

436

IN PRAISE OF NOAH

Chalcedon Report No. 343, February 1994

It is sad how in the past generation so many important persons and texts in the Bible have become neglected. We are the losers for that neglect.

One of the great saints of Scripture, an awe-inspiring man, was Noah, once a favorite person with Christians. We are told that Noah was a just and upright man (Gen. 6:9). He lived in an era of radical corruption. God announced to him that He would in due time wipe out all that world with a great flood, and Noah had to prepare a great ark against that day (Gen. 6:13–22). Animals, and food for them, and for Noah's family, had to be prepared. What Noah knew was coming, no one else knew, but all knew the radical depravity of the world of that time.

Thus, *first*, Noah had to prepare for a flood. This was done in the face of unbelief, and, no doubt, scorn. No one else felt that judgment was coming. Year in and year out, Noah worked, patiently and faithfully. *Second*, Noah did not waste his time on the obvious. He did not document the corruption around him: he built the ark. We have today many people who write and talk at length on conspiracies, corruption, evils in high places and low, and so on, as though this were the gospel! Their absorption with evil is evil. Our Lord tells us that it is morally wrong to study "the deep things" or "depths" of Satan and his conspiracy (Rev. 2:24); we must *serve* Him. We must major in God's Word, not in Satan's plan.

Third, Noah *built* and he *preached*. Second Peter 2:5 tells us that Noah was "a preacher of righteousness [or, justice]," a man who proclaimed God's law-word and also built an ark in order to prepare for the world after the flood, after the judgment.

In our time again, as often before, we face judgment, and we need to remind ourselves of Noah's constructive faith: he built, and he preached.

He was not a young man, and everything familiar to him was going to disappear. Noah could have resigned himself to the hope of heaven, but he knew that first of all God had a task for him here on earth.

Fourth, God tells Noah, "with thee will I establish my covenant" (Gen. 6:18). Noah, like Adam, becomes with this the representative of humanity. The covenant becomes God's gift to Noah of the grace, mercy, and law of God (Gen. 9:1–17). Mankind must look to Noah (as to others) as their father in the covenant of God.

Fifth, we are told that Noah was "moved with fear" to faithfulness, whereby he "became heir of the righteousness which is by faith" (Heb. 11:7). In Noah's case, faith and fear were closely linked. Noah feared God because he knew Him. Noah knew, as Otto Scott has observed, that "God is no buttercup." Nowadays, having scoffed at the fear of God, we have become afraid of men. But Noah knew that nothing that men may do can approach the wrath and the judgment of God. It was not the conspiracies of his fellow men that Noah feared but the righteous anger of God.

Sixth, we do not remember the tyrants and the degenerates of Noah's time. Rather, as 1 Peter 3:20 speaks of them, they were "the days of Noah." One man against his world, and yet Noah's name marks that age. He alone mattered.

Noah is very important. We need to think more about him, his faithfulness, and the vast dimension of the evil that he faced. By comparison, we are richly blessed. Our greatest problem is usually ourselves. *Remember* Noah.

437

A "ROOT OF BITTERNESS"

Chalcedon Report No. 348, July 1994

An early warning to the church was to beware of "any root of bitterness" which can trouble and defile a man (Heb. 12:15). Perhaps never before has this warning been more needed than now.

The number of such people in churches is particularly of concern to me. The causes are many. It can be the conduct of pastors, church officers, other members, parents, husband, wife, children, employers, employees, and so on. All over the country, these embittered people are causing distress and grief to those around them. They refuse to be comforted or to rebuild their sometimes shattered lives. Instead, they try to shatter the lives of those around them. Two or three times a month, I hear from people whose lives are being clouded by someone who nurses a root of bitterness and will not surrender it.

There are some very important aspects to this. *First* and foremost, anyone with a root of bitterness in his life is indicting God. They will sometimes burst out with anger to demand, "How can God do this to me? How could He let it happen?" Almost always, they do not want an answer, and they resent being given a Biblical one. They want agreement that they have been fearfully wronged. To the best of my knowledge, this is often the case. But they forget that this is a fallen world: sin is its way of life, and injustice is natural to it, not justice. It is the most natural thing in the world for people to do evil. Why the surprise? Were they so greatly worked up when the injustice affected others, before their turn came? To live in this world on a routine basis means either to compromise with injustice or to be a target of it, and even compromising affords no escape! This world is a friend, and one to injustice, not to the righteous. Our purpose here is not to live our lives in peace, and as we want, but to serve and advance the Kingdom of God. We are soldiers of Christ, and this world

is no longer an Eden but a battlefield. Those with a root of bitterness expect Jesus Christ to cradle and coddle them all their lives. They refuse to see this world as fallen, nor to see themselves as part of the battle of the ages between the Kingdom of God and the kingdom of man. They indict God and demand a good world; they want to be undisturbed in their self-centered way of life. The proof of their ungodly and egocentric lives is their root of bitterness. Their attitude is, "How dare God do this to me?"

Second, those with a root of bitterness also indict the church. This is a silly reaction. The church is full of people like them! Where were they when others received injustice, lost their jobs, had their spouses abandon them, or their children break with them? Remember, it was the church of His day which crucified Jesus Christ, and the church has been doing the same thing ever since (Heb. 6:6). Such people want to punish the church, and so they stay away. This does not make them any the better, although it may improve the church. They feel that they do well to be angry (Jon. 4:4, 9–11). They see their anger and hatred as a virtue, as a proof that they are the righteous ones. In fact, their anger places them on the same moral level as those against whom they rage.

Third, many with a root of bitterness indict their family. They say, in effect, how dare you enjoy life when I am suffering so much? They work, then, to destroy the peace of the family. Their bitterness sometimes infects the children. In some instances, their bitterness harms a marriage, destroys the children, and makes the house a sorry place to visit. I recall vividly one such instance from the 1960s; the unwillingness to order a bitter person to leave (pity made the couple relent) led to the radical warping of the children's lives.

What makes it especially difficult to deal with persons possessed by a root of bitterness is their stubborn refusal to change. Because they were in the right in whatever caused their bitterness, they feel justified in their anger and their hostility. It is almost as though the injustice they suffered gave them a right to be forever angry and unpleasant. Almost ten years ago, I had to sever all connection with a man I knew *slightly* who bombarded me with long, very long, letters. He had been wronged by a federal agency, and he believed it was every Christian's duty to join him in his protests: the case was over; no appeal remained; but he still felt that all the churches were evil if they did not rise up to his defense. (His own faith was at most nominal.) To say anything kindly to him was to invite a deluge of papers presenting his case! No person's grief or sorrow meant anything to him; only his own case mattered.

A root of bitterness leads to a self-absorption this side of madness. Such people plague God and man with their anger, bitterness, and complaints.

Worse, they try to make all who refuse to get involved in their bitterness feel guilty. I was told of one man who carried thick stacks of papers about in his car so that he could hand a folder of many, many documents to anyone who was courteous enough to offer a murmured sympathy!

The church has too long been patient with such people. They refuse to be comforted because they want God to reorder history to suit them. They are determined to nurse their grief. Leave them alone. "Let the dead bury their dead" (Matt. 8:22).

438

COMMUNITY AND STRENGTH

Chalcedon Report No. 241, August 1985

Because man is a creature, he cannot stand alone. Neither economically nor socially, can man be a hermit without a serious loss of his function and development. Communion and community are essential to man's growth. It is thus all important to make sure that our community is not a harmful or empty one, and that our communion is not in trifles.

Man's being requires communion and community with the Creator, the triune God. As St. Augustine said, "Our hearts are restless till they rest in Thee." Man's strength is a result of his relationship to God.

Modern man, however, has only a slight relationship to God. His "Christianity" is by and large a matter of fire and life insurance, not a community of life with God. Men today relate more readily to their fellow men, and they are far more dependent on this community than on God. They are more concerned about what other people think of them that what God thinks of them.

All this has consequences. We have seen, in many hijackings and kidnappings, the victims identify with their captors against their own family or country. They may be brutalized by their captors, in one case raped, and yet they will side with them in all too many cases.

This should not surprise us. If men do not have an overruling and governing communion with God, they must have, and will have, such a relationship with men. In our humanistic age, men draw their standards and laws from men, and therefore their basic community and communion is with men. It is only such people who can be "brainwashed"; in truth, "brainwashing" is a myth. It simply means that men without faith are dependent on and vulnerable to men and will be shaped by them. If the Lord does not mold us, then men will.

Communion and community with the triune God is established through

Jesus Christ and His atonement. The day by day means of community is maintained by obedience to God's law-word, His way for our life in communion. If we follow man's law as our way of life, it is because our community is with men.

This is not to deny for a moment that community with our fellow men is essential, but not on humanistic grounds. We have today a major communications gap among peoples, problems between the generations, the social classes, within the family, between employers and employees, and so on. If men are not at peace with God, they cannot be at peace with one another. The loss of faith in the triune God is followed by a loss of community among men. The rise of antinomianism is a symptom of a changed centrality in the lives of men: man's word and law have replaced God's. The "virtues" of too many churchmen are what James Saurin two centuries or more ago called negative virtues, i.e., abstaining from evil, when we are required also to manifest positive virtues. Moreover, Saurin spoke out against "mutilated virtues," i.e., a selective obedience to God and His law where we think He is "worth obeying" and a neglect of other commandments. True virtue he saw as "connected by the bonds of obedience to the will of God."

Our Lord said, "My meat [i.e., my strength] is to do the will of him that sent me, and to finish his work" (John 4:34). If Christ's strength came from full obedience, will not our strength and communion come the same way also?

439

FOR GOD AND COUNTRY

Chalcedon Report No. 14, November 5, 1966

An expression increasingly stressed in some conservative quarters has a rather strange history. "For God and country," we are told, sums up our cause. Now certainly, the phrase calls to mind an apparently noble purpose, but is it entirely a wise slogan? And how has it been used in the past?

Some years ago, a country in the midst of war summoned people to sacrifice their savings, gold and silver, time and effort, "For God and country." People loyally lined up and cooperated; for some who gave heavily, iron medals were awarded for their services.

Another crisis situation: inflation. The citizenry were summoned to rally to their country's welfare by surrendering their gold and silver, including their wedding rings, "For God and country."

We can agree that these were bad uses of the phrase, especially since enemy powers were involved. Is the phrase a sound one in the right hands? To answer this question, it is necessary to examine the nature of Biblical ethics or morality.

The demand of humanism (and of its child, socialism) is for a *universal ethics*. In universal ethics, we are told that, even as the family gave way to the tribe, and the tribe to the nation, so the nation must give way to a one world order. All men must treat all other men equally. Partiality to our family, nation, or race, represents a lower morality, we are told, and must be replaced by the "higher" morality of a universal ethics.

But Biblical morality is not a universal ethics. It does *not* have one code for all men. Where mankind is concerned, Biblical morality has three separate kinds of moral requirements.

First, there is the law of God for the family. The family has a high and central position in Biblical law. There are four laws that pertain to

the family in the Ten Commandments alone: "Honor thy father and thy mother, as the LORD thy God hath commanded thee; that thy days may be prolonged, and that it may go well with thee, in the land which the LORD thy God giveth thee" (Deut. 5:16). The seventh commandment forbids adultery (Deut. 5:18), and the tenth, covetousness of our neighbor's wife, home and possessions (Deut. 5:21). The eighth commandment (Deut. 5:19) forbids theft and protects property, and, in Biblical law, property is seen as one of the central mainstays of family life. In the New Testament, it is emphasized that a man's first human obligation is towards his family: "But if any provide not for his own, and specially for those of his own house; he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel" (1 Tim. 5:8). A man's first and basic responsibility, in the realm of his relationships towards his fellow men, is towards his own family. He cannot put them on the same level as all mankind. The consequence of a universal ethics can only be communism. In a universalistic morality, all men must be given the same love, support, and consideration as we give to our family. It is impossible to do this without total communism. But Biblical morality insists that the family, which must be grounded on Christian faith, must come *first*. A man is *required* to love and support *his* wife; he is forbidden to love and support any other women. He must support and discipline his children; he cannot do this for other children. A universal ethics is a communistic ethics.

The *second* area of law in Biblical morality deals with our brethren in the faith, our relationship with true believers. We are with true believers members of a larger family, the household of Jesus Christ. We have an obligation of love to our "brethren" in the faith. The early church established the order of deacons and a deacons' fund for the care of widows (or orphans) who had no family (Acts 6:1–6). Christians share a common faith and a common destiny. They believe in the Bible and thus have in common a standard of law: they are a community. We can, very quickly, feel a sense of kinship with true believers whom we have scarcely met, because we share a common perspective, yet a neighbor, whom we see daily, is in reality a stranger to us, because his every belief is hostile to ours. God *requires* us to be partial to that which is our own. To give equal favor, support, or attention to that which is hostile to us is to destroy ourselves: it is to subsidize the opposition.

The *third* level of Biblical law deals with the rest of the world, with unbelievers. Here we are to "walk honestly toward them that are without" (1 Thess. 4:12), i.e., our behavior towards unbelievers must be honorable. We must love our neighbor and our enemy, which means giving him the God-given privileges of the second table of the law. The Bible repeatedly

identifies, as in Romans 13:8–10, love of others as "the fulfilling of the laws": thou shalt not kill, i.e., respect all men's right to life; thou shalt not commit adultery, i.e. respect the sanctity of every home; thou shalt not steal, i.e., all man's property is under God's law and safeguard of law; thou shalt not bear false witness, i.e., respect all men's reputations; thou shalt not covet . . . i.e., respect these things in thought, as well as in word and deed. Works of mercy, in emergencies, are to be extended to all men, as the law, and the parable of the Good Samaritan make clear. But our Christian family comes first, then our fellow believers, and, last, the world at large.

"For God and country." Where does our country come in? We serve God, not only directly in worship, but by our faithfulness in every area of our life, by our family life, our relationship to the world. We serve Him by our integrity in our vocation, and in our citizenship. We have dealt with our moral relationship to men: to family, fellow believers, and to the world. What about institutions, such as church and state? Both institutions are ministries of God. The church is the ministry of the Word, the sacraments, and of true discipline. Without these, there is no true church, even though an institution may call itself a church. The state is the ministry of justice (Rom. 13:1–6): its function is to provide godly law and order. The obligation of believers is to be obedient citizens, insofar as the state does not require what is contrary to our duty to God and our responsibilities under God, for "We ought to obey God rather than men" (Acts 5:29). The citizen must pay taxes, and bear arms in his country's defense. He must be honest and industrious, and he ought to pray for those having authority. More than that cannot be required of him.

Where does the state come in? Certainly, it does *not* have the same status as our family. *No man* can morally sacrifice his family to his country; this is no more than a modern form of human sacrifice to a false god. Our family *must* come before church work and before patriotic work. The moral foundations of society are in the Christian family. It cannot be sacrificed to anything else, to either church or state. If we say the country is a bigger and more important thing, and must come first, the liberal can say that the world is bigger and has priority over the nation and the family.

Then where does the state come in? Where does our country rank in moral importance? This depends on the country. *If* it is a Christian country, it has a rank placing it in the realm of our duties to our fellow believers: the state has entered into the ranks of the faithful. But if the country (or church, or school), has departed from the faith, if it has officially and practically denied God and His Word, then it is a part of the world of unbelief, and honesty requires that we treat it as such.

Does this mean that we stand by and let our country go down the drain? By no means, by no means at all. All the more zealously, for the Lord's sake and for our children's sake, we need to reclaim our country. But we must have a sense of proportion. Some churches absorb so much of their members "time for the Lord," supposedly, that family life disintegrates; but family life is the first area of godly responsibility. And some patriots are ready to sacrifice their husbands and children "for the cause." But their first area of responsibility is to their husbands and children. The same holds true for many men. How many, many people spend years trying to win radicals over to conservatism, and then wake up to find their children have become themselves radical! Certainly, the schools have a share of the blame, but the first responsibility is parental. Should they quit their work? Again, by no means. But their work must have a sense of proportion.

If our work is truly "For God," it will be primarily constructive in every area, in the home, church, community, school, and country. To be "For God" means to establish godly homes, Christian schools, Christian study groups, godly political action, godly businesses geared to sound economics, and so on. It does not mean merely reacting to the opposition. It will be for the family, for the faith, for the country, and for the school, because it is "For God."

There is much to commend in the phrase, "For God and country," but there is much against it. It is a handy phrase for the enemy to use in the future, with the help of apostate churches: "For God and country," "For God and the Fatherland," or "For God and the Soviet Union" as apostate Russian churchmen say. But, as Joshua said, "choose you this day whom ye will serve . . . but as for me and my house, we will serve the LORD" (Josh. 24:15).

But even more militates against the phrase, "For God and country." With all due respect to the dedicated and fine patriots who use it, the term makes an equation where no equality exists. The phrase has a ring of truth, but it will not stand up to investigation. It joins the absolute, God, with a relative, the country. We cannot link a relative and an absolute together. We cannot call for service to "God and church" or to "God and school," because the service God requires, and the claims God has on us, far transcend the claims of church, country, or school. The essence of statism and totalitarianism is that it makes the relative absolute. It makes the state into another god; it gives to the state power and authority which rightfully belong to God only.

The state today is claiming too much. In the United States, the purpose of the Founding Fathers was to limit severely the powers of the federal

government by means of the Constitution. The federal union had to be strong enough to avoid impotence, but it could not claim powers which infringed on God's sovereignty and man's liberty under God. The foundation of liberty, they saw in the faith. As George Washington said, "Let it be simply asked, Where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths, which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice?" Patrick Henry said that subversive and revolutionary forces from Europe were seeking to destroy "the great pillars of all government and of social life; I mean virtue, morality and religion. This is the armor, my friend, and this alone, that renders us invincible . . . If we lose these, we are conquered, fallen indeed!" How many men today can equal Patrick Henry's dedication to his country? But Patrick Henry was a great American because of the greatness of his faith, character, and intelligence, and because he brought a sense of proportion and dedication to all things.

Our Pledge of Allegiance says it best: "one nation, under God." This is the true perspective, one to which we must give allegiance and service as well. Let us serve family, school, church, and country under God and only *under God*. No cause can rightfully claim more of us.

440

THE BIBLICAL DOCTRINE OF SUBMISSION, PART 1

Chalcedon Report No. 440, April 2002

THERE is no lack of general agreement on the importance of and the necessity for the Biblical doctrine of submission. The differences, however, are great as to what it requires. For example, a story popular in some medieval circles (of priests and men) told of patient Griselda, who meekly submitted to sadistic treatment by her socially superior husband and, after many years, was rewarded for her submission (Giovanni Boccaccio, *The Decameron*, tenth day, tenth story). But we know that medieval women, in high places and low, were aggressive and very vocal, so patient Griselda was by no means representative of her era.

Another example of submission of an historical nature is the Jesuit order. Jesuits voluntarily took a vow of unreserved and unqualified submission to the pope. This made them a powerful force for the Counter-Reformation, but created an intense hatred for them both in and out of the Roman Catholic Church. Within the Roman Catholic Church, the animosity and slander was so great that Catholic monarchs demanded the suppression of the order. In the brutal events that followed, Russia and Russian Orthodoxy and some Protestants protected many Jesuits. All kinds of slander were directed against the Jesuits, which still survive.

The problem for the critics was a simple one. Unquestioning and absolute obedience to God is one thing, but a like obedience to the pope or to the church is another. Outside the Jesuit Order, not many Catholics agreed with that; nor do they agree now. The general opinion was that anyone making such a submission was capable of anything.

Protestant Jesuits

Today we have in many Protestant circles a Jesuit-like demand for submission on the part of members and clergy. The results are deadly, as always.

Among the Biblical texts commonly used to affirm the doctrine of submission, two notable ones stand out:

> Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake: whether it be to the king as supreme; Or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evildoers, and for the praise of them that do well. (1 Pet. 2:13–14)

> Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? Do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same: For he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake. (Rom. 13:1–5)

Submission to the State

These two texts do not deal with submission in the church, nor in the family, but in the civil state, in the state or civil government. Their basic premise is, *first*, that we live in a world governed and predestined by God. Our rebellion, however evil the circumstances, is a revolt against God. The world indeed is full of sin, but our rebellion does not remove the fact of sin but aggravates it. *Second*, God's way of transformation is not revolution but regeneration. The state is a ministry of justice; the church, a ministry of salvation. Man finds it easier to turn to revolution and conflict because it demands no change in him. God's way requires not only that we submit to His will and be obedient, but also that in Him we be made a new creation. The only efficacious change comes by regeneration. Thus, the Biblical doctrine of submission has as its necessary correlative the doctrine of regeneration. The fallen man wants revolution, or an external imposition, as the only way he sees of affecting change. If he believes in education as an alternative, it is in compulsory statist education, no less a revolutionary device. The Christian must affirm that humanistic efforts and devices are superficial and that only God's regenerating power can

effect change. Thus, we cannot separate submission from regeneration.

Third, social order is not maintained by every man doing that which is right in his own eyes, as in the days of the judges. Such a condition prevails when God is not king over the nation and its peoples (Judg. 21:25). Even the worst rulers must maintain some kind of social order.

Fourth, rulers are ordained of God. If we have bad rulers, it is because we are a bad people, and the solution again is not in revolution but in regeneration. This does not preclude using peaceful means to alter society, but it does mean that our essential hope is in regeneration.

Rulers are "ministers of God." Not all ministers are good, as any look at the church will tell us, but neither are we the people. Godly submission begins with submission to God and His law-word. It means that the problem of sin and evil is not countered with violence and death, and His regenerating power makes us into a new human race, one empowered to do good and to establish justice.

Fifth, this makes submission a matter of conscience. It is emphatically not a surrender to evil. It is a recognition that sin is not eliminated nor curtailed by revolution and violence, but by good works, and these Christ's people must supply.

The Romans 13:1–5 text cannot be separated from that which follows it, namely, *first*, that paying taxes is a religious duty, according to verse 6, in order to maintain some semblance of social order. Thus verse 7 requires all due tribute, custom, fear, honor, and dues to be paid as a form of obedience to God — no tax revolt, in other words. *Second*, we are to be debt-free as a normal thing, although debts for up to six years are permitted by God's law. Our service to God involves avoiding bondage to men. Our obligation to other men should not be money or debt, but love. *Third*, love is the fulfilling or putting into force of the law. We do not commit adultery, meaning that we respect the integrity of our neighbor's marriage. We do not kill, i.e., we respect the integrity of his life. We do not steal, i.e., we do not violate his property or possessions. We do not bear false witness: we respect his good name and reputation; and we do not covet what is our neighbor's so that in word, thought, and deed, we manifest our love for our neighbor by obeying God's law in relationship to him. "Love worketh no ill to his neighbor: therefore love is the fulfilling of the law" (Rom. 13:10). Love is thus defined as keeping the law of God in relationship one to another.

Submission to Christ

Fourth, it is time for us to wake up out of the sleep of our dark world

and to put on the armor of light (v. 12). We can only change the world by submission to Jesus Christ and His law-word. We must, *fifth*, "walk honestly, as in the day, not in rioting and drunkenness, not in chambering and wantonness, not in strife and envying" (v. 13). We are a people with work to do. *Sixth*, this means "put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make not provision for the flesh, to fulfill the lusts thereof" (v. 14). We are not here to please ourselves, but to please God, and we dare not forget this. It is not what we want from God that is all-important, but what God wants from us.

The verses which follow 1 Peter 2:13–14 are similar to those in Romans. The alternative to civil revolution is the godly reordering or reconstruction of our lives and our world. We are told, *first*, that it is the will of God for us that we submit to evil to "put to silence the ignorance of foolish men" (1 Pet. 2:15). All kinds of foolish charges are made against Christians by the ungodly; we must not provide grounds for more. *Second*, we are to live as free men in Christ, as servants of God, never using our freedom as an excuse for misconduct. This means, *third*, that we love our fellow believers, honor all men, reverence God, and honor the king (v. 17). The world loves its own and looks on all others with hatred; we must treat all men as God would have us do. *Fourth*, "servants" are now addressed. This term can include anyone who works for another person. Such a relationship is not perfect, and it does involve sometimes "suffering wrongfully." We must be patient. We are called to live in an evil world, as did Jesus Christ, and this means "suffering wrongfully" at times. He sets the example for us of patient endurance (vv. 19–25).

Fifth, in 1 Peter 3:1–7, we are told of the duties of wives and husbands, the regenerated life rather than a revolutionary one. Peter goes on to say much more, but this is enough to indicate that the Christian life is regenerative, not revolutionary and destructive.

Our texts have dealt with the Christian in a civil and social context, in an unsaved world as in the New Testament era. Submission thus has been viewed in the context of a fallen and un-Christian world. But what about submission within the Christian community? In part, Peter touches on this in his counsel to husbands and wives. This is submission in the Lord. We shall now see what more is involved. But before we do, let us use the premise of regeneration versus revolution to examine a contemporary problem. We have here two kinds of opposition within the Christian community. On the one hand, we have had some who aggressively oppose abortion by lawless acts aimed at abortuaries, imitating radical civil tactics. But men cannot be regenerated by violence. The way of fallen man is to try to change the world by violence, not by regeneration.

On the other hand, many Christians have worked to counsel women seeking abortion, to offer godly help and Biblical solutions. Much remarkable work has been done because the basis of their effort is to save the life of the unborn child and the soul of the mother.

The answer of humanism to problems is compulsion and violence, ultimately death. For the Christian, it is Christ and life. The two ways could not be more different.

441

THE BIBLICAL DOCTRINE OF SUBMISSION, PART 2

Chalcedon Report No. 441, May 2002

The Biblical doctrine of submission to an ungodly authority requires that we turn away from revolution to regeneration, from man's way to God's way, to reconstruct and reorder our world.

But what about the Christian community? Are we to submit to evil here? If we are dealing with presumably regenerate men, are we to submit as we would to the ungodly from whom we cannot expect God's justice?

As we saw last month, the Jesuits have required an unquestioning submission to the pope, and they have only earned the hostility of many Catholics, including the clergy. An unquestioning and total submission to anyone other than God is rightfully seen as wrong, and those making such a vow have been mistrusted even by their fellow Catholics. It is very dangerous to require a submission of any such dimension to any other than God and His Word. What then does godly submission mean within the Christian community?

The Word of God

The alpha and omega of our understanding of godly submission is that we recognize that every word of God is God-breathed (2 Tim. 3:16) and is binding on us. Because it is God-given, the words of Scripture are all God's law. The Bible is God's law book.

In Matthew 18:15–17, we are given God's way of dealing with problems created by sin. The *first* step, when we have an offense committed against us, is to go to the offender quietly and to tell him of the problem. "If he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother" (v. 15). The presupposition is that an actual offense has occurred.

Second, if this effort fails, "then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established" (v. 16). We are here dealing with a procedure which is both neighborly and yet also legal. Its purpose is restorative.

Then, *third*, "if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it to the church: but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican" (v. 17). Notice that this reads, "tell it to the church." As long as the church was small in numbers, and for at least two centuries home churches predominated, this could be true, but in time this hearing was delegated to the elders. In 2 Thessalonians 3:14–15, we read:

> And if any man obey not our word by this epistle, note that man, and have no company with him, that he may be ashamed. Yet count him not as an enemy, but admonish him as a brother.

Paul here is exercising his apostolic authority, but in so doing he is giving a rule of discipline to the church. What is relevant for us is that the disciplined man was not to be counted as an enemy but as a wayward brother. The goal was to make him ashamed and repentant. On occasion, however, the judgment could be severe. In 1 Corinthians 16:22, Paul writes, "If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be Anathema Maranatha," or *accursed*. At times, as in 1 Corinthians 16:22, we find *Anathema* and *Maranatha* joined together, and this usage was at times present in the early church. Maranatha was a Hebrew word meaning, "The Lord is come." Its use could have meant either, "The Lord had come in judgment," or "Lord, come in judgment." In either case, its usage stressed the solemnity of the judgment.

The Pope vs. Jesus Christ

As we have seen, the Jesuit error was to tie absolute loyalty to the pope rather than to Jesus Christ, and this misplaced loyalty was resented by other Catholics. A like misplaced loyalty is to the church rather than to Jesus Christ. A related error is to insist that there can be no reversal of any church court's decision except on *procedural grounds*. A great injustice may be perpetrated, but, if the legal procedures of the session or presbytery are correct, there can be no reversal unless an incorrect form has been filed, or some like technical error. This is also true in civil courts in the twentieth century. What this does is to declare that the decisions of the court of origin are virtually infallible; and, with respect to justice, they are inerrant and do only err in procedural matters. This is, of course, *a denial of the Reformation*, and a very common one. The

Reformation stressed the fallibility of men and institutions; Calvinism in particular made it clear that no class of men or organizations, neither church nor state, were exempt from sin. To trust in men and institutions was tantamount to distrusting God and His Word. Even though the Calvinists tended to be well-educated and scholarly, even into the eighteenth century, Calvinism was regarded as a faith unfit for gentlemen because it placed them on the same level as common people. For Calvinists so-called to insist on trusting the church was a denial of their heritage.

Church Courts vs. Community

In a very real and important sense, we have begun at the wrong end by stressing the work of the church court. Because the church is a community whose central rite is communion, any judicial action must be preceded by prayer and godly, loving care by the people. Instead of talking about the sin of a member, they must be in prayer and manifest a family's concern for a member.

The texts requiring this are too many to cite. Here are a *few* from the gospels alone: Matthew 5:23–24; 6:12; 18:21–22; 23:28; and 25:31–46 (the parable on judgment). In Luke, we have 10:27–37 (the Good Samaritan) and 14:12–14, and in John 15:15–17 we are most emphatically commanded to love one another. Any church that ceases to be the family of Christ and becomes simply a court has failed. The elders cannot replace the functions of the family members, and to reduce a church's duty to the work of elders is to handicap the elders.

Life depends on obedience, and without it we have anarchy and death. In fact, our Lord tells us in John 7:17 that knowledge depends on obedience: "If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine." This means that an inactive congregation will be an ignorant one.

At this point, an important aspect of the Biblical doctrine of submission comes to light. Submission is not inaction but rather a reliance on Christian action. This can mean prayer for the person or persons involved, intercession by friends of the offended party before the matter goes to the elders, and even *afterwards*. This must be brotherly helpfulness rather than censoriousness. Its good is restoration rather than judgment, although that may follow at the hands of due authorities.

We began by calling attention to the very different views of non-Christians and Christians, the difference between revolution and regeneration. The first sees compulsion and violence as the answer, and too often in church history men have put their reliance in compulsion. For the Christian, the answer is regeneration, and this means the ways of *grace*. Now

grace is not without judgment, but in essence its ways are the ways of peace. We live in a culture that refuses to admit the existence of supernatural grace, but this does not diminish its reality, and neither does the widespread prevalence of revolutionary violence diminish its failure. We, the people of God, have God's work to do, and it must be done in God's way.

When our Lord declares, "Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God" (Matt. 5:9), He does not say, "Blessed are the elders who are peacemakers." If we know enough about a problem in the church to gossip about it, perhaps we know enough to help remedy it! Submission, we must remember, begins with submission to every word that proceeds out of the mouth of God (Matt. 4:4).

We submit to civil powers in most instances, although where the freedom of the Word of God is at stake, "We ought to obey God rather than men" (Acts 5:29). The scope of a non-Christian civil solution is limited, and even in a Christian state, the state is at best a ministry of justice, not salvation. Salvation is from the Lord. We must constantly seek the regenerating power of the Lord, and here the church *and* the Christian people and community have God's power in ways that the state does not. They can invoke Christ's regenerating power to cope with sin. As against coercive power, the Christian must invoke the regenerating power of God. If we do not do so more often, it is perhaps because we have come to believe more in compulsion than in grace, more in revolution than in regeneration. Too many churchmen have become children of their times and expect compulsion to be more effective than grace. Christian submission begins with placing ourselves under the every word of God and His Spirit, for only so can we do His work.

442

HONORING UNGODLY MEN

Chalcedon Report No. 314, September 1991

I have long hesitated in saying this, because it is not my desire to interfere in the internal affairs of various churches but to speak to the issues of faith. However, because I have heard of no protests within that specific denomination, I feel it necessary to speak out.

One of the remarkable steps in the church within the United States occurred in recent years when a group of truly outstanding pastors and laymen worked successfully to recapture one of America's largest churches from the modernists. It was a magnificent work and is still in progress.

This great struggle was shamed and disgraced this year when President George Bush was asked to address the convention and was there honored. But Bush is the man who fired an evangelical White House staff member for protesting a bill favoring homosexuals and protesting a celebration with them in the White House! Is it God-honoring to honor such a man as President Bush?

We went to war to defend two Muslim slave-holding states. Our chaplains could not wear crosses, and Bibles could not be mailed to our servicemen. We bombed Christian churches out of existence but not mosques. Should we honor the commander-in-chief of such an operation?

I am not questioning the freedom of the president to his opinions, but I challenge the morality of the church in honoring him. Has the church so low a view of the Lordship of Jesus Christ as to have His house receive and honor every caesar that comes along, irrespective of what he does? Saint Ambrose rebuked from his pulpit an emperor who claimed to be a professing Christian. The early church prayed for the conversion of rulers, not their blessings.

One of the more abused texts of Scripture is 1 Timothy 2:1–4. Paul asks us to pray for kings and rulers and "all men," especially "for all that

are in authority." Why? The reasons are plainly stated: *First*, "that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty," i.e., in a way that "is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour." In other words, pray that these ungodly ones do not molest the church and that they leave us alone! *Second*, we are to pray because God "will have all men to be saved and to come unto the knowledge of the truth."

The usual church prayer, "bless the president, bless the governor," is idiocy. *What we are commanded to pray for is their conversion, and that we be left alone, unmolested in Christ's service.*

Jesus Christ alone "is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords" (1 Tim. 6:15). He alone is to be honored in His house. In His presence, kings and commoners, presidents and the humblest believers, are to bow before Him, believe in Him, and obey His Word. We must beware of dishonoring God and the Son of God.

We are not our own. We have been bought with a price, Christ's atoning blood. Him only must we serve (1 Cor. 6:19–20).

443

HOW TO BE BLESSED

Chalcedon Report No. 373, August 1996

According to *The Arabian Nights*, King Shahryar, on discovering the adultery of his wife, cried out, "Only in utter solitude can a man be safe from the doings of this vile world! By Allah, life is naught but one great wrong." Repeatedly in history, men have come to a like conclusion, with devastating results.

The world is indeed a fallen world and full of evil. The Bible tells us so, in case we are under the illusion that man is naturally good. But we are forbidden to dwell on that fact or to see the study of evil as the solution. The church in Thyatira was studying "the depths of Satan," or, the deep things, the hidden conspiracies of Satan, and for this our Lord rebuked them sharply (Rev. 2:24). Majoring in the study of conspiracies leads to ascribing more power to them than is their due, and it results in forgetting the predestinating and providential power of God, and this is a fearful sin.

Men like King Shahryar forget that they too are sinners. Giving too much power to sin, they become themselves evil and heartless.

Too many people today excuse their indifference to Christ and His requirements of us by saying, "It's a dog-eat-dog world," by which they mean, "I have to be one of the dogs."

Ours, however, is a providential world of God's creation and ordering. All things work together for good for us as the called of God (Rom. 8:28), but all things do not work together for us if we are evildoers. We cannot neglect God and expect His blessing.

There is an old story about a man who demanded entrance into heaven because he believed he was a good man and had gone to church. When asked what he had done for the Lord apart from going to church, his answer was vague. When asked what he had ever done for his fellow man,

he said he had once given a dollar to a beggar. St. Peter's command was, "Give him a dollar and tell him to go to hell." He had neither grace nor works. Well, the world is full of men who are evil, and the daily paper proves it. But the world is also full of the glory of God, even as the waters cover the sea. "The whole earth is full of his glory" (Isa. 6:3).

Contrary to King Shahryar's, "life is naught but one great wrong," it is God's creation; it moves to His purpose, and it leads to our eternal victory in Him. The glory of God thunders in all of creation, as the psalms tell us, because all things move to accomplish His sovereign will. Life is a battle a between good and evil, not a holiday, and to expect it to be easy is a certain way to making it difficult.

Modern man has an easy life basically, but his proneness to whining makes him incapable of enjoying God's gracious gifts. Not until man stops majoring in evil and begins enjoying God's grace and mercy will he be blessed.

444

WHATEVER HAPPENED TO DEATHBED SCENES?

Chalcedon Report No. 204, August 1982

When I began my ministry at the end of the 1930s, the world was a dramatically different one. Aspects of that world survived until the late 1950s, and then disappeared. One common fact of that and earlier eras which has since become a rarity is the deathbed scene, the family coming in to say goodbye or to be blessed, the last words, and then the end.

Philippe Aries, in *The Hour of Our Death* (1981), studied the changing attitude towards death from the earliest Christian times to the present day. As faith and culture have changed, so too men's basic attitudes towards death. For example, during the Middle Ages, the ideal was a death in bed, surrounded by family and friends. As a result, what developed was a kind of ritual of dying, because, from start to finish, it was known to be a religious act and a stage in the development of life and faith. In the later medieval era, people came to desire a sudden death; there was less faith, and also a lessened sense of community with the world of the living on earth and those in the world to come. Instead of a rite of passage, there was a desire for an unexpected and sudden passage.

After 1500, the deathbed scene, with ups and downs of popularity, was again an important fact, a kind of liturgical act. (In fact, in Catholic circles, extreme unction made it so. In Protestant circles, the pastor was a necessary part of the deathbed scene. Over forty years ago, an elderly Scot recited to me some verses he had been taught as a child, to recite on his deathbed.)

The Romantic movement was greatly attracted to the liturgy of the deathbed because of its potential emotional content, and, in non-Christian circles, the deathbed now gained a new and romantic content. It

became the occasion for the manifestation of greatness, a new-found purity, and a cleansing of the pollutions of life. The high (or low) point of this tendency came somewhat later, in Charles Dickens's famous deathbed scene of little Nell. Readers on both sides of the Atlantic shed an abundance of tears over it.

Within the circle of Protestant orthodoxy, the approach of faith to life and death was very well expressed by John Newton, author of "Amazing Grace," in his great hymn, "Come, My Soul, Thy Suit Prepare" (1779). The last verse reads,

> Show me what I have to do,
> Ev'ry hour my strength renew;
> Let me live a life of faith.
> Let me die thy people's death:
> Let me die thy people's death.

Children were taught in their earliest years a simple prayer:

> Now I lay me down to sleep.
> I pray Thee, Lord, my soul to keep;
> And if I die before I wake,
> I pray Thee, Lord, my soul to take. Amen.

In more recent years, the last two lines have been changed to read:

> In peace and safety 'till I wake,
> And this I ask for Jesus' sake. Amen.

In recent years, what has happened to deathbed scenes? For the most part, they have been drugged out of existence. This has been done, because most people want it so, both the dying and their families. For the smallest complaint or pain, let alone dying, people demand of a doctor, "Can't you give me something for it?" We have a drug culture because we are unwilling to face either life or death. We prefer drink or drugs to reality, because we do not want reality impinging upon our dreamworld. Man's original sin, his desire to be his own god and his own universe, finds pain and death shattering realities. Hence, all frustration and suffering must be made the targets of legislation and of the therapy of drugs. We have a worldwide drug culture because the spirit of our age is hostile to God and His real world. Drugs are the stuff of dreams and illusions, and hence their appeal.

I mentioned earlier an old Scot, a quiet and rock-like Calvinist. He died of cancer; he was a year in dying. His children and grandchildren urged him to take some medicines (drugs), and to give up his solitary life for a "rest home," or to move in with a widowed daughter. He refused,

saying he enjoyed his house and garden, liked his own cooking, and could take care of himself. He took care of his flowers with especial pleasure, talked matter-of-factly about the progress of the cancer. He was a vigorous and hardy man who had never paid too much attention to pain. I visited him very frequently, to read Scripture and to pray. He was active in his garden until the day before his death and made a good witness to his daughter, who was present at the end. He had lived with a clear mind and died with a clear mind. He died with dignity and grace.

Death has no dignity for us now, because life is for us without dignity, and we fail to see life as a grace (1 Pet. 3:7), and thus cannot end it with grace. We prefer to be drugged, if not by narcotics or liquor, then by entertainment, and unthinking routine, or a life of escapism.

What we have "gained" is one of the horrors of history, the hospital death, with drugs, tubes connected to the failing body, and strangers called nurses, nurse's aides, and orderlies, going and coming all around us. Death is pushed out of sight, and the deathbed has lost its dignity. Drugs have reduced or eliminated pain, but they have also eliminated feeling and consciousness. Because for the modern age, death is a dirty fact, we have sanitized it and made it anonymous. From a time of communion, it has become a time of final loneliness. This should not surprise us. A dying culture, and the world of humanism is dying, cannot give dignity to either life or death.

445

HEAVEN

Chalcedon Report No. 318, January 1992

A pastor friend has suggested that I write something about heaven. The *first* thing to be said is that the Bible assumes the reality of heaven but tells us very little about it. God's Word speaks, not to satisfy our curiosity, but to command us as to our service to Him. This world is very important to the Lord, and it must be important to us. It is the place of our testing and refining for His eternal Kingdom and service. Revelation 22:3 says of the new creation, "his servants shall serve him."

Second, the criterion for our entrance into heaven is entirely God's grace through Christ's atonement. None of us earn or deserve heaven. God in His grace makes us members of His eternal Kingdom. That membership begins here and now. All of us have times and problems that lead us to wish that God would spare us these evils and heartaches. But these things are a part of God's grace to us, a means of preparing us for His eternal service. This is why Paul says, "Rejoice in the Lord always: and again I say, Rejoice" (Phil. 4:4). We are to cease from our anxiety and see God's glorious purpose in all things.

Third, in Hebrews 4, we are told that heaven, the eternal Kingdom, is God's great Sabbath rest for us, even though it is also a time of service (Rev. 22:3). Because then "there shall be no more curse," the impediment of sin and evil is gone, and work and rest are a joyful unity in Christ. The removal of the curse means that "God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away" (Rev. 21:4).

Fourth, I am sorry to say this, but it is wrong to make heaven (or the rapture) too important in our thinking. It is the Lord alone who must be central. To focus on heaven is to focus on ourselves and our future. It

leads to a self-centered, not a God-centered, faith. We must with simple trust do our duty and believe that our God is faithful to His Word. "Trust and obey."

Fifth, heaven is one part of God's glorious creation, a place for His people. Even as He made the earth, so He made heaven. In Jesus Christ, God the Son "tabernacled" with us, even as at the end the triune God shall "tabernacle" or live with men (Rev. 21:3).

Sixth, in Revelation 22:2, we are told that the tree of life will bud and bear fruit simultaneously and continuously. This means, as Dr. K. Schilder wrote, "Promise and fulfillment will have become one." Our potentialities will all become actualities because the tree of life, Jesus Christ, heals all "nations" or families of the earth.

Seventh, the reality of heaven, the resurrection of the dead, and the new creation, is beyond our ability to grasp. Our bodies are compared by Paul to seed that is sown (1 Cor. 15:36–38). If we have never seen an oak, it is not possible for us to imagine the mighty tree that grows out of an acorn. So, too, we cannot imagine the glory of the resurrection body, nor, for that matter, of a glorious realm we have never seen.

I began by saying that the Bible bars the door to our curious questions about the world to come. We are not to think about "what's in it for us?" but about our duty here and now. Some may say that they are too old and infirm to serve God now, but this is not true. I have known and know many aged and slowly dying people who are constantly in prayer for many persons and causes. As long as our minds are clear, there are things we can do, and prayer is at the top of any list.

God's sovereign grace determines all our days and our place in His Kingdom. In John's vision (Rev. 5:13), all creatures or created things in heaven and on earth praise God. Let us be in earnest in joyfully praising Him now.

446

GATHERED UNTO THEIR FATHERS

Chalcedon Report No. 366, January 1996

When I entered the first grade, learning to read was for me a marvelous privilege. As I learned to read, I usually read my textbooks from cover to cover at once, and anything else I could find. In May 1923, a friend of my father, later a professor of mathematics, gave him John Morley's *The Life of Richard Cobden* (I now have the book and treasure it). It was so beautifully bound, I had to read it! But, most of all, I read and reread the Bible. Much I did not understand, but it was all exciting reading.

One expression impressed me greatly: the Bible spoke of a man dying to be "gathered unto his people" (Gen. 25:8, 17; etc.), or in Judges 2:10, "gathered unto their fathers." As a child, as a young and now an old man, I have often thought of that phrase. My ancestors came to the faith by God's grace somewhere between A.D. 310–320, so there are many to be gathered to. Both of my grandfathers were killed for their Faith by the Turks. My paternal grandfather was blinded first to prevent him from his calling, but he knew much of the Bible and all of the liturgy by heart, so he continued to serve, and then he was killed. Many died a like death before him; one of them, Isaac Rushdoony, now the name of Mark's son, was killed by the Persian Mazdakites (the most radical communists in history) for refusing to renounce Christ. A number of Armenian leaders were executed on that same day in A.D. 451.

To be "gathered unto my fathers" is an exciting and awe-inspiring thought. It leads me often to pray that all my children's children to the end of time will be faithful to the Lord and a part of the great gathering. Mark 12:25–26 tells us that in the new creation there is neither marrying nor giving in marriage, but the phrase, "gathered unto their fathers" indicates some kind of family closeness, despite the fact that marriage

is transcended. In time, or, rather, beyond time, we will understand its meaning.

Meanwhile, God calls Himself "our Father," and He gathers us to Himself and to our redeemed forbears. We shall meet all those who preceded us. Ours is a very rich and exciting faith.

Of course, meanwhile, there is so much work that I want to do, the Lord permitting. Also, I have a number of unread books that I want to read! I enjoy my work, and I find the *gathering* an awe-inspiring fact, but so, too, the privilege of serving Him here. Our times are in Thy hands, O Lord, who doest all things well.

CHRISTMAS & THE INCARNATION

447

CHRIST'S BIRTH: THE SIGN OF VICTORY

Chalcedon Report No. 185, November 1981

One of the magnificent and resounding prophecies concerning our Lord is Isaiah 9:6–7: "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even for ever. The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this."

Prior to these words, Isaiah gives us a perspective on the world apart from and in rebellion against God. It is a view of darkness, evil, gloom, and stumbling in the darkness of sin and misery. Isaiah's day was Assyria's day of power, and Assyria's threat hung over the nations like an imminent death sentence. The evils of history seemed only to be intensifying and the darkness deepening.

The origin of this darkness was the apostasy of the covenant people. Instead of being the people of dominion, they had become instead the slaves of sin. In a world of evil, the halfhearted and hypocritical sinner is no match for the dedicated sinner, even as today the inconsistent and masquerading humanists of the West are no match for the militant and more systematic humanists of the Soviet Empire. The triflers of Israel were no match for the ruthless warriors of Assyria. They were under the rod of their oppressors, but their foremost oppressor was their own sin and apostasy.

A victory, however, was in the offing, "as in the day of Midian" (Isa. 9:4), i.e., as in the day of Gideon. Gideon's victory was emphatically supernatural. The battle was the Lord's, and the battle cry was, "The sword of the Lord, and of Gideon" (Judg. 7:18). Before Gideon could go into

battle he had to recognize that the victory is of the Lord, and for His glory.

This victory is to be more dramatic: instead of a Gideon, it will begin with a child, a wonder child and a miracle. God the Son will invade history! "The earth is the Lord's, and the fullness thereof: the world, and they that dwell therein" (Ps. 24:1). The earth and the peoples thereof belong to the Lord; they have fallen under the dominion of sin and are in rebellion against God the Lord. As King and Sovereign, He invades the world to recapture His possession and to make it again fully His. As against the Assyrian invader, another Invader is coming. One whose power created and ordained all things.

A male child shall be born, "a Son is given," the heir-Son of David, God's only-begotten Son. On His shoulder is the government of all things, so that all creation is in the hollow of His hand. This wonder-child's name is Immanuel, God with us (Isa. 7:14), and He is virgin-born, the new Adam and the head of a new humanity to replace the old humanity of the fallen Adam.

Isaiah describes this coming King: He is the Wonder of the Ages, and the great Counsellor, the source of all wisdom and counsel, so that His law-word is the governing and true word for all ages and all men. This Son is also the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, and the Prince of Peace. He restores peace to the world and reigns over it in peace as the great and eternal Prince and God.

Moreover, His coming is the beginning of His reign, power, and sway, for, "Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end." As king, He shall establish His reign with justice, and His law shall govern all things for ever.

Magnificently, this prophecy cannot fail. "The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this." Men of zeal are the doers of the world; their efforts are feeble and limited when compared with the zeal of the almighty and triune God. His zeal will perform the triumph of Christ's Kingdom!

What this prophecy tells us plainly is that the Lord God is concerned with more than the redemption of our souls. His work of salvation does emphatically include our salvation, but it also includes His triumphant repossession of the whole creation. With Christ's coming, death, resurrection, and ascension, God began the shaking of all the things which are, so that only those things which cannot be shaken may remain (Heb. 12:26–29).

History, thus, is a great shaking, a continual earthquake. God the King so orders all things that men cannot rest in their sins. His judgments shake and shatter the nations in their smug self-satisfaction with their

sins. "There is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked" (Isa. 57:21). The present turmoil of history witnesses to the presence of God the Lord. He is shaking and dispossessing the peoples of our time for their lawlessness. He who refused to spare either Israel or Judah, no less than Assyria, will not spare today an unrepentant Russia, Europe, or America. His judgments bring us closer to our triumph in and through Him. Therefore, rejoice.

Among the most beautiful and resounding words from the liturgy of the presanctified of the early church are these concerning the birth of our Lord:

> The Virgin, today, cometh into a cave to bring forth ineffably the Word that is before the ages. Dance, thou universe, on hearing the tidings: glory with the Angels and the Shepherds him that willed to be beheld a little Child, the God before the ages.
>
> Prepare thyself, O Bethlehem, Eden is open to all; make thyself ready, O Evphratha, because in the cave the tree of life hath budded from the Virgin: for truly an intellectual Paradise is her womb become, in which is the divine plant, Whereof eating we shall live, and not, as Adam, die. Christ is born to raise the image that was formerly fallen.

These early Christians believed that Christ's coming had altered history and all creation: therefore, they sang, "Dance, thou universe!" Christ's coming meant the death knell of the Caesars and Romes of history, if they refused to submit to Christ the Lord. In terms of Scripture, these men saw themselves as "more than conquerors" (Rom. 8:37), as victors over the nations in Christ, not as victims. Only such a faith could and did conquer.

Many of the errors, sins, and shortcomings of the early church are no longer with us, but neither is their zeal, nor their assurance of victory.

Whittaker Chambers, on deserting the communists to work for the restoration of the republic, remarked sadly that he had apparently left the winning side for the losers. Too many churchmen today act as if they too joined the losers in becoming Christians. Such an attitude is a denial of the incarnation and resurrection. They surrender what cannot be surrendered, the assured kingship of Christ, and the everlasting increase of His government and sway. They assume that, because they lack zeal for Christ's Kingdom, the Lord too lacks zeal. But Isaiah tells us, concerning Christ's Kingdom and government, "The zeal of the LORD of hosts will perform this."

By and large, the humanist believes that, with respect to history, death ends all. Some humanists with occultist tendencies hold that after death,

we live as spirits in some vague and neutral realm. This neutral realm is an undivided realm and hence without heaven or hell, defeat or victory. All too many Christians are little better. History is for them the arena of retreat and defeat, and the world to come a retirement home for the pious defeated ones. (This plainly denies Revelation 22:3, "and his servants shall serve him.") Having no dominion on earth, they see no dominion in the world to come.

The glory of our Lord's birth is the glory of sure and total victory. The Virgin Mary, inspired of God, saw her Son's birth as the beginning of a great overturning: "He hath put down the mighty from their seats, and exalted them of low degree" (Luke 1:52). In the modern era, the kings of Europe banned the Magnificat from churches because of that sentence! The kings are gone, and Christ remains as Lord and King.

Those churchmen who would deny or abolish the note of victory are as foolish as those crowned heads of Europe, and they will join them in the trash heap of history. Christ is King: let the peoples tremble! Let none dare deny His sway.

The joy of the Christmas season is the joy of triumph, the joy that the King has come, and He reigns. It is "joy to the world," because "the Savior reigns." Hence the summons, "Dance, thou universe," or, as Isaac Watts said, "heaven and nature sing." Again, in Watts's words,

> Let joy around like rivers flow;
> Flow on, and still increase;
> Spread o'er the glad earth
> At Immanuel's birth —
> For heaven and earth are at peace.

History was no picnic in Watts's day, but he knew that for those who are in Christ, "heaven and earth are at peace," and, as the people of Christ, we establish that peace on earth through our faithfulness.

How, then, do we become the people of the Prince of Peace? He is our peace, and we proclaim Him as the Man of Peace. In Paul's words, "But now in Christ Jesus ye who sometimes were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ. For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us" (Eph. 2:13–14), i.e., between God and man. The reign of peace begins with peace with God through Jesus Christ.

The establishment of that peace, then, is the application of God's law-word to every area of life and thought. God's law teaches us how to live in peace with Him, and at peace with our neighbor. It teaches us how to be at peace with the earth, by keeping God's laws in relation to it.

Because Christ is our sabbath rest (Heb. 4:1–16), we are able to rest in a restless world. We have peace in a war-sick age, because "This man shall be the peace" (Mic. 5:5).

We have in God's law the prescription for the ills of men and nations, and in the incarnate Son of God the healer with power, who enables men to rise up and walk in obedience to His law.

The church cannot honestly celebrate Christ's birth, Christmas, and sing the triumphant carols, and then turn its back on the mandate to exercise dominion and to be "more than conquerors."

From the early church, the Order of the Orthros, comes this prayer: "By night our spirit watcheth early unto Thee, O God, for Thy precepts are light. Teach us, O God, Thy righteousness, Thy commandments, and Thine ordinances; enlighten the eyes of our understandings, lest at any time we sleep unto death in sins; dispel all gloom from our hearts; bestow on us the Sun of Righteousness; and unassailed do thou keep our life, in the seal of Thy Holy Spirit; direct our steps into the way of peace; grant us to behold the dawn and the day in exultation, that to Thee we may send up our morning prayers. For Thine is the might, and Thine is the Kingdom, and the power, and the glory, of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, now, and ever, and unto the ages of the ages. Amen."

448

THE WORD, THE PERSON, AND THE SONG: COMMENTS ON LUKE 2:8–15

Originally delivered to the Chalcedon Guild
Chalcedon Report No. 112, December 1974

THE words of Luke 2:8–15 sing out magnificently, and the joy, peace, and victory of the birth of Jesus Christ glow through the ages and warm our hearts. Here is the good word, good news, to "all people" who will harken, to a mankind "sore afraid." "Fear not: for, behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people." All "people" or *nations* shall be included in the "great joy."

This amazing *word,* this good news, was announced to the "shepherds abiding in the field, keeping watch over their flock by night," not to the heads of state, not to the self-styled wise of the world, nor to its religious leaders. When God spoke *the word* of His Son's nativity, He by-passed the leaders of the world, because their order stood condemned by Him. The world was waiting for its savior, but it was looking in the wrong place and for the wrong person.

Men felt that history was at a dead end, that men and nations alike had failed to realize man's hope of paradise regained, of a world order in which every man would live in peace with his neighbor, under his vine and fig tree. For history to have a future, men held, a world savior and a world empire were needed. In one empire after another, rulers had declared that their word was the good word, the saving word. When Pharaoh Thutmosis III ascended to the throne, he summoned an assembly of his empire and declared, "The god of heaven is my father. I am his son. He has begotten me and commanded me to sit on his throne, while I am still a fledgling." The Assyrian great kings ascended their thrones and each proclaimed his reign as the day of salvation: "Days of justice, years of righteousness, plenteous rainfall, good prices for merchandise. Old

men leap for joy, children sing. The condemned are acquitted, the prisoners set free. The naked are clothed, the sick are cured."

In the years 21–12 B.C., the last great pagan expression of hope appeared in the Roman Empire. Augustus Caesar was proclaimed the imperial savior of the world. Dr. Ethelbert Stauffer, in *Christ and the Caesars*, summed up the imperial doctrine: "a new day is dawning for the world. The divine saviour-king, born in the historical hour ordained by the stars, has come to power on land and sea, and inaugurates the cosmic era of salvation. *Salvation is to be found in none other save Augustus, and there is no other name given to men in which they can be saved*" (p. 88).

But the Caesars, like all the monarchs before them, had no effectual answer for the problem of sin and guilt. They offered only new arrangements of old sins, and men remained as fallen when their reigns ended as at the beginning, and the hopelessness of the peoples only deepened.

As against all this, the angels spoke, not to those whose hopes were in the intellectual, social, or governmental pretensions of state and empire to be the means to paradise regained, but rather to shepherds keeping watch over their flock by night. Into the dark night of history came *the joyful word:* the birth of Immanuel, God with us, of whom Joseph had been told, "thou shalt call his name JESUS: for he shall save his people from their sins" (Matt. 1:21). He shall save *His* people: they shall be reborn and made into a new humanity under the headship of the new and greater Adam (1 Cor. 15:45–47). The real problem of history, man's sin and the fall, shall be overcome. *The joyful word* is salvation from sin, freedom from the power of sin and death. "His people" became a new creation, with citizenship in God's Kingdom and a glorious life in Christ in time and eternity. The paradise destroyed by Adam's sin is opened to man in a greater scope by birth, the obedience, the vicarious atonement, and the resurrection of Jesus Christ.

The joyful proclamation of the early church, in celebrating the nativity of Christ, sings out over the centuries:

> Prepare thyself, O Bethlehem. Eden is open to all; make thyself ready, O Ephratha, because in the cave the tree of life hath budded from the Virgin: for truly an intellectual Paradise is her womb become, in which is the divine plant, whereof eating we shall live, and not, as Adam, die. Christ is born, to raise the image that was formerly fallen.
>
> The Virgin, to-day, cometh into a cave to bring forth ineffably the Word that is before the ages. Dance, thou universe, on hearing these tidings: glorify with the Angels and the Shepherds Him that willed to be beheld a little Child, the God before the ages.

Dance, thou universe, Christ is born, our Lord and Savior, King of the Universe! This is the word, *the joyful word* of salvation: man's redeemer is born, who shall save the lost and finally make all things new. It was the shepherds who first heard the word, "and the glory of the Lord shone round about them." Hear that word now, and see His glory. "Arise, shine; for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee" (Isa. 60:1).

Into the dark night of history there came thus *the joyful word,* and there came *the Person, Jesus Christ:* "For unto you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord. And this shall be a sign unto you; Ye shall find the babe wrapped in swaddling clothes, lying in a manger."

This *person* was the *Redeemer.* The word *redeemer* is one of the most beautiful of all Scripture. It is an Old Testament word whose meaning is basic to the New Testament. The Hebrew word is *goel*, one who asserts a claim or has the right of redemption, one who avenges the wronged, enslaved or murdered man, one who is hence *the next of kin*. The word is the most common in Isaiah, but we see it also, for example, in Job 19:25, "I know that my Redeemer liveth," in Psalm 19:14, "O Lord, my strength and my redeemer," in Psalm 78:35, "the high God was their Redeemer," in Jeremiah 50:34, "their Redeemer is strong." In Isaiah 49:26, God declares: "And I will feed them that oppress thee with their own flesh; and they shall be drunken with their own blood, as with sweet wine: and all flesh shall know that I the Lord am thy Saviour and thy Redeemer, the mighty One of Jacob." God, as His chosen people's next of kin, will avenge them against their adversaries. The riches of the enemy will be the riches of His people" "Thou shalt also suck the milk of the Gentiles, and shall suck the breast of kings: and thou shalt know that I the Lord am thy Saviour and thy Redeemer, the Mighty One of Jacob" (Isa. 60:16). Those who turn from their transgressions will find Him their Redeemer (Isa. 59:20). Over and over again, God describes Himself as the Redeemer of His elect people: Isaiah 41:14; 43:14; 44:6, 24; 47:4; 48:17; 49:7, 26; 54:5, 7–8; 59:20; 60:16; 63:16.

The New Testament gives us the fulfillment of this declaration in *the person* of Jesus Christ, very God of very God and very man of very man. God became incarnate, "the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us" (John 1:14). God became our Redeemer, next of kin, by putting on flesh, by becoming man, in all things like unto us, "yet without sin" (Heb. 4:15).

It became forever impossible for man to cry out, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me? Why art thou so far from helping me?" (Ps. 22:1). Man had himself rather forsaken God and had chosen to be

his own God (Gen. 3:5), and yet God in His mercy had not abandoned man. Jesus Christ became the abandoned one, accursed of God as our sin-bearer, and redeemed us at the price of His blood, gaining for us "the forgiveness of sins," i.e., the acquittal of the death penalty against us, because He Himself rendered satisfaction to the law by taking the death penalty as our substitute, our next of kin (Eph. 1:7). He redeemed us *to* God by His blood (Rev. 5:9), rescuing us from the slavery of sin and the reprobation of death."

The word of the Kinsman-Redeemer is to satisfy all legal claims against our person: He took upon Himself the death penalty. The Kinsman-Redeemer had to redeem a forfeited inheritance (Lev. 25:24–28); Christ came to restore Paradise, and Scripture closes with a vision of the Greater Garden City, New Jerusalem (Rev. 21 and 22). He rescued us from the bondage of sin (Lev. 25:47–54), and from the death incurred by our surrender to the enemy (Num. 35:12, 19).

Thus, we are not alone. God the Son is our next of kin, who has manifested His grace and love unto salvation. "While we were yet sinners, Christ died for us" (Rom. 5:8). Thomas Washbourne (1606–1687) stated it powerfully in a poem:

> Come, heavy souls, oppressed that are
> With doubts, and fears, and carking care.
> Lay all your burthens down, and see
> There's One that carried once a tree
> Upon his back, and, which is more,
> A heavier weight, your sins, He bore.
> Think then how easily He can
> Your sorrows bear that's God and Man;
> Think, too, how willing He's to take
> Your care on Him, who for your sake
> Sweat bloody drops, prayed, fasted, cried,
> Was bound, scourged, mocked and crucified.
> He that so much for you did do,
> Will do yet more and care for you.

God the Son having died for us will do yet more and care for us.

The Person came as a "babe, wrapped in swaddling clothes, lying in a manger." The first Adam was created a mature man, with every natural advantage. The last Adam was born a helpless babe, a symbol both of new life and of helplessness. Despite that seemingly helplessness of Christ in the world, then and now, He, by whom all things were made, "without him was not any thing made that was made" (John 1:3), governs all things in terms of His sovereign purpose and towards His decreed end.

"Behold, I make all things new" (Rev. 21:5). A helpless babe before the hatred of Herod, He prevailed. Seemingly helpless now against the powers of the apostate nations, He prevails. The word of warning to the ungodly nations which conspire against Him still stands: they *cannot* break the bands of His government, for all their counsel or conspiring together. "Be wise now therefore, O ye kings: be instructed, ye judges of the earth. Serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice with trembling. Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little. Blessed are all they that put their trust in him (Ps. 2:10–12). Remember, therefore, that though we live in perilous times, it is the enemy who is in the greatest danger, *not us*. We have the Son, and He is our Kinsman-Redeemer, our next of kin.

There is a third aspect, besides *the word of joy,* and *the Person*, in our text: it is *the song.* "And suddenly, there was with the angel a multitude of heavenly host praising God, and saying, Glory to God in the highest, and on earth, peace, good will toward men." We are not told that this was a song, but the words are in the form of a hymn or psalm, and, through the centuries, the church has rightly assumed it to have been an angelic song.

Biblical faith is unusual in that it gives us a *singing religion*. This is unusual in world history. Other religions either have no music or else have only a crash of gongs or instruments to arouse the spirits, or a chant or sun incantation. Biblical faith is unique because of its joyful song: it alone has something to sing about. We forget how powerful a missionary instrument Christian hymns have been and are. Well before World War II, the other religious had felt the impact of Christian singing on their people and had begun to adapt hymns for their own use. Much earlier, paganism tried to create songs, with poor success. The note of joy and victory was missing. Now, they began to use altered Christian music, so that, in the Orient, children were taught to sing, "Buddha loves me, this I know"! Such attempts, however, are shallow; the realization soon comes: how can dead Buddha love me, when he did not love even himself?

One of the glories of Biblical faith is its singing, and the birth of our Lord has inspired some of the most telling songs setting forth our faith:

> God rest ye merry, gentlemen,
> Let nothing you dismay,
> Remember Christ our Saviour
> Was born on Christmas day,
> To save us all from Satan's pow'r
> When we were gone astray;
> O tidings of comfort and joy, comfort and joy
> O tidings of comfort and joy.

Christmas music is joyful because it stresses salvation and victory. In the words of John Morison's hymn (1781):

> To us a Child of hope is born,
> To us a Son is giv'n,
> Him shall the tribes of earth obey,
> Him all the hosts of heav'n.

The call is, "O come, all ye faithful, joyful and triumphant." "He comes," wrote Isaac Watts in 1719, "to make His blessings flow, Far as the curse is found." Therefore,

> Joy to the world! The Lord is come:
> Let earth receive her King;
> Let every heart prepare Him room,
> And heav'n and nature sing.

Take away that certainty of victory, that "joyful and triumphant" hope, and the faith of the church becomes another in the long chronicle of earth's sad religions. "He rules the world," the hymn declares, and the Christmas carols peal out with so glad a sound that even unbelievers, once a year, briefly warm their hearts with its reflected glow.

Christ our Savior is Lord and King! None can deny that fact without denying Him. Ours is the joyful word, the glorious Person of God incarnate, and the triumphant song. Never forget that.

> And it came to pass, as the angels were gone away from them into heaven, the shepherds said one to another, Let us now go even unto Bethlehem, and see this thing which is come to pass, which the Lord hath made known unto us. (Luke 2:15)

449

THE ANNUNCIATION: LUKE 1:26–38

Chalcedon Report No. 458, December 2003

It is difficult to approach the story of our Lord's virgin birth without a sense of holy awe. It is one of the most moving and inspiring of all stories.

Luke tells us that in the sixth month the angel Gabriel came to Mary in Nazareth. The sixth month of what? The sixth month of Elisabeth's conception. Elisabeth, a kinswoman of Mary, was a greatly older woman, well along in years after a lifetime of barrenness. God had announced that through her the forerunner, the prophet who should prepare the way for the coming of the Messiah, would be born.

Ave Maria

The birth of John the Baptist was announced in the solemn grandeur of the Temple; that of Jesus, in a humble home in Galilee. And yet the beauty and holiness which accompanies that annunciation and the events that follow are unrivaled in all of history. A hymn written in the very earliest times of the Christian church echoes the sense of reverence which the church has felt as it has sung of that event: "Ave Maria." The song in its original form is purely Biblical. The third portion, which begins, "Holy Mary, Mother of God, pray for us," was added in the fifteenth century and was not even officially in use until 1568; but the original form of the hymn, the first two parts, comes from the earliest days of the Christian church.

Mary, we are told, was a virgin espoused to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David. In those days in Israel, betrothal, or we would say "engagement," was the *legal* act of marriage. The only way a betrothal could be broken was by divorce. The property settlement was made at that time; the girl's property was vested in the future husband; and although they did not live together until at least a year was passed,

they were legally man and wife. Commonly during that year, the young man earned the dowry which was to go to the bride to be part of the family capital, her treasury, and the inheritance of her children. Thus, any unfaithfulness on the part of a betrothed girl was, according to law, punishable by death; this is clearly stated in Deuteronomy 22:23–24.

The angel came in unto her and said, "Hail, thou that are highly favored, the Lord is with thee: blessed art thou among women."

Mary's Reaction

The reaction of Mary to the appearance of the angel Gabriel and this salutation perhaps comes through to us a little more clearly — because the wording is unfamiliar enough to give us a little bit sharper focus on it — in the translation by the great Lutheran scholar Lenski in his commentary. He translates verses 29 and 30 thus:

> But she was greatly perturbed at the word and began to argue with herself of what kind this greeting might be. And the angel said to her, "Stop being afraid, Mary, for thou didst find favor with God."

Then Gabriel went on to make the great announcement: "And, behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name Jesus." The name Jesus means, "God is our salvation." "He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest [or, 'Son of the Most High']: and the Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of His father David." (He who shall be born of you miraculously shall be the Son of God, very God of very God; but He shall also be the son of David, very man of very man.) "And He shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of His kingdom there shall be no end." (He shall be the Messianic King, the Messianic King foretold by David and the prophets of old, and He shall also be the eternal King, King of kings and Lord of lords, eternally King, so that His rule shall be over time and over eternity, over this world and over the world to come.)

"Then said Mary unto the angel, How shall this be, seeing I know not a man?" Mary was not only a woman full of grace, but also a woman with a down-to-earth realism, and this is real holiness; she realized immediately that this glorious miracle presented for her a tremendous problem: she was legally wed to someone; and if she became pregnant, she was liable to the death penalty if her husband filed charges against her. She knew she would be wide open to gossip, to accusations; and indeed, we do know that for a time, according to St. Matthew, Joseph thought of putting her away until God spoke to him in a vision.

"And the angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God.'" Not a word said as to how she is to protect herself. Simply the announcement, and Mary's responsive duty to receive it by faith.

God Becomes Man

The virgin birth is the greatest miracle of Scripture. It is in a very real respect the key miracle because we cannot take away the supernaturalness of our Lord's birth without destroying Christianity. Without the virgin birth we reduce the faith to the level of all paganisms because the essence of all paganism is man's apotheosis — man becoming God. But the essence of the Christmas story is that *God became man.* This was an act of sheer grace on God's part; and man's salvation is not man becoming God as it is in all of paganism, but God became man and for our salvation assumed the fullness of humanity, fulfilled the full requirements of the law, died as our sin-bearer, and arose as He who conquered sin and death for us.

"And, behold, thy cousin Elisabeth, she hath also conceived a son in her old age: and this is the sixth month with her, who was called barren." Here Gabriel, in effect, hints to Mary, "Go to your cousin, Elisabeth. She, too, is the object of a miracle. Rejoice with her and she with you in that which God has done." "For with God nothing shall be impossible." This, then, is a tremendous declaration. Problems, yes, of a certainty. God cannot enter into this sinful world without the sinful world striking back. Men cannot take the course of holiness and truth and righteousness without the world lashing out at them in hatred. Problems, of a certainty; but with God nothing shall be impossible.

Mary's Faith and Ours

"And Mary said, Behold the handmaid of the Lord; be it unto me according to thy word. And the angel departed from her." Here we see the greatness of Mary's faith, "Behold the handmaid of the Lord." The word *handmaid* has a beauty, an old-fashioned ring to it that takes away, to a certain extent, the literalness of the word and its meaning. It means simply, "Behold the female slave of the Lord." And with that statement she avows her total submission to whatever God does, whatever God brings upon her. Here we have true faith, this total submission. And there cannot be true faith without this kind of submission. Where men pick and

choose at God's Word and declare, "I will believe this, and I will not believe that," they have denied Scripture and set themselves as gods above God, as judge over His Word. But true faith everywhere will say even as Mary, "Behold the handmaid [or, manservant] of the Lord. Be it unto me according to thy word."

The New Humanity

This was the annunciation of our Lord's birth. His birth marked the beginning of a new creation, of the new heavens and the new earth. He was the second Adam, born from above, come to usher in a new world. That new world grows day by day. Whenever a Christian enters into the Kingdom, is converted, he is born into the citizenship of that new creation so that we have, as it were, a life in two worlds: by virtue of our birth in the old Adam, we belong to a world which is sentenced to death; by virtue of our rebirth in Jesus Christ, we belong to that new creation which shall grow and abound unto eternal life and to the fullness of all hope, all the promises of life.

Moreover, the birth of our Lord sets forth God's continuity in His work. He did not destroy the old creation to make way for the new Adam and the new world. He used the old to create the new: Mary, a daughter of Adam, to give birth to Christ, the second Adam. And there is the same continuity in our lives. He uses the material and the framework of the old man in us, the old Adam, to create the new man in Christ. When Scripture declares, "Behold, I make all things new," this is what the Lord means. It is to be understood in terms of this continuity, of the new or renewed work of creation in terms of Christ, so that we are fully recognizable in terms of what we were before we became members of Christ and yet wholly new in that we have a new heart, a new life, a new perspective. We are fully recognizable and yet truly new. And so is the new creation which is our destiny. It is now beyond our imagination; but when we enter into it, it shall be fully recognizable; and we shall know it to be the fulfillment of all this in our being, of all our hopes, of all the potentialities of nature and men. "Behold, I make all things new" (Rev. 21:5).

This, then, is the glorious annunciation of our Lord's birth declared unto Mary and in Mary finding a response which is the type (meaning "symbol" or "foreshadowing") of true faith: "Behold the handmaid of the Lord; be it unto me according to thy word."

Let us pray: Almighty God, our heavenly Father, we give thanks unto Thee for the glory of Thy Word and of Thy so great salvation made known to us through Jesus Christ, Thy Son, our Savior. We thank Thee,

our Father, that He as born of us, of the Virgin Mary, is very man of very man, in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin. But we thank Thee, our Father, that He is also very God of very God, the eternal One, and that in Him we have access unto the throne of grace. Our God, we thank Thee. In Jesus's Name. Amen.

450

THE MAGNIFICAT

Chalcedon Report No. 208, December 1982

The Magnificat of the Virgin Mary, in Luke 1:46–55, has had a very interesting history. In our time, modernists have treated it as an invention of Luke; Professor Joseph A. Fitzmyer, a Jesuit scholar at the Catholic University of America, has said, "there is no reason to think of Mary as the one who has composed it." *No reason!* Such is the audacity of unbelief.

With the triumph of the Enlightenment, the monarchs of Europe forbade the use of the Magnificat in churches because Mary's words were seen as an incitement of treason and revolution, especially verses 51–53.

There were grounds for this attitude. After all, even Luther, who was no friend of insubordination, had written to John Frederick (1503–1554), nephew of the Elector of Saxony and a potential ruler thereof, about the implications of the Magnificat. In the Epilogue of his book on the Magnificat, Luther wrote, "Your Grace should reflect that in all the Scriptures God did not permit any heathen king or prince throughout the length and breadth of the world to be praised, but, contrariwise, to be punished: this is a mighty and terrible example to all rulers. Moreover, even in Israel, His chosen people, He never found a king worthy of praise and not rather of punishment. Above all, in the kingdom of Judah, the chief portion of the whole race of mankind, exalted by God and beloved of Him above all others, there were few, not above six, kings found worth of praise." Apologists for monarchy mined the Scriptures for texts to buttress the divine right of kings; meanwhile, the Magnificat was banned in many countries as encouraging sedition.

From start to finish, the Nativity narrative is offensive to the mind of the Enlightenment, and also to modern man. It asserts as history an unprecedented "violation" of every premise in the mind of "natural" or fallen man. A virgin conceives, something no virgin is supposed to do,

and miraculously so. Added to that upsetting fact is the declaration that the virgin's child "shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest, and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David" to rule a Kingdom of which "there shall be no end" (Luke 1:32–33).

The offense does not stop there. This holy child, the God-man shall institute a great overturning in history. In preparation for His coming, God the Father had already broken the great powers of antiquity, as He declared to Ezekiel: "Thus saith the Lord God: Remove the diadem, and take off the crown: this shall not be the same: exalt him that is low, and abase him that is high. I will overturn, overturn, overturn it; and it shall be no more, until he come whose right it is: and I will give it him" (Ezek. 21:26–27). With the coming of Mary's Son, another great overturning is declared; all those things which can be shaken will be destroyed, until only those things which cannot be shaken remain (Heb. 12:26–29).

Now the cause of the revolution has been popular in human history, at least from the days of the communistic Persian Mazdakites of the fourth century of the Christian era, but it is a humanistic revolution which is popular, not a God-created change which begins in the heart of man and changes him and his society to conform to the last Adam, Jesus Christ. At present, most states around the world believe in varying degrees that they can control revolutionary elements, but they at heart know that the power of God and its manifestation in the lives of men is beyond their control. Hence, we see in some instances more effort and passion extended by certain nations to control Christ's people than to control revolutionists.

The Magnificat tells us why. In the words of William F. Arndt, Mary declares, "Through the Messiah, God will dethrone all his enemies." In banning the Magnificat, the Enlightenment kings of Europe were simply recognizing the meaning of Mary's exultant psalm. The coming of Christ means the destruction of everything that opposes God the Lord. There are, as Arndt stressed, three main thrusts to Mary's exultant words. *First*, (vv. 46–50) the Virgin Mary thanks God for His grace, for favoring a humble maid of Israel in so miraculous a fashion. This is a great reversal of human expectations, and it sets the pattern for God's work through the Son. His grace works a reversal in history: men are turned from sin to righteousness, from death to life, from evil to justice, and God's power brings history to fulfill His foreordained purposes. *Second*, (vv. 51–53) she praises God for scattering the proud and the haughty in the imagination of their hearts. The self-righteous are put to shame, and the poor are cared for, the mighty are put down, and those of low degree are made great in the Kingdom of God by His sovereign grace. The old order of the first Adam is shattered, and Christ's order is triumphant. *Third*, (vv.

54–55) the Virgin Mary rejoices in the fact that God keeps His promises. The promises made to the forefathers, beginning with Abraham, are all meticulously kept by God in His own good time, to bring about the perfection of His purpose.

The Enlightenment kings feared the meaning of all this. Churchmen hastened to assure them that they had nothing to fear from the Magnificat. To this day, Arndt echoes the old apology for the Magnificat, saying of v. 52, "In my opinion the meaning of the words of Mary is exclusively spiritual." Mary, in that verse says, "He hath put down the mighty from their seats, and exalted them of low degree." To reduce that to a purely spiritual meaning is to make nonsense of it! In Mary's day, Herod knew better, and, to destroy the infant Messiah, the Lord of history and eternity, he killed all the babes in Bethlehem and its vicinity. The Christ-child escaped, and Herod died a miserable and evil death. (Let the Herods of the U.S. Supreme Court take note, who, by their decree, are responsible for the killing of 1,200,000 unborn babes a year!)

Mary allows no limiting of her words: "My soul doth magnify the Lord," or, I declare the greatness of God, and she proceeds then to describe how great God's works are to be through His Son. *This is the key: the Son.* All too many advocates of the humanistic social gospel have come to the Magnificat to claim some justification for their socio-political goals. The fact is that Mary's exultant song and joy comes from the knowledge that her coming Son is the great instrument of salvation and regeneration for the individual and for society. The Magnificat is totally messianic. *It is through the Messiah that God will dethrone all His enemies.* He comes as the last and greater Adam who will by His sovereign grace create a new humanity, regenerating men into His image as the perfect Man, and thus creating through them the world-Eden God requires.

Recently, an educator, Joseph Chilton Pearce of Virginia, made some telling criticisms of statist education. He spoke of it as a recent experiment in "engineering children," only a century or so in age, and "a monumental failure." The source of the trouble, he said, was in the failure of statist education to provide a model whereby the child could construct his life and knowledge. The modern era has seen "the model breakdown." This breakdown has created "some really deep-level psychological imbalance in the structure of the whole processes of our society." In fact, the damage done to the child has been so serious and so damaging to the child that, in facing the child who is our society's future, "we're dealing with highly damaged goods."

The damage in the past two decades has been especially severe, says Pearce. We have given children the worst possible models. The book, *The*

Naked Ape, was used in high schools in the 1960s and the 1970s. (One can add, as Pearce does not, that its evolutionary premises have long colored every level of education and society.) Pearce, author of the *Magical Child*, *The Crack in the Cosmic Egg*, and *The Bond of Power,* sees the ape model as highly destructive to the child. "Kids have no choice except to take as their model presented to them by their culture — that we are just a naked ape. So they begin to act like it! The social structure begins to collapse."

To change the culture, Pearce holds, it is necessary to change the models which govern education. Our present educational system reduces the child to a naked ape or a rat running through mazes in a laboratory. "Now, you can patch that (the educational system) up from here to eternity, but it will never give you anything other than, essentially, a dysfunctional creature — because it's totally, diametrically opposite to the development of intelligence as we find it" ("Is School Making Even Smart Kids into Dumb Ones?" Q. & A. interview Geoff Harris, in the *Los Angeles Herald-Examiner,* Tuesday, September 21, 1982, pp. A2, A12).

Pearce is right that we need a new model for education, but he does not offer one, nor can humanism do so. Its models are responsible for our present plight. Our statist schools have become Ape Schools, and the schools and our society a jungle.

It is at this point that the telling relevance of the Magnificat appears. Mary's words, in every sentence, simply echo, quote, or rephrase Old Testament prophecies. There is nothing new in what she says except the exultant joy. Now, in the coming child, the great victory begins! "Through the Messiah, God will dethrone all His enemies." It is this process of dethroning that Mary rejoices in. With her miraculous conception, the great dethroning has begun.

But this is not all. Humanity now has a new model. The model for the old humanity of the first man was Adam, whose life's premise with the fall became the tempter's program, every man his own god, knowing or determining for himself what is good and evil (Gen. 3:5). The product of this model was sin and death. This old humanity is thus caught in the trap of its own nature.

Man, made in the image of God (Gen. 1:26–28), and made for godly dominion, sees now in the Christ a new model. By God's sovereign grace, men are recreated in that image, and they see in Christ the very image of God incarnated.

Redeemed man is still man; he is not, nor can he ever be, a god; that effort was the tempter's snare. Man, however, can be the faithful image of the communicable attributes of God, and in this, man has his model in

Jesus Christ, who is very God of very God and very man of very man. In Christ's perfect humanity, man has his model.

In the temptation, Christ as our Adam and federal head made clear that "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God" (Matt. 4:4). Man models himself after the Word of God by the every written word of God. Moreover, man cannot test or prove God, but God tests and proves man (Matt. 4:7), this means the life of faith, not sight. Again, God alone is Lord; hence, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve" (Matt. 4:10). Like Christ, his model, the redeemed man will say, "Lo, I come to do thy will, O God" (Heb. 10:9), and he will obey and be faithful to the law of God.

The Magnificat speaks of a great overturning, because it sings with joy at the coming of the Great Overturner, Jesus Christ. Our world today has substituted for the old model of fallen man an even worse one, the naked ape, and we have Ape Schools and an ape society that puts apes to shame.

The Magnificat is the great song of victory because it celebrates the coming of one who recreates man after His image and gives to man His perfect life as a model. Out of Him comes the power which makes all things new, so that the heavenly triumph is proclaimed "The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever" (Rev. 11:15).

451

WISE MEN STILL ADORE HIM: MATTHEW 2:1–12

Chalcedon Report No. 171, November 1979

Who were the Wise Men? In the Greek, the word translated as *wise men* is literally *Magi*. Some modernist translators and commentators have rendered this as "astrologers" or "Magicians," distorting the text. The Magi were quite literally *wise* men. Their origins go back to the ancient world, to the antiquity of Babylon — at least to the days of King Nebuchadnezzar.

It was the custom in Babylon to seek out very young boys, usually barely in their teens, who showed great promise with respect to intelligence and various aptitudes. These boys were then trained in the palace college to be the "brain trust" of Babylon. They would become the astronomers, various administrative officers, experts in agriculture, commerce, or military matters. All in all, the Magi constituted a highly trained "brain trust" for Babylon.

The dream of Babylon was to create a one-world order, a paradise without God; and so it was that Babylon scattered the populations of the captive countries, seeking to destroy all the old loyalties and allegiances and make them one people under the rule of Babylon. But the concept did not die with Babylon. "Wise" men became increasingly an aspect of various empires which followed: Medo-Persia; the Macedonian Empire of Alexander the Great, one of whose "wise" men was Aristotle; and Rome.

When Christ was born in Bethlehem, the world had reached a dead end. The planners had planned their plans. The "wise" men of Babylon had failed; so had the "wise" men of Medo-Persia, Macedonia, and now Rome. All sense of meaning was departing from life.

In the Roman Empire, life was increasingly reduced to one dimension alone, and the life of that day has a familiar ring: men saw no meaning in

life except pleasure, and the essence of pleasure for them was sexual. Sex was seen by them not as the love and communion of man and wife under God, but as power, and the exploitation of feeling, of emotion, as well as other people. There was an extensive cynicism. There was very little left of which men could be proud. This was the world of the "wise" men of the day, a world of experts who were steadily destroying mankind and civilization. And of all the "wise" men, very few were truly wise.

There were here and there men moved by the Spirit of God, who, recognizing that mankind was at a dead end, that there was no hope for man, that man was reducing everything to ruins, and that the future of civilization was very bleak and dark, returned to the Old Testament Scriptures. We know there were a few such men in the region of Ancient Babylon, a few here and there throughout the Asiatic world as far east as China. To certain of these men God spoke and give a sign; and He rewarded their long, long prayer and search: it was revealed unto them that the Christ Child had been born.

So they left home. How many of them, we do not know. The familiar song says, "We Three Kings of Orient Are," but actually the Scripture does not specify the number; it simply gives the plural — Wise Men. They could have been three; they could have been ten. The number three comes from the three kinds of gifts they brought. These were the men who were truly wise. They came from somewhere in the East, probably from the region of Babylon, sometime after the birth of our Lord. We know that Christ was no longer in the manger. They were now in a home.

When Herod questioned the Wise Men, they indicated that the Christ Child had apparently been born sometime previously, so that later when Herod gave the order to slay all children in the region of Bethlehem in his attempt to kill the young Christ-King, he ordered that all children two years old and under should be slain, thereby hoping to make sure that he killed the child.

The Wise Men came to the house where Joseph and Mary and the Babe were to be found. They fell down and worshipped Him, and they presented their gifts of gold, frankincense, and myrrh. Gifts in ancient times were symbolical: a gift was given in terms of the person's office and station; the gift had to suit the person to whom it was given. By their gifts, these Wise Men indicated that they knew the full meaning of the Christ Child.

Gold . . . the gift of a King. Thereby they declared that the world now had its King, He who was ordained to be King of kings and Lord of lords, King of creation, King of the world, King of men and nations. Giving Him gold, they acknowledged Him to be God's King of the Kingdom of God.

Frankincense . . . belongs in a temple. It is used for worship. By the gift of frankincense they acknowledged that Jesus Christ was the great High Priest, He who had come to make intercession with God for His people, to offer up the acceptable sacrifice, and to make atonement for the sin of His people. By the gift of frankincense they acknowledged that at last the great High Priest had come, the Priest appointed by God, the Priest for whom all previous priests appointed by the Old Testament had been merely substitutes and stand-ins. This Babe, therefore, was the great Priest "after the order of Melchisedec" (Heb. 5:6), having no ancestry nor parentage with regard to His office, His Priesthood, but receiving it like Melchisedec, directly from Almighty God.

Myrrh . . . was used in ancient times for embalming. By this gift they recognized and acknowledged that Jesus Christ was not only the great King and Priest but also the sacrifice, that He Himself was both Priest *and* sacrifice. He had come to lay down His life as a ransom for His people.

Their gifts indicated that they were indeed *wise men*, wise in Scripture, wise in the Holy Spirit.

The world around us is not unlike the world in which the Wise Men lived. It is again a world in which the experts are destroying civilization, in which self-styled wise men — the pseudo-wise men — are again laying plans for a great one-world order — without Christ — a world in which they are dreaming filthy dreams of a humanity reordered in terms of humanism.

But wise men, who are truly wise, *still* adore Him. And we who at this time give thanks unto Almighty God for the birth of Jesus Christ, His only begotten Son, our Lord, are, therefore, in the sight of God and by His grace the Wise Men of our generation. We know that the world around us will crumble and fall as surely as Rome crumbled and fell. "Except the Lord build the house, they labour in vain that build it" (Ps. 127:1).

The basic remedy of the "wise" men of that day and of the "wise" men of the Caesars was slavery. Their answer to every problem of man in that day added up to slavery. They called it then as they call it today "cradle-to-grave" security, but the "perfect" life of security is *slavery*. It was in the Roman Empire that serfdom was begun: in exchange for their liberty people gained cradle-to-grave security from the hands of the Caesars and became members of his household, worked on his estates, worked in his shops, became his servants. Today, men who are without Christ are exchanging their liberty again for serfdom, for slavery to the Caesars of our day. Again the world is at a dead end, a dead end created by the falsely wise men.

Wise men came and they rendered unto Him their adoration as their great King, as their Priest, and their Savior. They returned to their homes in confidence, because they knew the Scriptures which declared Him to be Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The Prince of Peace, also declared that the government should be upon *His* shoulder and that of the increase of His government and peace there shall be no end.

As we come today, by the grace of God the Wise Men of this generation, as we worship Him we too, can return to our homes in the serene confidence that the government *is* upon His shoulder, and of the increase of *His* government there shall be no end. For we have been born not into the slavery of Caesar but into the glorious liberty of the Sons of God, and we have this confidence in Him, that what He has begun in us, that He will accomplish, and "If God be for us, who can be against us?"

452

ON THE BIRTH OF OUR LORD

Chalcedon Report No. 317, December 1991

The Christmas season is a joyful one, a time of celebration of God's grace to us in Jesus Christ. It is also a time when some people write to me annually to damn all Christmas observances as pagan, to send me tracts on the subject, and to tell me to read Alexander Hislop's *The Two Babylons*. Well, I read that book at least fifty years ago; it is an amazing collection of data on ancient paganism, but the conclusions drawn are fallacious. It is true, for example, that pagans worshipped the evergreen tree (and the oak, and many other trees). Pagans, after all, in idolizing the created, could only use God's handiwork. This does *not* make such things pagan, however! The tree of life is a type of Christ: very early, the church celebrated Christ as the tree of life at His Nativity. Off and on over the centuries, it has been much used by Christians. At times, the Last Judgment has received more stress than His birth; at other times, other emphases have predominated.

The Puritans *for a time* abandoned the observance of Christmas because of the prevalence of drunkenness, but people continued to get drunk on any and every occasion. Do we know that our Lord was born on December 25? Well, Alfred Edersheim, in *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, gives evidence that favors this date. Does the Bible *command* us to observe our Lord's birth? No, no more than it requires worship twice on Sundays, prayer meetings, women's guilds, Sunday school, etc. But it does *command* us thus: "And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength: this is the first commandment" (Mark 12:30). Rejoicing in our Lord's coming and birth is one way of showing our love.

I was taught as a child that the evergreen Christmas tree was a type of Christ. The ornaments in those days were made to resemble fruit, and

fruits were also hung on the tree in terms of Revelation 22:2. As a father, I read to my children, gathered around the Christmas tree, Luke 2:1–20, and we sang Christmas carols. (The four girls had lovely voices.)

I enjoy Christmas. It brings to mind some remarkable words from the Nativity service of early Christians: "The Virgin, to-day, cometh into a cave to bring forth ineffably the Word that is before the ages. Dance, thou universe, on hearing the tidings: glorify with the Angels and the Shepherds him that willed to beheld a little Child, the God before the ages."

My heart sings at the thought of Christmas and Easter, incarnation and resurrection. I feel sorry for those who view so joyful a time sourly, and I earnestly pray that the joy of the Lord may indeed become their strength (Neh. 8:10).

The birth, life, death, and resurrection of our Lord are witnesses to God's amazing grace. Paul's *command* to us is clear: "Rejoice in the Lord always: and again I say, Rejoice" (Phil. 4:4).

How lovely are the many glorious hymns wherein men over the generations have rejoiced in our Lord's birth. One that comes to mind begins:

> All my heart this night rejoices
> As I hear, far and near.
> Sweetest angel voices,
> "Christ is born," their choirs are singing.

Merry Christmas, and God bless you all.

453

SILLY SURRENDERS

Chalcedon Report No. 372, July 1996

One of the sad aspects of the Christian community is its gullibility concerning its critics and their many tales about the Bible and our history. Every year, I hear from some people that any observance of Christmas or Easter is pagan and wrong. Is this truly the case?

True, the name *Easter* is of pagan origin, but that observance has been known in much of our history as the Christian Passover, or, the Day of Resurrection. The name *Easter* does not alter the facts. As for Easter eggs, their origin is indeed pagan, but they are not a part of the church's worship, nor is their present status anything but as a treat for children. Who has seen them followed by pagan fertility cult rites? A little common sense is in order.

The yule log had origins in paganism, but do you know of any instance where the yule log had a part in Christian worship? The Christmas tree is Christian in character. It is an emblem of Jesus Christ, our *tree of life*. In Revelation 22:2, the tree of life is described as an everbearing fruit, and evergreen. Hence the use of evergreen trees. When I was a child, the Christmas tree was decorated with popcorn strung in long lines, and with fruits, to typify Revelation 22:2. Some early commercial ornaments were made to resemble fruits.

But what about the Reverend Alexander Hislop and his study of *The Two Babylons*? Hislop was a devout and a learned man, but he erred by seeing similarities as connections. The fact that a baseball team calls itself the *Indians* does not make the team of Indian origin. All trees, virtually, have been worshipped at some time. If you have a tree once regarded as holy in your yard, are you therefore a secret and pagan tree worshipper? There are few things in our world which men have not made a part of their worship at some time!

But what about December 25? There is no evidence of Christ's birth on that day, is there? Well, the great Alfred Edersheim, in *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, two volumes, presented evidence that it well could have been the date for very good reasons. Yet too many churchmen seem to believe that they gain intellectual respectability by agreeing with the critics!

But is it morally right to celebrate such days? And what is immoral or un-Biblical about doing so? In antiquity and later, the birthdate of kings was celebrated, and not to do so was treasonable. The New Testament declares Jesus Christ to be King over all kings, and Lord over all lords (1 Tim. 6:15). Not to observe His birthday would have meant denying Him. When persecutions abated, we see at once a developed celebration, indicating a long, covert observance.

This birthday tradition has been transferred in our time from kings to countries. In the United States, for generations the Fourth of July was the great civil holiday celebrating the birth of the country. Its decreasing importance means a decreasing regard for the country by the people.

Cynicism comes cheaply and easily, but its effects are corrosive and lasting. It is sad to see churchmen too ready to believe what the ungodly have to say. If they say that many other religions have had crucified saviors, or virgin births, or whatever, it does not occur to them that Biblical faith and history have been mimicked since antiquity.

If we are Christians, we need to know God's Word, and also our own history. We are called to be "*more* than conquerors" (Rom. 8:37), not retreatists. We are people of victory.

454

THE BIRTH OF THE KING

Chalcedon Report No. 329, December 1992

The cynicism of skeptics, too often echoed by churchmen, has led to a disinterest in any studies on the meaning and celebration of Christ's birth. Its celebration was, supposedly, a late development and heavily influenced by paganism.

The reality, however, is that it was, however covertly done, an earthly fact and a legal necessity. We find very early the premise of its observance and celebration in Matthew 2:2, the wise men from the East asking Herod, "Where is he that is born King of the Jews?" Among other texts, there is also 1 Timothy 6:15, which speaks of Jesus Christ as "the blessed and only Potentate, King of kings, and Lord of lords."

The legal fact of the Roman Empire, and of pagan antiquity, was that the birthday of the king or emperor was celebrated annually, and sometimes even monthly, because the king was the people's ruler, lawgiver, and savior. The early church, by celebrating the birthday of Jesus Christ, at first quietly and then openly, was declaring their true King, Lawgiver, and Savior to be Jesus Christ. The celebration was a statement of faith.

This celebration was thus not a mindless festival. It was a statement to the world that the true and great King was one Jesus, Lord, Creator, and Savior.

In the United Sates, we celebrate the birth date of the republic, July 4, annually. In other countries, like observations occur for the day of national birth, or of a royal birth. The origins of such days go back into remote antiquity and state worship. The foundations of life and of law and society were celebrated on such occasions.

The Christian observance of the birth of Jesus Christ the King was a testimony to the Kingdom of God, to the birth of the King-Redeemer, and to the great and blessed hope of His inevitable triumph and coming again.

The world is trying to de-Christianize Christmas and to turn it into a pagan winter festival. Many churches do not observe it, and those who do have too often reduced it to a children's day.

But it is the birthday of our King, and song writers once celebrated its meaning. Isaac Watts wrote, in 1719,

> Joy to the world! the Lord is come:
> Let earth receive her King;
> Let every heart prepare him room,
> And heav'n and nature sing. Amen.

Our Savior-King was born. Therefore, good Christian men, rejoice!

THE BIRTH OF THE GREAT KING

Chalcedon Report No. 341, December 1993

"Now when Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judaea in the days of Herod the king, behold, there came wise men from the east to Jerusalem, Saying, Where is he that is born King of the Jews?" (Matt. 2:1–2). These wise men were foreign scholars who had studied the Hebrew Scriptures and had been somehow made to know that the time of the Messiah's birth had come. They did not go to Jerusalem assuming that the Messiah would be born there, but confident that the capitol would have authentic information. The birth of a king was always a national event in antiquity, a holy day and commemorated as such.

The reception of this news from the wise men was not received favorably by the leaders of the people. It meant that the future was not to be in their hands but in the Messiah's. They therefore were greatly distressed.

That distress is shared by our modern leaders. They are deeply hostile to Christ the King because the essence of their political philosophy is that man must be his own god, determining for himself what is good and evil, thus creating his own law and morality (Gen. 3:5). They want a one-world order based on man, not the Messiah.

Believers, however, celebrate Christ's birth because He is the King of kings, and Lord of lords (1 Tim. 6:15). Not to celebrate a king's birthday could in antiquity be seen as treason. The celebration was an affirmation of loyalty, of allegiance.

A great deal of nonsense is written about the origin of Christmas. We are told, for example, that it was of "late origin." This obscures the fact that *royal* births of Roman emperors were routinely observed, and any open observance of another king's birth was dangerous. Even the so-called Christian emperors could be dangerous at this point. Within the past century, research has pushed the earliest *known* observances back further

than the nineteenth-century scholars maintained.

The key fact was that the birth date of a king or an emperor was celebrated. It was the acknowledgement of his rule and of hope in his government. To observe Christ's birthday was to declare Him Lord and Savior.

Ethelbert Stauffer, in *Christ and the Caesars*, pointed out that, when Pharaoh Thutmosis III mounted the throne, he proclaimed to an imperial assembly, "The god of heaven is my father. I am his son. He has begotten me, and commanded me to sit on his throne, while I was still a fledgling." When the Assyrian great king ascended to the throne, and age of salvation was proclaimed: "Days of justice, years of righteousness, plenteous rainfall, good prices for merchandise. Old men leap for joy, children sing. The condemned are acquitted, the prisoners set free. The naked are clothed, the sick are cured." Extravagant as these statements are, they only grew more extravagant in the days of Rome. We *know* that, with the Enlightenment, in the early years of the modern era, the "enlightened Christian monarchs" of Europe *banned* the use of Mary's Magnificat (Luke 2:46–55) as treasonable and revolutionary. The Roman emperors were far harsher than they! He that is born as our king is "the only Potentate" (2 Tim. 6:15), the only ultimate power in all creation. We therefore rejoice because our King reigns. The early church rejoiced, and so must we. A hymn of Aurelius Clemens Prudentius (A.D. 348–413) survives, which declares:

Earth has many a noble city;
Bethlehem, thou dost all excel:
Out of thee the Lord from heaven
Came to rule His Israel.

Fairer than the sun at morning
Was the star that told His birth,
To the world its God announcing
Seen in fleshly form on earth

Eastern sages at His cradle
Make oblations rich and rare;
See them give, in deep devotion,
Gold, and frankincense, and myrrh.

Sacred gifts of mystic meaning:
Incense doth their God disclose,
Gold, the King of kings proclaimeth,
Myrrh his sepulcher foreshows.

Jesus, Whom the Gentiles worshipped
At Thy glad Epiphany,

Unto Thee, with God the Father
And the Spirit, glory be. Amen.

456

THE INCARNATION

Chalcedon Report No. 353, December 1994

The most beautiful and marvelous event in all history was the birth of our Lord. Luke's account of it is verbal music; the words sing out and are a perpetual joy to read.

But the *event* was not so wonderful. No room at the inn, the necessity of a flight into Egypt to escape Herod, the slaughter of the innocents, and more, tell us of the world's hatred. When He began His ministry, His brethren did not believe in Him (John 7:5). He was accused of consorting with the worst kinds of people (Matt. 9:11). Many held Jesus was demon-possessed and mad (John 10:20). This was God the Son, and the world hated Him and crucified Him. All this belongs with the Christmas story.

After all, a world in total rebellion against God and His law was not then and is not now ready to hail as King the One who comes to break the power of sin and to restore the Kingdom of God. They wanted Him dead, even as today they want dead or disgraced all who truly follow Jesus Christ and uphold His Kingdom. Their venom is as real now as ever.

No man has won a popularity contest by faithfulness to Christ and His law-word. Such a premise invites attack. The world is at war with God, a war which began in Eden, and which was greatly intensified with our Lord's coming.

Thus, our Lord's birth marks the intensification of the war of the ages. It is a bitter and ugly war, but our Lord cannot lose. We should expect troubles, opposition, and hatred, but also victory. "This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith" (1 John 5:4).

This is why, in this season and always, our song must be, "Joy to the world, the Lord is come. Let earth receive her King." If we are evil spoken of by men, remember our Lord, and what He suffered, and the victory He won for us. Therefore, rejoice!

"Make a joyful noise unto the Lord, all ye lands. Serve the Lord with gladness: come before his presence with singing . . . Enter into his gates with thanksgiving, and into his courts with praise: be thankful unto him and bless his name" (Ps. 100:1–2, 4). "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon His shoulder: and His name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace" (Isa. 9:6–7). Amen.

457

CHRISTMAS

Chalcedon Report No. 425, December 2000

I have vivid memories of my very early Christmases, before I ever entered school. The Biblical account was read to us by my father, sometimes in Armenian, at other times in English. I was told that the incarnation was necessary to save this fallen, sinful world. As an Armenian boy, very familiar with the horror stories of the massacres, I knew it was fallen indeed. I also recall vividly one winter night, when my father and mother were at a church meeting, an incident, not the first nor last. My sister, my young aunt, and uncle (more like brother and sister to me) were already in bed, and my grandmother was putting me to bed when young hoodlums, hating foreigners, broke the windows of the bedroom and fled. My grandmother, knowing the horrors of the Turkish massacres and fresh from the evils of the Russian Bolshevik-made famine, quietly hugged me and prayed with me. Then, despite my pleas, she left for the kitchen and some dishes, saying that our persecuted Lord could and would take care of me.

As soon as I could read, both in the Bible and my Bible storybook, I read and reread the Biblical account of the incarnation. At Christmas, my father had us help with the Christmas tree, in those days ornamented with candles and fruit such as oranges, apples, and pomegranates because Revelation spoke of Christ as the tree of life, bearing all manner of fruit in all seasons. I was taught the meaning of Christmas as the beginning of the destruction of sin — Christmas, thus, was a season of joy.

Now, at eighty-four, with few Christmases left to me, I feel the same joy, and the same assurance of victory. We are the ordained people of victory, and nothing can change that fact. I recall vividly my father's readings of the Christmas story, and my confidence in God's victory. He is the Lord, and none other. Men and rulers forget this to their peril. He is our Savior, or our Judge.

Christmas is thus a season of holy joy to us, a celebration of a coming and inevitable victory. With the incarnation, Christ began His invasion of history. We are a part of His army of victory. Therefore, rejoice!

458

A BARN TO HOUSE THEE

Chalcedon Report No. 447, December 2002

There was no room for Him, once long ago,
Only a cold and drafty barn, and, like a blow,
The smell of dung did greet
Him, Who came from heaven, none to meet
Him, save the displaced cows and sheep
Whose restless night disturbed His sleep.
Only some sheep men came to pray.
No scholars came to mark the day.

Still as of old the world denies
Room to its King and from Him shies,
The Cross His only gift from men
And man as brutal now as then.
Lord, if again a barn do not offend Thee,
This dung and filth would comprehend Thee,
Here is my heart, with its unclean floor
A barn to house Thee, as of yore.

459

THE BIRTH OF THE KING

Chalcedon Report No. 377, December 1996

Too often, scholars tell us that the early church did not observe Christmas, and knew nothing about it. When Christmas observances first occurred, we are told, it was supposedly a few centuries later. If this is true, why do we find that the Christmas observances were so well developed when we first meet them? Our first knowledge of Christmas celebrations tell us of a holy day of established practices and forms.

We cannot understand Christmas unless we recognize it as what Scripture and so many hymns tell us about it. It celebrates the birthday of the King over all kings, and the Lord over all lords (1 Tim. 6:15). In antiquity, the king's birthday was the key holiday, and it was a necessary observance. To celebrate another king's birthday was treason, and hence Christians for generations could not openly observe the birthday of their King.

We are very near a like condition. The day of resurrection is now turned into a pagan holiday, and Christmas is being similarly transformed. We have a generation which says in effect, "We have no king but Caesar" (John 19:15).

To celebrate the birthday of our King means to affirm that, in every area of life and thought, He is King and Lord. The Christmas carols or hymns sing of His triumph and universal reign as the great Prince of Peace. The joy of Christmas is essentially the knowledge that He is King. The wise men had some awareness of the importance of our Lord's birth, for they came asking, "Where is he that is born king of the Jews?" (Matt. 2:2). Mary, in the Magnificat, rejoices that the great royal overturner was coming through her (Luke 1:46–55). The whole of history was to have a new direction and a new power. The newborn King was the last Adam, "the Lord from heaven," the head of a new human race which would

replace the fallen humanity of the first Adam (1 Cor. 15:45–49). By His coming, the King gives a new direction to history, and the new destination is universal victory.

We are in our present distress because people in the church have forgotten Christ the King, do not seek victory, and are content to let fallen men rule over them.

Lacking the faith of our fathers, we are throwing away their victories. Instead of being "kings and priests unto God and his Father" in Christ (Rev. 1:6), we are television addicts (an average of four hours daily) who have little time for the Bible and prayer. We are losing by default.

It is time for us to celebrate Christmas joyfully as the promise of victory and then to apply His victory to our lives, our times, and our world.

460

THE NEW ADAM, JESUS CHRIST

Chalcedon Report No. 171, November 1979

We live in a world which is the shambles of Adam and his work in Eden, his sin. The first Adam, the father of us all, left the world a wasteland of sin and death, and the sons of Adam ever since have been enlarging the scope of sin and death. The world of the first Adam has only one destiny, disaster and death.

Into the world came the second and last Adam, but, unlike the first Adam, not as a mature man, but as a babe. A new humanity began with Him, and all who are born again in Him, who are made a new creation in Jesus Christ, are freed from the power of sin and death and made strong in life and righteousness. No other event in all of history has brought forth more pure and unalloyed joy in song, and with reason: it marks the beginning of the new creation, of the new heavens and the new earth. Hence, we can sing:

> God rest you merry, gentlemen,
> Let nothing you dismay,
> Remember Christ our Savior
> Was born on Christmas day,
> To save us all from Satan's pow'r,
> When we were gone astray;
> O tidings of comfort and joy, comfort and joy,
> O tidings of comfort and joy.

As Isaac Watts wrote, in 1719, "He comes to make His blessings flow as far as the curse is found." In the words of "In Dulci Jubilo," a medieval hymn:

> He hath opened the heavenly door
> And man is blessed forever more.
> Christ was born for this!

And yet our Lord says plainly, "Think not that I am come to send peace on earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword. For I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law. And a man's foes shall be they of his own household" (Matt. 10:34–36).

Two humanities and two kingdoms are in confrontation and at war, the humanity of the old Adam and the kingdom of Man on the one hand, versus the new humanity of Jesus Christ, the last Adam, and the Kingdom of God on the other. The duty of all who are members of the new humanity of Jesus Christ is to reclaim the whole earth, all men, and all things, for their King, to assert the Crown Rights of Christ the King over all creation. There can be no peace nor true government apart from Him, and of whom it is said, "Of the increase of his government and peace, there shall be no end" (Isa. 9:7).

The joy of the Christmas season, the joy of Christ's birth, is thus the rejoicing of men in a victorious battle. Their King has come, and He shall prevail. The songs of Christmas are in many cases songs of victory in the face of an evil and threatening world; they are the songs of a great peace and assurance to a world long bound by sin and sorrow's sway. Our Lord has come: therefore rejoice! The battle is His, and He shall prevail, and we with and in Him: therefore rejoice!

A century ago, Joseph Parker observed, "The ages do not live backwards; God did not show the fulness of His power, and then call the ages to behold its contraction. The way of God is 'first the blade, then the ear, After that the full corn in the ear'."

We dare not see our time as an age of contraction in our Lord's power sway, for to do so is sin. He is on the throne, He is preparing to destroy His enemies, and summoning us, with them, to submit ourselves to Him (Ps. 2:1–12).

This then is the day of the Lord, of His judgment, of the expansion of His power, and of the certainty of His reign. It is therefore a day for singing. Even on the eve of His arrest, trial, and crucifixion, our Lord commanded His disciples, "Let not your heart be troubled" (John 14:1), and He had them sing a hymn before they left for the mount of Olives (Matt. 26:30; Mark 14:26). We even more are required to rejoice in Him and to sing. Paul commands us to both obedience and action, and to "Speaking to yourselves in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord" (Eph. 5:19). The people of victory will rejoice (1 John 5:4). Let us adore Him, and rejoice.

R.J. RUSHDOONY & CHALCEDON

461

WHY I AM REFORMED

Chalcedon Report No. 403, February 1999

Over the years, I have often been asked what made me a Calvinist, and now the Chalcedon staff has asked that I write an answer to this question. In part, I answered that question in my appendix to *By What Standard?* many years ago. Basically, the answer is this: I am a Calvinist because God made me so in His mercy and predestinating power.

Thus, in a sense, I was born a Calvinist. Again, I was baptized a covenant child. My Armenian heritage reinforced this fact. From my earliest years, my memories were of the arrival of friends and relatives from the old county. Numerous meetings with them followed in the three-county area as others met with them to ask about their own loved ones. Some would be told that their loved ones were seen floating dead in a stream, or seized by Turkish and Kurdish forces. This and more told me that this world is a battle between two forces. We were ordained to victory, our faith assured us, but at a price.

The Bible in this context was a military book, our King's orders to us, His people. As soon as I could read, I read the Bible over and over again. It did not occur to me to doubt anything it said. I did not understand all that I read, but I understood enough to know that the King's Word was to be believed and obeyed.

Years later, as a graduate student, I was asked by another if I really took the Westminster Standards literally, so I reread them. It made me more aware of what a Reformed believer is, and more clear in my grasp of the line of division.

At the time, of course, much that passed for the Reformed faith or Calvinism was vague and compromising. Much of it was simply a more "dignified" fundamentalism. This is where Dr. Cornelius Van Til was so important. He clarified, restored, and developed the Reformed faith. He

settled and shaped my own faith and direction. I cannot overstate his influence, nor the strength he gave me in my development and direction.

It was the Lord who made me Reformed in His sovereign grace and mercy, in His predestinating power and grace. In youth, His directing power made it clear to me that a believer is a doer, and so I gained a vocation.

Being a Reformed believer is very easy: You go with the flow of history, you go with God as against man. Being an unbeliever is what is hard, painfully hard. I have known well enough unbelievers to know how true this is. Life then has no meaning, and we are empty of any truth or purpose. There is then no victory in history, and life is barren of purpose.

The Reformed faith tells me that there are no meaningless facts, no brute factuality, to use Van Til's term, in God's creation. I live in a cosmos of universal and blessed meaning. True, it is at present a battlefield between two alien powers, but the victory of our Lord is assured.

My place in that battle and that victory are all of grace — a privilege. It has brought me my share of problems, but my life has been a rich one compared to the many relatives and ancestors who died for the faith.

Chalcedon was founded to further our victory in Christ. It amazes me that prominent churchmen actually see my faith in that fullness of victory as wrong. I pity their lack of faith, and I pray that they will change.

462

BORN RICH

Chalcedon Report No. 389, December 1997

It is a privilege and a form of wealth to be born into a rich culture, and most Americans, although they fail to recognize it, are born rich. My father and others with an extensive knowledge of various cultures often remarked that the poor in America were richer and freer than most of the world's peoples.

Now add to that the fact of being born into another culture, and yet living here in America, and one can see how wealthy an immigrant or foreign family can be, if they know and respect their heritage. I had the wealth of an ancient Christian Armenian culture and all the vast treasures of an American one.

My father was born in a remote village on a mountain next to Ararat. He lived where his family had lived for perhaps 2,000 or so years. Having played as a boy in the churchyard where his father (of the married clergy) had been a priest of the Church of Armenia, my father had memorized the names of his ancestors for fifteen or more centuries back, from the gravestones and church records. My mother came from the city of Van, which was relatively modern and prosperous.

As a boy, I heard stories from survivors, including our family, of the massacres and the long death march. I heard of the martyrdom of many, including my paternal grandfather, first blinded, then a year or two later killed by the Turks. My maternal grandfather was killed while on a pilgrimage to a favorite monastery church.

My father knew the ancient liturgy as the very beautiful songs of medieval monks. They still echo in my memory with their intense faith.

I was thus born rich though materially poor. My father loved California. Having spent time in Europe in his student days, he knew and thought highly of it, especially Switzerland; but he held that Americans

failed to appreciate the often greater beauty of their own country.

Up until my college years, I was immersed in the Armenian community. With time, I lost my ability to read and write Armenian, but the cultural impact remained. I was a child of two worlds and two cultures.

This enabled me to see, as I grew older, how both American and Armenian cultures had steadily left their moorings and had drifted from a strong Biblical and theonomic faith to a vague evangelicalism. I was brought up with unchanging reverence to believe that the Bible is the very Word of God.

I can vividly remember each Christmas, my father's reading of the Nativity accounts. I recall him helping us decorate the Christmas tree and telling us that it signified Jesus Christ, the tree of life, evergreen, ever-alive. The ornaments were fruits, or simulated fruit ornaments, to set forth Revelation 22:2. I can recall coming home from kindergarten with my first tale of a Santa Claus, amazed and excited. My laughing father cleaned the chimney, but my cousin Edward, two years older than I, told me it was a silly American story. I always disliked Santa Claus after that.

In Armenia, there was no neutral ground between Islam and Christianity, and I came to realize that there is no neutral ground anywhere. But, to my dismay, the country was drifting into a belief in neutral ground, with all racial groups in that drift. As a student at the university, then in seminary and in the ministry, I came to realize that this belief in neutrality was becoming a kind of new religion, especially among scientists and among churchmen who advocated a rationalistic apologetics. It is difficult for me to express the deep revulsion I felt towards this, then and now. It gave me an intense appreciation of Cornelius Van Til when I encountered his thinking. My horror for neutralism has only deepened with time.

Almost from the day I learned how to read, I began to read the Bible. I loved its majesty, beauty, and certainty. In my later university years, I would read as much as an hour, out loud, saturating myself with the glory of God speaking to man. Over the years, when speaking at various churches, I try when possible to read Scripture myself in the service, rather than having another do it. It is a privilege I cherish.

I have been doubly blessed in being an heir of two Christian cultures. Truly, I was born rich.

463

FATHERHOOD

Chalcedon Report No. 407, June 1999

Andrew Sandlin has asked that I write about my father's influence on my life and faith. This is not easy to do, since his formative power was more than I can summarize.

Both my father and mother influenced me profoundly. I was closer to my mother but more taught by my father. Both all their lives read their Bibles daily. After his blindness, my father recited it from memory. My mother's faith was simple and uncomplicated. My father's was complex. In Armenian, he was a simple, trusting believer in the whole Word of God. In English, he showed the influence of his education at the University of Edinburgh and New College, and he reflected the British systematic theology; he more or less took modernist views of the Bible on a tentative basis. But, as an Armenian, he held to the faith of his fathers. When we argued, he always ended up by commending my strong Calvinism and unreserved faith.

I cannot begin to delineate his influence on me. Before my birth, he dedicated me to the Lord and His ministry. I was told this very early, and though at times I rebelled against the idea, most of the time I felt honored and privileged.

My father told me, well before my teens, when I was already an omnivorous Bible reader, that there was much in the Bible I would not understand, but to believe and obey was my primary responsibility.

My father and I would often take long walks together, especially in the evenings, and these were times of informal teaching. My first ambition was to be a farmer, having even then a love of the country, and then an astronomer, for my father taught me to love and know the stars. Above all, he taught me that to serve God is man's highest privilege and calling, something I strongly still believe. If the Bible is true, no king or emperor

has ever had a calling to rival that of God's servants.

Both my parents taught me to love reading. They read to us or bought books for us, something I have done for my children and grandchildren. I enjoyed talking with them and discussing things with them to the last.

The family was important to them, personally and religiously. My father laid down the law that, when we were apart for any reason, a weekly card or letter was a *duty*, one I honored faithfully, I think.

Very early, I was troubled and distressed by the lax and disrespectful attitude of American children toward their parents, and I found it as painful to hear as foul or obscene language. I saw it as immoral and religiously wrong. I loved my parents, and, even now after many years, I miss them, and I look forward to seeing them in heaven.

My father knew the Bible by heart, both in English and Armenian, as some of us, including my eldest daughter, Rebecca, can testify. It was a wonderful sound to hear him in his blindness as he walked around joyfully reciting the Bible, even to the many chapters of "begats." It was there that his faith shone through most clearly and joyfully. And it was a joyful faith. It saw him through orphaned years, the massacres and the loss of his firstborn, Rousas George, through the death march, and hard years of work, and finally blindness. He was a happy man because he knew his Lord, and the truth of His Word.

464

MY LAST DAYS

Chalcedon Report No. 428, March 2001

I am now eighty-four years of age, feeling somewhat venerable and dignified with my white hair and beard. I don't enjoy hobbling poorly, with a cane, but I have taken it as a part of my age. Well, a year ago, during my weekly two hours with my physical therapist, I saw the previous patient walk out. She was a woman in her mid-nineties. She had fallen down a flight of stairs and broken thirteen bones. Now she was well and walking normally! I felt like a weak young punk by comparison!

Well, compared to the rest of the world, we routinely come out badly, but in Jesus Christ, we are always with God, as high as possible.

I have never doubted the Bible or the Holy Trinity since I was a child. Any other faith is absurd and is madness. As a result, I have always "known my place" as His servant and a child by grace.

Old age is His ordination and a part of my preparation for eternity, which is very real to me. I hope to do a little more writing, but otherwise I am ready for heaven. I look forward to all that it means, including reunions with loved ones and fellow believers already there. Death is the greatest adventure.

I don't enjoy my hobbling and sometimes attendant pains, but I know that the best is yet to come. God's grace is an amazing thing. I have known it and will know yet far more.

Dying is a part of the fall, and yet it places us forever beyond the Fall. The life of faith is truly life. I have been blessed with a godly family and with a calling. I am also blessed by you, our supporters, and you are daily in my prayers.

My present condition is difficult and sometimes painful, but it has a happy ending. May you all be similarly blessed.

465

ON DEATH AND DYING

Chalcedon Report No. 429, April 2001

I have been asked to write on death and dying. Since I am dying, according to my doctor (within a few months or years!), it seems fitting for me to do so.

My familiarity with death goes back to my earliest days, to World War I, when a young maternal uncle died. The loss was more like that of a big brother to me. I can recall vividly the puttees he wore as part of his uniform. When last at our Kingsburg cemetery, I visited his grave.

After World War I and into the mid-1920s, a very familiar event was the arrival of Armenian friends and relatives from the Near East. Armenians from Fresno, Kings, and Tulare counties gathered to ask if, during the massacres and death march, they had seen relatives and friends. The answers were sometimes grim ones.

I was thus very early familiar with death, but even more familiar with the faith and the Bible, read daily to us by my father, often in two languages.

It never occurred to me to doubt the faith. I was around six or seven when I first heard a boy express atheistic beliefs, and I thought he was crazy. I have not since changed my mind. To believe that creation is a mindless product is at best stupidity, if not a sin.

As a pastor, some deathbed incidents have made me very aware of the thin line separating us from eternity. I expect, when I die, to see the Lord and countless loved ones. It will be going home for me.

We live in a world of death because of sin, and we have a duty to overcome sin and death through Jesus Christ. This is our major calling. When I die, I shall be with the Lord, and free from sin and death.

I have always seen unbelief as a form of sin and madness.

Now, all that the Bible has to say on the world to come can be stated in

a few paragraphs. God requires us to believe in the resurrection, but not to be too interested in it. God's commandments fill books; His comments on the life after death, a paragraph or two. It is obvious what we are to be concerned about. It is not Christian to neglect the law (much of the Bible) and to concentrate on life after death, to which little space is given.

God's priorities must be ours also. We must believe and obey the Lord. God does not exist to answer our questions! He is the Lord, the King, and the Commander. Obey Him, and believe Him.

466

CHALCEDON

Chalcedon Report No. 363, October 1995

The story of Chalcedon is really my life's story. Being an Armenian, many of whose family members died for the faith, and coming from a long line of clergymen, the faith was identical to life for me. Before my birth, I had been dedicated to Christ's service by my parents.

America was for us almost a paradise, a land of freedom and joy. We reveled in its richness. None could have been more patriotic than we were. There was so much to appreciate and be grateful for in America's history. There were, however, disturbing things also.

An incident occurred when I as perhaps ten or eleven years old which until now I have never mentioned or discussed with anyone. A neighborhood boy, a superior mind, a happy, red-headed, and sparkling person, asked if I might be permitted to attend an afternoon film showing. This was in the day of silent films. The picture was of no importance, essentially trifling entertainment, but it suddenly overwhelmed me with a shocking realization. For all those in the film, there was no God, no Christ. They lived in a meaningless and empty world. This filed me with a great horror. Is this how most people live? Are they dead to God? Are they going through life as sleepwalkers? The film was an awakening into an empty world. I did not sleep well that night. I read the newspaper the next day with recognition that men were blotting God out of their world, and it made me fear for the future. I did not know the answer to what I saw, but I sensed that I was somehow in a dying world, or a burning building.

As a university student about a decade later, I was increasingly aware of the cultural love of death, and I began to realize that I, as a Christian, had a responsibility to build the culture of life, the world order of the triune God. I spent much time in the library stacks reading extensively

in history, anthropology, and more, and in studying the answers given in literature. I knew something had to be done to make Christianity and His law-word relevant to every area of life and thought or else Christianity would wither into a meaningless "spiritual" religion unrelated to the Bible.

Long before I had given a name to what I wanted to do, i.e., *Christian Reconstruction* and *Chalcedon*, I was thinking constantly about the Bible and its answers. I was always reading and rereading the Bible. Before I was ten, a fine old man, an old-line New Englander, had warned me once that I was "too young" to be reading much of the Old Testament, but I found it too intensely interesting even to think of stopping.

And so we started Chalcedon, Dorothy and I. I had many ambitious ideas as to what it should be, but people were uninterested in all of them, and thus we began with a mimeographed letter which in its first issue was optimistically run off to the tune of sixty copies, one sheet only. Mrs. Grayce Flanagan ran it off; and for some years, together with the tape ministry, it was her work, aided by Dorothy, that very substantially made Chalcedon possible.

Chalcedon has a very simple premise: if God is indeed the God revealed in Scripture, then His law-word is relevant to and governs every area of life and thought. In polytheism, there are many gods, each governing a limited sphere, some the weather, others farming, others childbirth, still others spiritual concerns, and so on and one. Antinomians and "spiritual Christians" have reduced Christianity to a polytheistic faith, with a limited sphere of relevance for Christ. I regard this as blasphemous. Christ *is* King over all kings, and Lord over all lords, the *only* Potentate (1 Tim. 6:15). To limit the scope of His government, and the governing application of His law-word, is to deny Him.

What next will Chalcedon do? That depends on you. We have always been, financially, a "shoestring" organization, but, by the grace of God, we have a worldwide ministry. What more may develop depends, humanly speaking, on your support.

Christian Reconstruction begins with you and me, our reordering of our priorities in terms of the faith.

What I suddenly realized as a boy at the film theater, namely, that no one featured in that film lived in God's world, and that all were assuming the nonexistence of the God of Scripture, is now a commonplace fact even in many churches. Churchmen live without God and yet somehow expect His blessing.

Nietzsche held, and A. J. Hoover pointed out in his study, *Friedrich Nietzsche: His Life and Thought*, that knowledge is man-made. Reality

is a human construction, and man is building his Towers of Babel to establish that he alone is the true and living god and lawmaker (Gen. 3:5). Nietzsche was suicidal, and he counseled peopled to "[b]uild your cities on the slopes of Vesuvius." This they have done, and the rumblings of disaster now surround them.

It is time to rebuild on the foundation of the Rock of Ages (Matt. 7:24–28).

467

CHALCEDON'S DIRECTION

Chalcedon Report No. 356, March 1995

Back in the 1930s, as a university student, I learned much about the history of the church, and its sometimes wayward drift. Most important, I learned of the total gospel as the Bible has presented it; the early church, as the new Israel of God (Gal. 6:16), lived by God's law-word. It saw its mission as the redemption of all peoples and the Kingdom of God on earth. It early created the diaconate (Acts 6) to minister to the needs of believers, and later of others; it created courts to adjudicate conflicts in its midst (1 Cor. 6); it took up collections for relief; and so on. It redeemed captives, cared for the elderly, for children, for the sick and needy; and its deacons were hated by Rome. The church was persecuted as an *imperium in imperio*, as an empire within the Roman Empire, which the Kingdom of God should always be in an alien world.

But, in the twentieth century, the church has extensively surrendered to Marxism, modernism, the social gospel, humanism, and more, often being more receptive to alien faiths than to the Bible.

Long before I established Chalcedon, I felt earnestly that the road to renewal began with a theological revival, coupled with a diaconal one, a restoration of full-time deacons to renew Christian ministries in health, education, and charity. At one time, all three of these were in Christian hands and were ministries of grave importance. Quite rightly, Rome hated the deacons, as witness St. Lawrence, who was so savagely martyred.

In the 1950s, I began working on the theological foundations (*By What Standard?*, 1958), then on the educational, published in 1961, *Intellectual Schizophrenia*. I had, meanwhile, been working on the *Messianic Character of American Education* (1963).

In more recent years, we have begun a varied diaconal ministry headed by John Upton, with several very able persons actively involved.

We believe that God *requires* this of us. We want no part with those who simply want to satisfy their own bent and to forget the wholeness of our calling. We hope to grow in this expanded ministry with your help. We have many more directions where we hope in time to develop fresh ministries.

The issue is the Kingdom of God. Churches have too often handed government over to the state. As I have been saying for year, with too little response, government means, *first* of all, the self-government of the Christian man. This must be its essential meaning for us. Then *second*, the family is God's basic governmental "institution," created in the Garden of Eden and essential to His Kingdom. *Third*, the church is also a government ordained by God. *Fourth*, the school is a government and an essential one which Christians must establish and maintain. *Fifth*, our vocation is a government that controls most of our days and is basic to Kingdom-building. *Sixth*, the various organizations, social communities, and standards of our life do govern and influence us. *Seventh*, the state is also a government, one among many, but a danger when it seeks to be a government *over* all spheres. Earlier in our history, the state was only referred to as *civil* government, one form of government among many. To speak of civil government as *government* is implicitly totalitarian.

We have a duty to restore true government, beginning with self-government. The practice of self-government is an impossibility if we adopt victimhood to explain our failures. But victimhood is very popular in our time, and many people see as the source of our ills some particular group: the capitalists, the masses, the Jews, the whites, the blacks, Hispanics, Asiatics, etc., men, women, or any *other* segment of society. Victimhood is the antithesis of moral responsibility, and its popularity rests in the smug self-assurance that it is the others, not we, who are to blame. (Incidentally, some see Christian Reconstructionists as the source of all evils, and R. J. Rushdoony as the evil leader! Of the making of fools there is no end.)

God in His Word summons us, not to victimhood, but to moral responsibility. We are to stand before God and confess our sins, not the sins of others. We all have people, no doubt, who are busily confessing our supposed sins and seeing us as the problem rather than themselves. Such a course is sinful, and also the route to madness.

Our direction is the Kingdom of God, as best as we are able. The Lord God does not save us to live in self-satisfaction and self-indulgence, but to serve Him with all our heart, mind, and being. This is our daily purpose and goal, and we trust that it is yours also. We will soon be increasing the scope of our diaconal and mission work with your help.

Remember, too, that the deacons of the early church ministered both to men's spiritual and also physical needs, as witness Stephen (Acts 6:8; 7:60), and Philip (Acts 8:5–40). And yet a recently published six-volume Bible dictionary has no entry for "Deacons"!

But William Smith and Samuel Cheetham, in *A Dictionary of Christian Antiquities* (1875), remind us that the deacons were "continually called Levites" (vol. 1, p. 527) because they were created in terms of that Old Testament order. As Levites, their functions were in terms of God's law and His mercy to those in need. The absorption of the diaconate into a mainly liturgical function was a serious mistake.

One of our critics has expressed contempt for our diaconal ministries as lacking in intellectual status! Well, if status were our goal, we would never have started Chalcedon in the first place. Our purpose is to seek first the Kingdom of God, and His righteousness (or justice) (Matt. 6:33).

If you agree, then please pray for us, and support us financially. There is much to be done. We have a world to conquer for Christ. We do it, not through coercion, but through conversion. We do not seek a top-down solution, an imposition from above, but a grassroots strategy, the conversion of peoples and the reordering of their lives in terms of God's law-word. We have a King, Jesus the Messiah, who requires that we abandon the Gentile strategy, exercising dominion and authority over peoples, in favor His way: "But whosever will be great among you, let him be your minister; And whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant: Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many" (Matt. 20:26–28).

In this our calling, *we need your help.*

468

THE OPPORTUNITY AND THE NEED

Chalcedon Report No. 352, November 1994

A very frequent question asked by our supporters is this: what is the real cost of my subscription? This is not easy to answer. The cost of the *Chalcedon Report*, i.e., *without* reference to salaries, maintaining an office, paying our staff, etc., is a few thousand dollars, but this is only a fraction of the total cost. There is more to Chalcedon than typesetting, printing, paper, and postage. With most publications, advertising pays the costs; we cannot accept advertisements. We do have scholars, here and abroad, active in various forms of Christian Reconstruction.

Thus, we have a witness to the whole counsel of God in all the world to some degree. But this is not all. Some of you are aware of John Upton's work in Romania in recent years; in 1993, his rescue activities were carried on television's *20/20* seven times, once for about half an hour. This has not been our only charitable activity: we are at present working to bring a young Ghana Christian here for urgently needed surgery, a young man from Brazil, and so on and on.

We do this because we believe the Lord requires it. The "cost" of your subscription each year can run between $100 on up to *many* times as much because we are eager to use whatever you give in the Lord's service. The world's economies are now beginning to falter, and we, like others, feel its decline. We believe, however, that this means that Christians must increase their outreach to a crumbling world order.

There is too little attention given in our time to verses like Psalm 41:1–2:

> Blessed is he that considereth the poor: the LORD will deliver him in time of trouble." The LORD will preserve him, and keep him alive; and he shall be blessed upon the earth: and thou wilt not deliver him unto the will of his enemies."

There are many such remarkable promises. They are God's promises, not man's. They are sure promises, and yet we neglect them.

Because we take God's Word very seriously, we believe that we have a duty towards all the world in terms of the Great Commission and all God's requirements of us. We are not here to please ourselves.

The early church moved out into the nations to preach the gospel and to meet every honest need: the gospel was for "the healing of the nations." Clement of Alexandria (A.D. 150–213?) wrote, "The word of our Master did not remain in Judea, as philosophy remained in Greece, but has been poured out over the entire world."

We feel strongly about that worldwide commission. We believe we must train men to see the broader scope of the gospel requirements. Institutions are necessary, but the Kingdom of God must have priority. The peoples must be converted and trained to apply God's law-word to every sphere of life and thought.

We have great hopes and plans toward that end. The needs are virtually limitless, but we cannot take one step without your support.

We do not go into debt. If the money does not come in, we do without it, but we do not incur debt. Our staff members have been leaders in the Christian school movement, homeschooling, charity, Christian scholarship in various fields, and so on. We need to break new ground; the opportunities are many, and we urgently need your help. We can go no further, humanly speaking, than your financial support allows us. Most of our staff, if not all, did better financially before joining us.

The world today faces a crisis unrivaled since the fall of Rome. A great opportunity confronts us. Help us use the day for victory in Christ.

469

IS IT NOTHING TO YOU WHO PASS BY?

Chalcedon Report No. 361, August 1995

One of the moving cries of Scripture is Jeremiah's despairing line, "Is it nothing to you, all you who pass by?" (Lam. 1:12, Berkeley version). Jerusalem was in ruins, many taken captive and enslaved, and many virgins raped by the conquerors. Many passersby saw the world as full of problems, though this was not their concern because it had not happened to them.

Chalcedon now raises a like cry to you. With the economic crisis worsening, more and more excellent missionary and charitable causes go without financing, or are being abandoned. This should not be, and we are concerned that it must not be.

As far as possible, we are planning to assist in keeping such works alive and extending them. In a very real sense, we are overextended now, but, precisely because ours is a crisis time, we must, as individuals and as organizations, try to do more than ever.

Remember our Lord's parable on judgment: "Inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not to me" (Matt. 25:45).

It scares me that so many church people are not afraid of God. They feel entitled to live well and to think of their welfare primarily, and, somehow, God is supposed to bless them for their living well.

I remember as a child, shortly after World War I, when I was not yet in school, sitting down for dinner with only a glass of water in front of us. My father told us of the news of our fellow Armenian refugees, and he said the price of our food would go for relief. My mother cried quietly as he told us of the suffering our people and others were experiencing. He said God required much of us because we had been spared much. This and like occasions I can never forget.

We are not put here on earth for our own advantage but for God's

purposes. We have an obligation to be good stewards of our lives, our assets, and our time, for Christ's sake.

One of the constant stresses of Scripture is on our concern and care of widows and orphans, the truly needy, the alien, and all of those whom God singles out in His Word for our attention. Our Lord's brother, James, tells us, "Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world" (James 1:27). We are definitely not "unspotted from the world" if we neglect godly charity, love, and help.

Our concern here at Chalcedon is to provide both the theological and Biblical foundations for Christian action in every sphere and to work in as many spheres as we can. We cannot do it without you. Will you help us?

470

WHY CHALCEDON?

Chalcedon Report No. 363, October 1995

WHY the name *Chalcedon* for an organization to foster theonomic Christian Reconstruction? The choice was entirely mine, because, at the time, no one else was involved in the effort.

The name *Chalcedon* comes from the church council of A.D. 451, whose purpose was to formulate theologically and philosophically the Biblical doctrine of the nature of Jesus Christ. In *The Foundations of Social Order: Studies in the Creeds and Councils of the Early Church* (1968), in a chapter, "The Council of Chalcedon: Foundation of Western Liberty," I deal with this more fully.

Common to antiquity was the divinization of the political order. There were variations in the form this divinization took, i.e., it could be the ruler, or the office, or the civil order that was divinized, but, in some form, the social order was a divine-human one. (I deal with this also in *The One and the Many.*)

If Christ's deity and humanity were confused, church fathers began to realize, the door was opened to the divinization of the human order. If the human nature of Christ were reduced, absorbed into the divine, or confused with it, Christology was affected; the incarnation was undermined, or its uniqueness denied. The incarnation was either a unique event, or it was a repeatable one. There had to be a true union but without confusion.

The best formulation of the answer came in the letter of Pope Leo, "The Tome." St. Leo defined, as did then the Council of Chalcedon, Jesus Christ as "in two natures, without confusion, without change, without division, without separation," truly incarnate, unique, and without any annulment of either nature in the union.

The implication of this statement was that no reproduction of this divine-human union in the incarnation could *legitimately* be claimed by

any Christian group. Repaganization efforts would not be lacking, but they were henceforth under the ban of Chalcedon's formulation.

Of course, they have occurred, and in the various branches of the church. In Eastern Orthodox churches, the doctrine of *theosis*, or salvation as deification, simply disregards Chalcedon. In Rome, the doctrine of the church as the continuation of the incarnation ignores the Chalcedon stand. Protestantism is quick to condemn Rome's position, while reproducing it with its concept of the church as the body of Christ. This Protestant version uses Biblical language for non-Biblical purposes, because the meaning of the church as the body of Christ is that it is His new humanity. As the last Adam (1 Cor. 15:45ff.), Jesus Christ recreates a new human race, His body or new humanity.

The pagan stream persisted all the while and came into sharp focus in the philosophy of Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770–1831). The mind, *Geist*, or spirit seeking to find itself in history locates itself in the state. For Hegel, "the Protestant principle" works to bridge the gap between man and the beyond and to gain an incarnation of the world-spirit in the state.

Such thinking had preceded Hegel and found expression in him. The state was now the agency of change, or revolution, because it was the incarnation of the world-spirit. At the same time, this made the state the target of revolution if it slowed down or blocked this perpetually revolutionary world-spirit. It can be argued that Marx was not as radical as Hegel.

We live thus in an age whose faith and spirit require perpetual revolution for a perpetually new world order. The American Unitarians, "respectable" gentlemen all, saw this clearly. Octavius Brooks Frothingham (1822–1895) held: "The interior spirit of any age is the spirit of God; and no faith can be living that has that spirit against it; no Church can be strong except in that alliance. The life of the time appoints the creed of the time and modifies the establishment of the time" (*The Religion of Humanity*, 3rd ed. [1875], pp. 7–8).

Behind such concepts is a faith in *creative destruction*, regeneration by mass violence, murders, and destruction. We have seen revolutionaries and terrorists boast of their destructiveness as though it were a virtue —and, for them, it is.

As against all this, Chalcedon represents a faith that begins with the premise that all men are sinners, totally depraved (i.e., every aspect of their being is tainted by sin), and in need of salvation. Only One, the God-man Jesus Christ, can make atonement efficaciously: He alone can save them from their sin. All their efforts to create either a good or a new

man, or a good or a new society, apart from Him are doomed. They will only compound the evil.

Our sole essential reliance on Christ means our sole and essential reliance on His law-word also. We cannot weld man's laws onto God's order.

This is what I have over the years maintained and will continue to do so to the end. I believe that, under God, I have no other choice, nor do you.

GENERAL INDEX

A

Aaron, 673
Abel, 97–98
Abelard, Peter, 620–622
Abner, 163–164
abomination, usage and meaning, 521–522, 1248–1249
abortion
  anti-abortion activism, 1364–1365
    in the early church, 546–547, 1072, 1141
    "Operation Rescue," 1140–1141, 1212–1213
    political action, 1139
    sued for libel and slander, 642
    and taxation, 597, 1140
    violence, 1140, 1364
  in classical paganism, 546–547, 905, 1072, 1141
  failure of the church, 73, 388, 549, 652, 1140–1141, 1212, 1364
  and the family, 282, 546–551, 811
  and God's Law, 546–551, 1001
    abortion as murder, 9, 217, 546–551, 642
    capital punishment, 546–547
    and common law, 550–551
    and God's judgment, 550, 1219, 1401
  and the medical establishment, 548, 550, 631, 642
  philosophy of,
    cites "ancient religion" as precedent, 1072
    in classical paganism, 546–547, 905, 1072, 1141
    feminism, 551
    "moral" because legal, 617, 642
    nihilistic culture of death, 9, 217, 436, 1205
    overpopulation, 551
    and pagan atonement, 287
    personhood of the fetus, 546–551, 1001–1002
    "pro-choice" and personal liberty, 286, 1001–1002
    progress, 9, 376
    self-realization, 282, 286
  result of antinomianism, 272, 311, 436, 549–550, 1001–1002
    changing standards, 100, 1072
    culture of death, 9, 217, 436, 1205
    evasion of responsibility, 840–841
    inversion of values, 217, 669
  Roe v. Wade, 1072, 1136
  and science, 547–549, 551
  and the state
    believed to be moral because legal, 617, 642
    court rulings, 1072, 1136
    overpopulation, 551
    regulations, 550
    social planning, 548–550
    state mandated, 556, 650
    state protection, 48, 284, 548–550, 597, 642, 1001–1002
    subsiding abortions, 548–549
  statistics, 9
abortionists, 550, 631, 642
Abraham, 88, 247, 725, 793, 914–915, 1166, 1291, 1401
abstraction, 191–192, 410–412, 621,

abstraction *(cont'd.)*
1064–1065, 1077–1078, 1159, 1209
abstractionism, 577, 793–794
abuse
and anarchistic individualism, 320
child abuse, 158, 228, 320, 673, 762, 901–902, 1065, 1320, 1338
and Christian education, 1062
in the church, 69, 84–85, 118, 158 (*see also* church as corrupted, with totalitarianism and abuse)
of citizens (*see* citizenry, abuse of)
and evasion of responsibility, 158, 228
by homosexuals, 673, 901–902, 1212
honoring abusive parents, 1320
"intergenerational sex," 673, 901–902
and liberalism, 901
of parents, 320
rape (*see* rape)
sexual abuse, 158, 228, 762, 901–902, 1065, 1212, 1338
and statist action, 1338
victimization of romantic women, 429
of wives, 118, 147, 320, 1361
of women (*see* women, and abuse)
academia. *see also* intellectualism
captured by humanism, 183, 380, 882, 968, 1217, 1339
vs. Christian faith, 137–138
critical analysis, 42, 410–412, 1131
influence of classical humanism, 968
and the lower class mentality, 870
and reality, 268, 411, 547, 696, 776, 870, 882, 1217, 1218
Satan as the first academician, 410
and statism, 267–268, 351
and the student movement, 192–193, 267, 882 (*see also* youth, student movement)
academic freedom, 44, 760–761
accreditation, etymology, 930
Ackerman, Nathan, 888
activism. *see* specific movements
Adam
see also (*see* New Adam, the)
and common depravity, 98, 130, 285, 290–291, 294, 333, 470, 644, 1035, 1179–1180, 1184, 1186, 1397, 1400–1402, 1423, 1424–1425
and common mortality, 1200, 1385
created mature, 1391
as a critic, 1332
and dominion, 358, 517, 1113, 1271, 1332
as federal representative, 1350
the first marriage, 913–914
humanistic view of, 472, 645
and the original sin, 199, 470, 1402
in *Paradise Lost,* 1199
in poetry, 222
victim mentality, 813–815, 1248
Adam, Harold J., 696
Adams, Henry, 1089
Adams, John Quincy, 47–48, 599
Adams, Samuel, 161
addiction, 268, 335, 708. *see also* drug and alcohol abuse
Adonijah, 1256
adulterous woman, case of the, 158
adultery
as an elite privilege, 824, 934
and betrothal, 1395
case of the adulterous woman, 158
David's, 307, 324
and divorce (*see* divorce)
and God's Law, 15, 162, 244, 277, 307, 752, 909, 947, 1323, 1326, 1357–1358, 1363
and humanistic "freedom," 782
of King Shahryar's wife, 1372
and modern politicians, 752–753
and moralism, 323, 589, 1250
result of antinomianism, 15, 20, 162, 314, 323, 420, 753, 782, 824
and "the right to privacy," 283–284
adversity, 955, 1292. *see also* trials and God's blessing
aesthetics, 526–528, 794. *see also* art
A Few Figs from Thistles (Millay), *783*
Africa and Africans
and applied Christianity, 471, 1237
cannibalism in, 230–231
and Christian persecution, 499, 814, 1132
drought and famine, 225, 326
and elitist rule, 296
false statistics, 230–231
intellectualism in, 647
and missionaries, 341, 471, 1143, 1251
modern slavery, 490–491
and statism, 326, 341, 405, 814, 977, 1069, 1230, 1270, 1338
uncivilized peoples in, 313–317, 858, 1066, 1143, 1255
African Socialist states, 405
agape, Greek, 183
Age of Exploration, 944
agnosticism and agnostics, 33, 172–173, 397, 531, 1174
agrarian life, 747, 849–852, 856. *see also* cities

agriculture
abuse of resources, 855–856
agricultural revolution, 853–855
big agriculture, 16, 213, 244
and cheap food, 699, 854–855
and Christian Reconstruction, 356
and statism, 219, 225–228, 230, 233–234, 244, 330, 855, 1068–1069, 1101–1102
Ahab, 201, 993, 1109
Ahmanson, Howard, 1126
AIDS, 799, 918, 1249, 1255
Air Force, U.S., 437
Alaric, 515
Alaska, 1060
Albanian genocide, 510
Albert, Steward, 390
Albion, Robert G., 1242
alcohol abuse. *see* drug and alcohol abuse
Aldanov, Mark, 381
Alexander, Lamar, 86
Alexander II, 402
Alexander the Great, 338, 1404
Alexander VI, 399
Alexandra Amalie of Bavaria, 765
Algeria, 226
Algiers, 490
Alinsky, Saul, 390
allegiance, 4, 220, 439, 443, 445, 526, 575, 585, 842, 878, 1019, 1100, 1286, 1404, 1414
Allen, Gary, 1236
Allen, Robert S., 755–756, 761
Allies, the (WWI), 1034, 1035
Alliluyeva, Svetlana, 324
Allis, O. T., 1176
almsgiving. *see* giving and charity
Altizer, Thomas J. J., 30, 33
ambition, 834, 859, 1251–1252
Ambrose, 642, 1370
America. *see* United States of America
American Civil War. *see* Civil War, American
American dream, the original, 104, 613, 1142
American Educational Trust of Washington D.C., 464
American Indians. *see* Native American Indians
American Medical Association (AMA), 548
American Psychologist, 761
American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, 771
American War for Independence. *see* War for American Independence
Amos, 648, 866, 959
Anabaptists, 148, 1209
anarchy and anarchism
and abuse, 320
vs. authority, 20–23, 32, 45–46, 269–270
the authority crisis, 184, 206, 266–267, 328–329, 437–438, 538–540, 927, 969
and collapse of society, 20–22, 40, 45, 184, 188, 302, 313–317, 364–365, 714, 851, 1120, 1363
democracy and mob-rule, 22, 25, 27, 36, 210, 355–356, 747, 1084
in the economy, 20, 21, 319, 846–847
and the family, 22, 320, 539
and immaturity, 847, 1309
and individualism, 319–320
insubordination, 437, 816 (*see also* authority, *vs.* anarchy)
and irresponsibility, 1112
and philosophy
atheism, 539, 750
as basic state of man, 21, 40, 404 (*see also* autonomy)
denial of the original sin, 318
environmentalism, 318
"equality" as basic to, 21, 40
existentialism, 20–21, 44, 191, 314, 319, 452, 748, 847
fueled by humanism, 257, 748, 803–804, 893, 1052, 1089, 1150
logical end of modernism, 318–322, 452
moral anarchy, 184, 420, 539, 747, 893 (*see also* morality in humanism, living beyond good and evil)
nihilism and meaninglessness, 435
personal view of reality, 300–301, 1101
rationalism, 319
relativism, 321, 533, 748, 868, 962
Renaissance thought, 318, 639
"rights" of men, 199, 738
promoted by the church, 20
rejection of God's authority, 20–23, 36, 57, 59, 302, 329, 379
result of antinomianism, 131, 184, 188, 314, 498, 748, 1113
and revolution, 184
and statism, 29, 36, 193, 232, 452, 680
Marxism, 21, 40, 235, 423–424
state schooling, 36, 1072
in the student movements, 209, 267, 810, 981, 1052
tax-revolt as shortcut to, 672
and terrorism, 302

Anathema Maranatha, 1367
ancestor worship, 440, 913, 1321
ancien régime, 646
Andelson, Robert V., 443
Anderson, "Bloody Bill," 479–480
Andre, John, 503
Andrews, Lewis, 1080
Andrews, Matthew Page, 1090
angel, meaning, 116
"angel of light," 116–118, 591, 632
Angel of the Lord, 793
angels, 1392, 1394, 1395, 1396, 1409
Anglicans and Anglicanism, 153, 391, 569, 1091, 1307
Anglo-Saxon superiority, 813–814, 1129. *see also* whites
animal cruelty, 771, 805
Animal Farm (Orwell), 192
animal intelligence, 1235
"animal rights," 459–460
animism, 389, 440
annunciation, the, 1394–1398
anomia, Greek, 1187, 1246
Anselm, 925, 1121
anthropology, 339, 459–460, 1170, 1237
anti-abortion activism. *see under* abortion
Antichrist, 18, 391, 543
Antichrist (Nietzsche), 969
anticommunism, 228, 482, 493–494
Anti-Duhring (Engels), 1100
Anti-Masonic party, 204
antinomianism
  and the atonement of Christ, 98, 1246–1247
  centrality of human "needs," 266, 285
  in the church, 126
    corruption, 77
    cultural impotency, 5, 6, 33, 119, 310, 651, 674, 1114 (*see also* pietism, and impotency)
    and discontinuity of Old and New Testaments, 633, 1209
    dispensationalism, 753, 1176–1177 (*see also* dispensationalism)
    earning judgment for culture, 657, 1005, 1021, 1288
    failure to deal with crime, 158, 1007, 1008
    failure to deal with sin, 1026
    false love of God, 167
    "higher" morality than God's Law, 1007, 1025, 1044, 1113–1114, 1209, 1338
    Holy Spirit's "leading," 133
    hostility toward historicity of Bible, 126
    joining of Christ's enemies, 131
    lawless grace, 1093 (*see also* grace and law)
    limiting Christ's lordship, 92, 464–465, 631, 651, 953, 1015, 1113–1114, 1129, 1209, 1439–1440
    origins of, 633–634
    and pietism, 119, 120, 162, 186, 657, 1093, 1209
    practical polytheism, 1439
    results in loss of culture, 638, 643, 657, 709, 753, 1007, 1008, 1026, 1044–1046, 1129
    results in the "Grand Inquisitor," 1044–1046
    and role of women, 633
    sentimentalism, 124–125, 167, 1008
    unchanged "converts," 467, 566, 953, 1008
    unconditional love, 959–962, 1219
    worldliness, 84, 1025
  vs. covenantalism, 12
  dividing God's Law into categories, 626, 947, 1161
  false view of God, 3–4, 5, 6, 14, 126–128
  God's Law exchanged for man's, 591–592, 632 (*see also* law, humanistic)
  as humanism, 586–587
  as legalistic and Pharisaical, 282, 323–325, 342–343, 591–592, 1336–1239
  limits all moral authority, 15, 281–282, 404, 591, 631
  a rejection of God Himself, 632, 1055–1056
  results in the culture
    anarchy, 131, 184, 188, 314, 364–365, 498, 748, 1113
    barbarism, 638–639
    child molestation and abuse, 272, 901–902 (*see also* abuse, child abuse)
    class warfare, 408, 866
    collapse of society, 38, 161, 162, 259, 313–317, 454–456, 498, 525–530, 623, 748, 750–751, 954, 1355
    crime, 280, 538–539, 807–808, 1010
    death as ultimate, 321–322
    debt, 157, 680–681
    economic crisis, 100–101, 713–714, 718–719
    elitist rule, 648
    escapism, 14, 1205–1206, 1215

existentialism, 382, 875, 879
intellectual paganism, 382
irresponsibility, 14, 210, 268, 807–808, 879
loss of community, 1355
love as redefined, 1322–1323, 1326
lower-class mentality, 879 (*see also* lower-class mentality)
marriage problems, 15 (*see also* marriage)
murder, 173, 272, 314, 433, 549–550, 1334
abortion (*see* abortion, result of antinomianism)
assassinations, 549
euthanasia, 272, 549, 1001–1002
"mercy-killings," 1001
suicide, 382, 385–386, 435, 527
nihilism and meaninglessness, 454–456, 538–539, 969
occultism, 180, 382, 415
psychopaths, 433–434
reconciliation without restitution, 93, 118
relativism, 535, 618, 621, 748, 969, 1020–1021, 1089
sexual crimes and perversions, 172, 764–769, 801, 875
adultery, 15, 20, 162, 323, 420, 753, 782, 824 (*see also* adultery)
bestiality, 272, 314, 488
homosexuality, 100, 272, 281, 488, 801
incest, 40, 272, 875
orgies, 875
pornography, 415
rape, 272, 433, 801, 1334 (*see also* abuse, sexual abuse)
slavery, 50, 1260–1261
statism, 328, 413–415, 529, 591, 624, 631, 643, 648, 993–994, 1037–1038, 1045, 1066, 1113 (*see also* statism)
theft, 272, 314, 993–994, 1334
theological ignorance, 162, 951
totalitarianism, 273, 413–415, 591, 1045
unholy communions, 1354
violence, 173, 314, 1010, 1031
welfarism, 314, 879
worldwide injustice, 618, 637, 650, 992, 993–994, 1007–1008, 1031, 1205–1206
youth in rebellion, 310–311, 435
and selective depravity, 414–415
as sin, 15, 177, 621, 1052, 1187, 1246–1247
Antioch, 1164
Antiochus Epiphanes, 5
antiwar protest, 309, 348, 760. *see also* international relationships, world peace
Antoinette, Marie, 766
anxiety, 1287–1288, 1291, 1297–1298, 1306, 1377
apocalyptic expectations, 435, 437, 1022, 1123, 1128. *see also* eschatology
apologetics
and critical analysis, 410 (*see also* critical analysis)
evidentialism, 427, 1163
presuppositionalist, 1432 (*see also* presuppositionalism)
"proving" the existence of God, 1163
rationalist, 152, 1432 (*see also* rationalism, in the church)
Apology of Justin Martyr, 1118
Aquarius, Age of, 446, 448
Aquila, 247, 1117
Aquinas, Thomas, 138, 248, 274, 394, 563, 683, 925
Arabia and Arabs, 473, 1035, 1036
Arabian Gulf, 876
Arabian Nights, The, 1372
archeology, 875–876
architecture, 142–146
church buildings, 139–141, 143, 145–146, 793–794
pride and status, 775–776
religious expression, 793–794
and statism, 142–143, 144, 752, 792
Ardrey, Robert, 768
Arens, William, 459
Argentina, 196, 553
Arianism, 207, 393–395, 1164. *see also* Arius
Aries, Philippe, 1374
Aristides, 1073
aristocracy. *see also* elitism
and agriculture, 853–855
"aristocracy of talent," 892, 1095
Biblical aristocracy, 1078
decadence and vices, 775–779, 791–792, 868–869
desire to supplant God, 458
early church conversions of nobility, 1117–1118
false reform by, 402
hatred of capitalism, 689, 777–778
as parasitical and non-working, 776–778, 868–869, 871

aristocracy *(cont'd.)*
resentment of, 1003
as ruler of lower classes, 39–40, 296
in the South, 506
Aristotle and Aristotelianism, 132, 393–394, 440, 476, 568, 577, 635–636, 683, 1049, 1167–1168, 1172, 1404
Arius, 393–394. *see also* Arianism
Arizona, 1060
Armenia and Armenians
Christianity in, 69, 1132, 1431–1432
and freedom, 653–654, 898, 1079
heritage of Rushdoony, 1304, 1429, 1438
immigration, 1243, 1436, 1446
language, 785, 1419, 1433, 1434
long memory of, 494
persecution of, 500, 510, 1303–1304, 1379
proverbs of, 742
Arminianism
Arianism as, 395
commonalities with conspiracy theories, 1196
crisis of, 954
denial of sovereign grace, 569
discarding God's Law, 969, 978, 1007
and false teachings, 341
"fighting fundamentalists," 137
as moralism, 325
objection to Van Til's teachings, 579
reduction of Christ's role in salvation, 950, 951–952, 1179, 1187, 1247
supplanting Calvinism, 135, 570, 1238
arms business, 1033
Arndt, William F., 1400–1401
Arnim, Bettina von, 787
Arnold, Matthew, 155, 794
Aron, Raymond, 767
art. *see also* culture
an expression of culture, 795–797, 798–801
architecture (*see* architecture)
baroque art, 140, 441
and Christianity, 44, 139–141, 441, 793–794, 795–796, 1134–1135, 1217
dancing, 788–789, 795–796
and the free market, 142
humanistic
aesthetics as ultimate goal, 794
avant-garde, 468, 527
Bohemian, 43
as creation of reality, 798–801
and emotionalism, 926
and experimental living, 799–800, 926
governed by death, 218, 800–801
Hollywood, 45, 1261
and Marxism, 775–776
modern art, 775–776, 788–790, 801
and nihilism, 447, 451, 537–538, 800–801, 874, 969
opera, 144, 791, 1095
and order, 788
pursuit of ugliness, 527, 800–801
rebellion in, 41, 44, 185, 218, 321, 380, 787–790, 800–801, 926
as source of culture and religion, 749, 787–790, 795–797
spontaneity, 839
subsidized, 765–767, 788
literature (*see* literature)
music (*see* music)
artisans, Christian, 441, 793
artists, humanistic, 44, 441, 787–790
Arts and Media Conference, 561
Artzibashev, Michael, 435–436
Asaph, 954
asceticism, 136, 1271. *see also* pietism, perfectionism *vs.* holiness
Asia and Asiatics, 296, 309, 341, 454–455, 755, 814, 1069, 1087, 1094, 1123, 1142, 1228, 1270
assassinations, 381, 436, 460, 525, 549, 746, 964, 1212
Assyria, 189, 865, 921, 1079, 1273, 1285, 1383, 1384, 1388, 1415
astrology, 176, 449, 799, 882, 1081, 1118, 1404. *see also* magic and the occult
Athanasius, 449, 643, 1164, 1319
atheism
vs. agnosticism, 172
and anarchy, 539, 750
and autonomy, 281–282
and the economy, 694–695
and justice, 650, 1203
in most pagan religions, 389
and myth of neutrality, 463
organized atheism of state, 370, 413–415, 641–642, 694–695, 816, 985
practical atheism, 32, 59, 709, 1286, 1287, 1289, 1438
and property tax, 1258–1259
relativism, nihilism, meaninglessness, 531, 538–539, 694, 1203
and revolution, 435, 1203
athemitos, Greek, 521
Athens, 774, 1073, 1084
athletics. *see* sports

Athos, monks of, 586–587
Atomic Energy Commission, 237
atomic warfare. *see* nuclear warfare
atomistic man, 188. *see also* individualism
atonement, as defined, 97
atonement, false. *see also* false gospels
in classical paganism, 287–288, 745
Karma (*see* Karma)
moralism, 323–325
pagan child sacrifice, 287–288
replaced with love and feeling, 187, 288, 634, 1324
sadomasochism, 288, 799, 1108
and twentieth century mass murder, 288, 291, 296, 333–334 (*see also* class and social warfare, and selective depravity)
atonement by Christ
and antinomianism, 98, 1246–1247
and Christian goodwill, 842
and Christian Reconstruction, 289, 295, 376, 383, 579
and Christian suffering, 1212
common need of all men, 288, 379, 409, 480, 1189–1190, 1449–1450
and communion, 178
and dominion, 131, 189
and God's Law, 334, 653–655, 1013, 1324
and God's love, 97, 1390–1392
and God's providence, 1391
as High Priest, 110, 1406
and His Lordship, 10, 18, 237, 285, 333, 376, 586
and judgment of God, 1180, 1324
and justification, 1179–1183
as "not God's first plan," 1176–1177
for Old Covenant believers, 1182
our Redeemer, 1390–1392
and peace, 1386
for personal sin, 295
as the second Adam (*see* New Adam, the)
and society, 97–99, 289, 333–334, 654–655
and capital punishment, 653–655
and law, 99, 289, 632, 652
and restitution, 653–655, 1013
starting place for ethics, 578–579
atonement tax, 108
Augustine, 132, 470, 570, 605, 746, 943–944, 970, 1222, 1354
Augustinianism, 110, 570
Augustus, 981
Aurelian, 746
Aurora, 663–664
Australia, 47, 225, 1338
Australian Christian Reconstruction, 682
authentically human, 417
authority
vs. anarchy, 20–23, 32, 45–46, 269–270 (*see also* anarchy, rejection of God's authority)
the authority crisis, 184, 206, 266–267, 328–329, 437–438, 538–540, 927, 969
in the church (*see* church government, authority and discipline)
vs. equalitarianism, 21 (*see also* equalitarianism [egalitarianism])
in the family (*see* family, authority and headship)
and interdependence, 269
in the state (*see* civil government)
submission and maturation, 149, 1121, 1361–1365
total hatred of, 437
authority, Biblical
basic to social order, 20, 22, 37, 266, 329, 356, 673
blessings of Christian authority, 20, 1004
Christian work and liberty, 20, 174–175, 369–370
corruption of headship doctrine, 375
decentralized, 108 (*see also* decentralization)
established by holy fear, 1276
faith and force, 26, 37
and freedom, 20
God's authority as absolute, 1171
bringing state under God's Law, 589, 1011, 1014–1015, 1023–1024, 1207
exclusively in terms of God's Law, 638–640
God as ultimate source of authority, 21, 22, 45–46, 59, 194, 538, 638, 768, 1055–1056, 1107, 1158, 1276, 1361
instrument of God's government, 89
Lordship of Christ (*see* Lordship of Christ)
unconditional obedience to God alone, 1361, 1366
humility of servant leaders, 934, 1443, 1447
limits on man's authority, 194, 405, 673, 768, 1447
limits on the individual, 673
sinful and illegitimate authority figures, 671–672, 1362–1363
and truth, 26, 31

authority, humanistic, 438
bureaucratic, 121–122
coercion, 995–996, 1020, 1102, 1121, 1443
dominion over peoples, 994, 995–996, 1004, 1090–1091, 1100, 1114, 1443
established by unholy fear, 1276
imposed by naked force, 20, 25, 32, 184, 230, 263, 296, 378
strength in numbers, 1354
false authority of Satan, 34, 162, 312
and Marxism, 36, 43, 251, 305
Roman law, 69–71
as Satanic, 590–592
shift in West, 39–40, 44, 765, 823, 915, 1120
and sovereignty, 222
definition of law, 666–669, 1010
and doctrine of infallibility, 42–43
and immanence, 984–985
totalitarianism, 984, 994, 995–996, 1110, 1120
unconditional obedience, 1361, 1366
without a basis, 750, 1089, 1120
as above the law, 988–989
authority crisis, 184, 206, 266–267, 328–329, 437–438, 538–540, 927, 969
the collective replacing God, 59, 847, 1087–1092, 1274–1275, 1354
impossible union of autonomy and authority, 269–270
loss of Christian power, 1143–1144 (*see also* pietism, and impotency)
man's word replacing justice, 496–498, 995–996, 1121
Authorized Version of the Bible, 1220
auto, Greek, 1011
autocracy and dictatorship, 27, 28, 41, 214, 259, 442, 445, 448, 812, 818, 878, 879, 884, 917, 1022, 1142, 1338. *see also* despotism
autonomy
and atheism, 281–282
and authority, 269–270
as basic state of man, 404
and cowardice, 6
and culture of death, 321–322, 811, 835, 1001–1002
denial of right and wrong, 1011
ends in hell, 271, 415, 523–524, 768, 804
ends in slavery of the masses, 625, 1114
as "freedom" in humanism, 318–319, 375–376, 449, 1021
goal of utopian humanism, 1045
in law (*see* law, humanistic, autonomy)
meaninglessness and nihilism, 135, 322, 457, 1430
and the occult, 180
and the original sin, 9, 15, 37, 199, 1052–1053
overcome by Christ, 10, 285, 333, 376
promoted by the Church, 625
and psychopaths, 376, 433–434
and rights, 9
of Satan, 15, 37, 252, 621
sinful in all classes, 338
vs. theonomy, 567, 572, 578–579, 626–627, 1025, 1114
total collapse of civilization, 313–317, 318–322, 331, 434, 618, 1010
autonomy, meaning, 623, 626, 1011
autopsies as mandatory, 999
Avery, second mate on the *Aurora,* 663–664
A World in Debt (Tilden), *709, 713–714*
Azerbaijan, 1303

B

Baal, 26, 515, 598–599, 600, 604, 640, 673, 1011, 1017, 1091, 1315
Baal, meaning, 598
Babel. *see* Tower of Babel
Babson, Roger, 688, 1226
Babylon and Babylonians, 142, 189, 465, 757, 902, 1049, 1109, 1273, 1274, 1404–1405
Bach, Johann Sebastian, 540, 1220
Bacon, Francis, 362, 363, 617
Bacon, James, 1285
Bailey, Foster, 446
Baker, Elliot, 364
Baker, Robert, 699
Baker, Samuel, 1143
Bakewell, Robert, 853
Bakunin, 435, 497
Balbus, Lucius, 981
Baldwin, Neil, 921
Balewa, Sir Abubakar Tafawa, 230
Balkans, 1303
Ball, John, 368–369
Ball, William B., 584, 606
Ball and Skelly, 584
Bamboo Curtain, 1069
Banfield, Edward C., 845, 847
Bank controversy, U.S., 49
banking, 16, 49, 144, 297, 718, 821, 892, 1067–1068. *see also* economy

baptism. *see also* sacraments
accreditation as statist form of, 931
baptismal creeds, 938
child dedication, 905–906
of children, 1184, 1186–1188, 1190–1191
of the Holy Spirit, 1184
limited as church sacrament, 1185, 1187
and need for regeneration, 905, 1189–1190
as purification, 1184–1185
and regeneration, 1187
sacerdotalism, 1187
sign of the Messianic age, 1184–1185
as sign of victory, 1184–1185, 1186–1188
Baptists, 156, 1160, 1203
barbarian, defined, 834
barbarism and rootlessness
among rebellion youth, 272–273, 320, 328, 786, 829–830
and art, 795–797
Christian conversion of barbarians, 1120–1121
as "freedom," 796, 887, 1034, 1052–1053
frustration with others, 1282
homelessness of modern soul, 803–804
and individualism, 314–316, 320
and instant gratification, 860
and rationalistic reform, 402
rejection of history, 834–835, 882–883
result of antinomianism, 638–639
result of modern statism, 1091
in society, 193, 211, 220, 313–317, 431–432, 750, 915
and spontaneity, 838–839
and state education, 881
in war, 1034
Barbary pirates, 490
Baritz, Loren, 1230
Barlaam, 587
Barna, George, 277
Barth, Karl, 305, 306, 462, 565, 633
Barty-King, Hugh, 683–684
Barzini, Luigi, 1068
basil, meaning, 145
basilicas, 145, 793–794. *see also* architecture, church buildings
Basques, the, 24, 494, 873, 1079, 1243
Bates, Ernest Sutherland, 541
Bathsheba, 307, 814
"Battle Hymn of the Republic, The," 948
Baumer, Franklin L., 482
bdelktos, Greek, 521
Bean, Philip, 1338
Beebe, Lucius, 1174
Beethoven, Ludwig von, 787–790
behaviorism, 1080, 1099. *see also* Skinner, B. F.
Bell, Daniel, 767, 1091
Bell, Don, 702, 759
Bellamy, Joseph, 1239–1241
Bello, Sir Ahmado, 231
Bellotti, Felice, 662–663
Bellow, Saul, 969
Bennett, Chester C., 761
Bentham, Jeremy, 747
Bentley, 442
Berger, Arthur Asa, 785–786
Beria, Lavrentiy, 324
Berkeley, George, 425
Berkeley High School, 760
Berkeley University, 390, 559, 1085
Bernardino of Siena, 91
Bernard of Cluny, 1087
Berryman, John, 799
bestiality, 272, 314, 488, 626
Bethlehem, 105, 902, 1401, 1404, 1405
betrothal, 1394–1395
"Better Red than dead," 612
Beverly Hills, 1004, 1084
Beyond Freedom and Dignity (Skinner), 1080, 1099
Bezaleel, 427
Bibby, Geoffrey, 875–876
Bible. *see also* Old and New Testaments
banning of, 202, 643, 1399, 1415
"bibliolatry," 112, 127
as comprehensive in application, 1159–1160, 1168–1169, 1216–1218, 1217–1218
made irrelevant, 410–411
pietistic limitations upon, 166, 462, 1159–1160, 1217–1218 (*see also* pietism)
as totally binding, 1366
criticism, 151–153, 624, 1196, 1249, 1397, 1399 (*see also* critical analysis)
given to every believer, 1172
application as goal of study, 411
ignorance of, 166, 173, 1253, 1277 (*see also* theological ignorance)
lazy study of, 1277, 1299
memorization of, 1299, 1434
neglect of, 1253
reading as a moral act, 1161, 1206, 1222–1223
reforming power of, 1091–1092, 1160–1161, 1223

Bible *(cont'd.)*
inerrancy of Scripture, 137–138, 151–153, 1157–1158
infallibility of Scripture, 152, 939, 1157–1158
inspiration of Scripture, 12, 1366
interpretation of,
anti-historicity, 132, 133
as divided (*see* Old and New Testaments)
Gnostic, 396
mythological character, 126, 461
and patristic symbolism, 572
plain meaning of the text, 1172–1173
as "poetic," 127
symbolism, 127, 133, 1172, 1253
offense of, 1160, 1219–1221
vs. other religious works, 11–12
sufficiency of Scripture, 1015, 1172
Textus Receptus (Received Text), 153–154, 569
wrong use of, 1161
Bible Belt, 953
Biblical Law. *see* Law of God
Big Brother, 229, 819, 1061
big organizations, 1264
Bilezikian, Angel, 1304
Bilezikian, James, 1304
Bingham, Joseph, 1260
biological and chemical warfare, 754–755. *see also* war
Birch, John, 759–760
Birchism, 760
birth control, 227, 243, 650. *see also* abortion
birthday celebrations, 1411, 1412, 1414–1415, 1422
Birth of Venus (painting), 183
birth rates, 210, 585, 650. *see also* population control
Bishop Pike, 391
Bismarck, 254
Bithynia, 738
bitterness, 1085, 1351–1353
Black Death, 367, 754–755
Black issues. *see also* racism
anti-black movements, 353–354
black as the evil race (*see* selective depravity)
black culture, 740, 1079–1080
black violence, 187, 1085
"civil-rights" revolution, 353–354, 1079–1080
in Congo, 662–663
and environmentalism, 208
eradication from education, 774
family culture, 847
ghettos, 1079
humanism in black leadership, 861
liberal favor for lawless blacks, 44, 45, 432
minority quotas, 1095 (*see also* minorities)
in Old West, 1279
racial reparations, 759–761
segregation and desegregation, 27, 121, 865–866, 965–966, 1079
voting blocs, 1079–1080
Black Mass, 179–180
Black Panthers, 819, 1079, 1081
Blackstone, William, 666
Blake, William, 838
blasphemy, 120, 129–131, 167, 342, 399, 513, 662, 694, 1045, 1177, 1212, 1227, 1255–1256, 1310
blessings from God
and covenantal faithfulness, 678, 880, 1268–1269, 1274–1275
expected despite sinfulness, 167, 1255–1256, 1271
framework for understanding history, 1321, 1400–1401
old age, 1435
trials as (*see* trials and God's blessing)
wealth as (*see* wealth, as a blessing)
Bligh, William, 541
Blumert, Burton, 258, 264
Bobgan, Deidre, 176
Bobgan, Martin, 176
Bob Jones University, 48, 606, 950
Bob Jones University case, 1048
Boccaccio, Giovanni, 111, 1361
Bodin, Jean, 419
Boethius, 1121
Bohemian art, 43, 44. *see also* art, humanistic
Bohn, Henry, 932
Boisen, Anton, 1345
boldness. *see* courage and boldness
Bolivia, 196
Bolshevik revolution. *see* Russian Revolution
Bonaparte, Napoleon. *see* Napoleon
Bonaventure, St., 1121
Book of Mormon, 12, 152. *see also* Mormonism
Book of the Three Habitations (St. Patrick), 746
Books of Homilies, The Two, 1220–1221
Borden, W.W., 1251
borders, national, 271
Bordier, Roger, 850
boredom, 776, 836–837. *see also* work
Borgia, Caesar, 399

Borgias, the, 1201
"born again." *see* salvation, as powerful, rebirth
Boston, 204, 1009
Boston, Thomas, 841
Boston University School of Law, 667
Botticelli, Sandro, 183
boundaries, 274, 1084, 1166
Bounty mutiny, 541
Bourbon style, 775
bourgeois, 57, 764, 766–767, 777–778, 864, 883
brain-trust concept, 39
brainwashing, 291, 494–495, 596, 1354
"branches" of the Vine, 1449
Brandt, William J., 457
Brant, Joseph, 886
Brazil, 1444
Breasted, James Henry, 774
Brezhnev, Leonid, 467, 1040
Bridgeman, Orlando, 43
Bristol, Mark L., 500
Britain. *see* Great Britain
British systematic theology, 1433
Britons, 24, 216
Brooklyn Dodgers, 965–966
Brothers Karamazov, The (Dostoyevsky), 1044
Brower, Charles H., 714
Brown, John, 260, 261, 479, 1022
Brown, Robert McFee, 759–760
Bruning, Heinrich, 306
Brussof, Valery, 364–365
Bryan, John, 926
Bryant, Sir Arthur, 367, 369, 370
bubonic plague, 754–756
Buchanan, James, 1264
Buddhism, 200, 201, 203, 277, 372, 389, 455, 527, 534, 538, 597, 603
budget, defined, 727
budgets and debt, 727–728
Buis, Henry, 543
Bullock, Allen, 408
bullying, 6. *see also* abuse
bureaucracy
  and funding, 728, 731, 732–733
  government by, 121–122, 222–224, 608, 629, 694, 1023, 1028, 1030, 1067–1069, 1075, 1083, 1119
  and management, 320–321
  and the "rights" of man, 222–224
Bureau of Internal Revenue. *see* Internal Revenue Service (IRS)
Burger, Chief Justice, 309–310
Burgess, John W., 666–667
Burgon, Dean, 151
Burgon, John William, 569
Burke, Edmund, 198, 215, 306, 767
Burma, 1203
Burns, Arthur, 1073
Burroughs, Edgar Rice, 431–432
Burroughs, William, 448
Bush, George, 86, 684, 1007, 1370
business. *see also* economics
  agriculture (*see* agriculture)
  arms business, 1033
  big business, 16, 213, 244, 702, 1029, 1264
  a calling under God, 444, 689, 776, 1102, 1146
  in Calvin's Geneva, 113
  and debt, 157, 701–702
  decapitalization (*see under* wealth)
  delight in, 776
  distrust of industry, 750, 777–779
  entrepreneurship, 122, 604, 689–690, 863–864 (*see also* risk)
  family business, 900, 993, 997
  funding Christian work, 1110 (*see also* giving and charity)
  handcrafts *vs.* mass production, 777–779
  industry as ruling class, 766, 777–779, 863–867
  investments, 677–678
  just prices, 683
  labor
    and Biblical submission, 1364
    civil rights laws, 1079
    and the conflict of interests, 1028–1029 (*see also* class and social warfare)
    delight in work, 776
    demand for perfection, 359
    dishonesty and theft, 821–822
    favoritism, 1095
    free *vs.* slave labor, 1022 (*see also* slavery)
    industrialists, 213
    job creation, 113
    the Peter principle, 320–321
    "sensitivity training," 176
    state guaranteed employment, 213
    strikes, 855
    unions, 16–17, 359, 603
      "Big Labor," 16, 1264
      Labor politicians, 192
    wages and inflation, 100
    worker as inherently virtuous, 293
  management, 321
  oil companies, 297, 1062–1063

business *(cont'd.)*
and "positive thinking," 176–177
profit *vs.* non-profit, 685
and progress, 851–852
salesmanship, 176
and statism, 122, 604, 995, 997, 1090 (*see also* economics, statist involvement)
statistics, 231
subsidies (*see* subsidies)
success (*see* success)
technology (*see* technology)
tithing (*see* tithing)
wealth (*see* wealth)
Byron, Lord, 280, 838
Byzantium and Byzantines, 474, 1003

C

Caesar. *see* Rome, as governing body
Caesar, Augustus, 1389
Caesars and Saints: The Evolution of the Christian State (Perowne), 1151
Cage, John, 801, 874
Cahn, Edmond, 668
Cain, 98, 744, 849, 898
Calhoun, John C., 506
California
and abortion, 547–548, 617
civil government in, 229, 547–548, 617, 721
education in, 240, 1132
farming in, 855
federal subsidy of, 1060
Fort Bragg, 267
Jamestown, 673
law enforcement in, 535, 761
lawsuits in, 25, 422
legislation in, 86, 547–548, 761
Palo Alto, 273
Ripon, 560
state flower of, 779
strikes in, 855
taxation in, 596, 1039
wages in, 855
California, Citizens for Law Enforcement Needs in, 535
California, State Board of Education of, 240
California Department of Industrial Relations, 86
California Franchise Tax Board, 596
California Public Health Department, 548
California Supreme Court, 535
Calleo, David P., 680
calling, vision, and vocation, 689, 917, 1217
applying the faith to every discipline, 1146
business as a calling under God, 444, 689, 776, 1102, 1146
and Christian contentment, 867
estate and calling (*see* estate and calling)
and God's protection, 872
as specifically Christian, 104, 807–809
work (*see* work)
Calvary Baptist Church, 596
Calvin, John
classical doctrine of the atonement, 289
commentaries, 163–164, 1179, 1318
delight in sports and games, 806
doctrine of man, 768
on the early church, 71
on the gospel, 743
influence on the Reformation, 91, 921, 1157
influence on the West, 394, 571
Kelly on, 163–164
on the law, 673
leader as teacher, 925
on necessity of the Bible, 1160–1162
opposition to, 173, 963, 975
precursor of Van Til, 565, 567–568
systematic teaching of, 163, 571
youth of, 1121
Calvin College, 562
Calvinism
civil religion as, 652
conversion to, 1138
as development of Augustinianism, 570
doctrine of God's sovereignty, 12, 135, 1301
doctrine of sin and depravity, 1128, 1368
growth of, 1131
influence in history, 570–571, 1237–1238
capitalism product of, 689
influence on Rushdoony, 1433
influence on Van Til, 562, 567–568
influence on Webster, 717
in the Reformation, 425
"is dead," 145, 926
moral antithesis, 509
opposition to, 571, 975
priority of God's law-word, 1301
reduction of, 112
and the Reformed faith, 1157–1162, 1429–1430
and amillennialism, 944
Arianism disguised as, 395
leaders of, 506–507, 570

and postmillennialism, 570
Presbyterians, 120
regional varieties of, 265
Cambodia, 309, 485, 510
Cambridge, 947
campaigns, donating to, 1127
Campanella, Tommaso, 362
Campbell, Charles L., 696
Campbell, Jeremy, 928
Campus Crusade, 564
Camus, Albert, 179, 415, 469, 787
Canell, Edward J., 568
cannibalism, 231, 350, 459–460, 491, 1064
Canterbury Tales, 94–95, 990
Canute, 424
capitalism (free market). *see also* business; economics
and anarchism (*see* economy, anarchy in)
and character, 688–689, 846–847, 1242
and competition, 805, 1242
decay of, 122, 688, 694–695, 696, 1029
and decentralization, 694–695, 1062–1063, 1098–1099–1102
development of Christian faith, 122, 688–689
growth of cities, 319
hated by aristocrats, 777–778
hated by intellectuals, 777–779, 1101–1102
laissez-faire, 237, 238, 239, 330, 531, 693–695
and law and order, 694–695, 984–985
libertarian free market, 31, 984
masquerade of fascism, 1039
problems in, 482, 682–683, 984–985, 1029, 1062–1063
and prosperity, 226, 699, 1242
protecting the free market, 648, 689–690, 695
and subsidies, 122
as too dangerous, 1062–1063
victim mentality and, 834
viewed as source of evil, 248, 324, 343, 423, 442, 648, 777, 805, 812, 821, 1282, 1284
war against, 648
capitalization. *see also* decapitalization
and authority, 22
and character, 918, 1270
and future-orientation, 853–856, 897–898, 918
and inheritance, 897–898
and progress, 1030
revival of, 691–692
as wealth, 687–690, 691–692
and wisdom, 688, 691–692
and work, 679, 687, 688, 691, 776, 846, 861, 918, 1004, 1005, 1053, 1282, 1284
capital punishment
for abortion, 546–547
basic to human action, 293 (*see also* selective depravity)
for child rapists, 228
and Christ's atonement, 653–655
failure to exact, 673
and God's Law, 653–655, 1001
and human rights, 26
for incorrigible criminals, 84, 653, 1014
restricted to civil government, 898, 916
Capone, Al, 523
Cardonnel, Father, 187
Carey, William, 216
Cargo Cult, 1255
Carib Indians, 491
Carlyle, Thomas, 442–443
Carnap, Rudolf, 1164
Carnegie, Andrew, 694, 1029
Carnegie, Dale, 176
Carnell, Edward J., 426, 564, 568, 577
Carnes, Conrad D., 780
Carter, James G., 54, 327, 877
Cartesianism. *see* Descartes and Cartesianism
Carthage, 1033, 1117–1118
Carto, W.A., 814
Case, Raymond, 602
caste system, 852. *see also* elitism
Castiglione, Baldassare, 791, 869
castration, 801, 905, 944, 1186
Castro, Fidel, 883
catechisms
systematic theology, 1230 (*see also* systematic theology)
teaching of, 573, 913
Westminster Larger, 392, 1159, 1230
Westminster Shorter, 98, 220, 342, 444, 840, 1230
Catherine of Aragon, 765
catholicity or universality, 112, 345
Caucasus mountains, 1303
causality
causation and humanistic science, 270, 275, 396, 1118
in covenantalism, 678–679
denied in humanism, 789, 834, 879
celebrities, 145
Celine, Louis-Ferdinand, 537
Celts, 24, 774
Centralia, 480
Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), 891

Ceylon, 1332–1333
Chalcedon, Council of, 129, 130, 1096, 1136, 1448–1450, 1463
Chalcedon Foundation
and dominion theology, 1232
on families and education, 912
friends of, 991, 995
history of, 1438–1440, 1441–1443, 1448–1450
premise of, 1137, 1146, 1439
purpose of, 847, 1112, 1344, 1430, 1438–1440, 1441–1443, 1448–1450, 1463
and Rushdoony, 588, 727
staff of, 1429
support of, 1126, 1127, 1201–1202, 1439–1440, 1443, 1444, 1446–1447
work of, 695, 724, 1441–1443, 1444, 1446–1447, 1463
Chalcedon Report, 1130, 1132, 1140, 1214
Chaldeans, 1180
Chambers, Whittaker, 1385
change, 49–50, 851–852
character
and capitalization, 918, 1270
care of widows and orphans as test, 1000
vs. cowardice, 911
education and training, 161, 1344
and freedom, 161, 968
and the free market, 688–689, 846–847, 1242
and generational discipline, 758, 911–912
and God's grace, 911
vs. intellectualism, 1344
of males, 847
and the media, 688
and the police, 761–762, 782
and politicians, 161, 488, 752, 878, 960, 1136
and society, 161, 316, 591–592
and status, 1078
charismatic movement, 119, 165, 426
charity. *see* giving and charity; poverty, and Christian duty
"charity" in place of law, 28, 133
Charles I, 28, 43, 789, 988–989, 1143
Charles II, 90, 104, 754, 988
Charles V, 870–871
Charnofsky, Michael, 459
Chastelard, 300
Chaucer, Geoffrey, 94–95, 96, 990
Cheetham, Samuel, 1443
chemical and biological warfare, 754–755
Chenghis Khan, 548–549
Cheval, Louisa, 459
Chicago, 209, 234, 309, 770, 771
Chief Joseph, 886
child abuse. *see under* abuse
Child Development Center in New York, 253
child molestation. *see* abuse, child abuse
children. *see also* family
abortion (*see* abortion)
abuse of (*see* abuse, child abuse)
birth control, 227, 243, 650
child-control by Biblical family, 897–898, 916–918, 1404
child-control by state, 897–898, 901, 905, 973, 1338
childbearing limited by state, 917
failure of state custody, 902
"health" homes for children, 595–596
psychiatric testing for future crime, 310
state schooling (*see* education in humanism)
statist experimentation, 253
child-sacrifice, 904–906
covenant children, 18, 1433
baptism of, 1184, 1186–1188, 1190–1191
dedication rites, 904–906
hope of Christian parents, 1190–1191
and debt, 1273
discipline, 405, 839, 840, 884, 887, 1310, 1320, 1357
education (*see* education in Christianity; education in humanism)
failure of parents, 901
child-oriented families, 786, 840, 887
enabling, 1255–1256
instant gratification, 840, 886–890
permissiveness, 886–890, 1255–1256, 1310
stealing children from God, 905
fatherhood (*see* fathers and fatherhood)
and the future, 908
inheritance (*see* inheritance)
as innocent by nature, 475, 476–478
motherhood (*see* mothers and motherhood)
myth of consent, 405
obedience to parents, 1320
ownership of, 905
priority of, 1359
rearing in "primitive" cultures, 840, 886–890
rebellious children, 320, 642, 1255–1256, 1266, 1310

salvation through, 476
sexual curiosity, 886–888
sheltering, 628
slavery of, 1338
suicide among young children, 978
taught to love work, 856, 887
"women and children first," 810–811
Children's Bill of Rights, 477
Children's Crusade, 476, 1083
Children's Day, 909
children's rights movement, 199, 270, 271, 477, 1055
Children's Welfare Bureau, 542
Chile, 687, 715
Chilton, David, 70, 1344
China and Chinese
ancient China, 527, 921, 1109
Christians in, 1303
economics, 705
Nixon's policy for, 613
Old China, 143, 372, 657
philosophy in, 277, 852–853
Red China
"children's crusade," 1083
humanism of, 668
hypocrisy in, 481
and myth of consent, 405
one-child policy, 650, 917
persecution in, 342
power of, 17, 365, 500, 657
problems in, 225–226, 326, 650, 656, 657, 755–756, 775
the Red Guard, 761–762, 1083
slave state, 603
utilized authoritarian culture, 21
as utopian hope, 1075–1076
stagnation of society, 851–852
Chinafication of America, 657
Chisholm, Anne, 830
Christ. *see* Jesus Christ
"Christendom"
collapse of, 448, 620, 759, 894
division from humanism, 183–184, 188
duties in the life of, 199
education thriving in, 939
failures of, 105, 132, 138, 446, 464, 932, 935, 937, 1209
history of, 222, 473, 1120 (*see also* the History Index)
languages of, 274
legal system of, 632, 1047
Levitical functions in, 54
nihilistic opposition to, 437
rebuilding and restoration of, 289, 501, 803, 1033, 1116
sports in, 805–806
Christianity and Liberalism (Machen), 1223
Christian Law Association, 584
Christian Manifesto, 970
Christian responsibility. *see* responsibility of Christians
Christian schools. *see under* education in Christianity
Christian Schools of Ohio (CSO), 606–607
Christian Zionism, 1175
Christmas
December 25, 1408, 1411
de-Christianizing, 1413, 1422
and the early church, 1408–1409, 1412, 1422
evergreen Christmas tree, 1408, 1410, 1419, 1432
Jesus as a babe, 9, 1391–1392, 1424
joy of triumph, 1386, 1388, 1409, 1412, 1417, 1419–1420, 1422
the manger, 1421
music of, 1392–1393, 1409, 1413, 1415, 1417, 1422, 1424
as pagan, 1408, 1410, 1412, 1414
poem, 1421
and the Puritans, 1408
Santa Claus, 1432
the song of the angels, 1392
the Wise Men, 1404, 1412, 1414, 1422
Christology, 1448
Christopher, St., 477
Chrysostom, John, 642, 1260
church
abuse in (*see* abuse, in the church)
as army of God, 73, 78–79, 110, 124, 175
as Christ's steward, 131
and the Dominion Mandate, 1232–1233
need for the Holy Spirit, 1164–1165, 1226
peaceful conquest, 76–77
as productive, 685
prophetic role, 597, 642, 1226, 1370
and social order, 174–175, 184
attendance, 361
as the Body of Christ, 130, 1449
continuity through OT and NT, 54, 68, 88–89, 792, 1443
corruption of (*see* church as corrupted)
as defined, 67–68, 109–110, 129–131, 1358, 1449

church *(cont'd.)*
denominations (*see* specific denominations and groups)
disunity in (*see* disunity in the church)
parachurch ministries, 685, 1109, 1127, 1147–1148 (*see also* specific organizations)
sacraments, 109, 438 (*see also* baptism; communion)
as the family of God, 69–71, 1368
high-church ecclesiology, 571–572
house church, 793–794, 1367
jurisdictional boundaries
an area of government, 917, 1078
discipline procedure, 1366–1367
embassy of Christ, 87
jurisdiction explained, 1110
limited but Christ is not, 1151
ministerial not legislative, 130, 131, 1368
as ministry of grace, 1093
not to be controlled by state, 1078, 1109–1110
liturgy, 53, 143, 163, 207, 1374–1375
membership and congregations
attempts to reform from within, 814
confirmation class, 572
congregation problems (*see under* church as corrupted)
leaving impotent churches, 803
and society, 247
music, 74–75, 120–121, 1392
persecution of (*see* persecution of the church)
preaching (*see* preaching)
programs, 72, 166
and the state (*see* religion and state)
tithing (*see* tithing)
welfare ministry (*see* welfare, and Christian duty)
to widows and orphans (*see* widows and orphans)
and youth, 186–187, 342–343, 418, 815, 1120–1121
Church, Gene, 780
church, meaning and etymology, 67, 925
church as corrupted
with bad leaders
clergymen corrupted, 48, 155–156, 157–158, 168–169, 390–391, 1065, 1128
false teachers, 117–118, 155–156, 157–158
feminized and sentimental, 156
homosexuality, 48
lack of vital preaching, 155–156, 168–169
revolutionary clergy, 390–391
soft on sin, 156, 157–158
theologically ignorant, 1128
church as a scape goat, 248
church when tolerated by the state, 9
with compromise (*see also* syncretism)
for acceptability, 138, 157–158, 177
as debt-ridden, 680–681
for membership, 177
congregation problems
bitterness of hurt people, 1352
demand for perfection, 359, 1342–1343, 1344
demanding to be pleased, 1342–1343
empty professions, 101, 102–103, 167, 753, 953–954
gossip, 659, 1369
greed of churchmen, 611, 657
laziness of Christians, 102–103, 189, 586, 611, 1126–1127, 1277, 1299, 1345, 1423
minimal giving of Christians, 83, 102, 732, 1126–1127, 1261, 1446 (*see also* giving and charity)
passivism and complacency, 245, 351
pettiness replacing service to Christ, 1341, 1342–1343
restless members, 361
victim congregation, 210
with false definition of itself, 67–68
attacking the faithful, 103
big churches, 1264
church as central priority, 82, 633, 1147–1148
church as man's salvation, 82, 1044, 1128
consumer-driven, 72–73, 74–75, 155–156, 177, 1044, 1277
reduced to a court, 1368
"relevant" Christianity, 1214
territorial of ministry, 1317
total inclusiveness, 203
trust in humanistic programs, 166, 1128–1130, 1169
with humanism
anarchy, 20
antinomianism (*see* antinomianism, in the church)
autonomy, 625
disguised as Christianity, 382
environmentalism, 1014

evolution, 396–397
existentialism, 120–121, 879
feminization, 48, 124–125, 156
and humanist presuppositions, 458, 540, 741, 753, 1044, 1114, 1128, 1232
medical model, 336–337
modernism, 120–121, 135, 221, 310, 380, 514, 542, 953
myth of neutrality, 464
operating paganism, 1223
present-oriented, 1304
psychological heresies, 336–337 (*see also* counseling)
rationalism, 13
relativism, 1170–1171
in the Renaissance, 183
suicidal nature of humanism, 186–189, 1122
with pietism (*see* pietism)
with poor theology
abstractionism and analysis, 410–411
"don't be judgmental," 1335
escapism, 1175–1177
and eschatology, 174–175, 753, 949, 1241 (*see also* eschatology, pessimistic)
in evangelism, 186
experimentalism, 120
and the question of predestination, 457, 978–982
redefinitions, 183, 186–187
rejection of dominion mandate, 950, 1114, 1224–1225, 1232–1233, 1329
sacerdotalism, 1187
theological decay, 458, 556, 573, 695, 1004, 1122, 1129, 1232, 1277, 1335
theological ignorance, 162, 173, 186, 1004, 1128, 1232, 1277
with pride
contempt for the Holy Spirit, 1164–1165
idealism, 1226
instant gratification *vs.* growth, 1199–1200, 1295–1296
legalism, 81
Phariseeism, 310, 1220, 1346 (*see also* Pharisees and Phariseeism)
self-centeredness, 1126–1127, 1146, 1150, 1197, 1206, 1301, 1446
self-will, 375
territorial of ministry, 1317
with sentimentalism, 634, 657
and antinomianism, 124–125, 167, 1008
centrality of faith, 75, 1337
centrality of salvation experience, 136, 466, 648
emotionalism, 124–125, 173, 426, 428, 1342
feelings before God's Law, 73, 120–121, 166, 173
"God is no buttercup," 1219–1221, 1303
human-centredness, 165–167, 186–189, 252, 648
idealism, 1226
needs before God's Law, 73, 74, 78–79, 140, 166, 266, 599, 638, 648, 1044
personal security replacing service to Christ, 1115
in prayer, 1308, 1312
reducing faith to moralism, 22, 104, 177
relativism and "sensitivity," 962, 1044
relieving stress as goal, 136, 1044, 1290
selective obedience, 301, 1355
with sexual sins
and antinomianism (*see* antinomianism, in the church)
erroneous celibacy of Christians, 944–945
homosexuality, 48, 158
with statism, 694, 1014–1015, 1026, 1128
democracy, 143, 145, 156, 599–600
a humanist world church, 594
Marxism, 388, 390–391, 760
revolution, 186–187, 244, 759–760, 1137 (*see also* revolution, and Christianity)
socialism, 149, 611, 694–695
with superficiality
"easy believism," 110, 136, 177, 1215, 1224–1225
empty professions, 101, 102–103, 167, 753, 953–954
forms replacing service to Christ, 183, 633–634
Jesus to make life better, 136, 1115
minimal faith, 589, 953, 1115
negation replacing faith, 1115
refreshing disgust, 1327–1330
respectable "Christianity," 1318
studied lukewarmness, 282

church as corrupted *(cont'd.)*
with totalitarianism and abuse, 238 (*see also* abuse, in the church)
church as infallible, 1367
controlling ministry, 1447
controlling women, 69–70
control through bylaws, 148, 1337
false incarnation doctrine, 131, 1449
imperialism, 68, 70
the Inquisition, 1044, 1047–1048
legalism and perfectionism, 80–81, 148–150, 1337
power blocs, 16
reconciliation without restitution, 93, 118
and rejection of the Holy Spirit, 1164–1165
unconditional submission demanded, 1361–1362, 1366–1368
usurping place as man's hope, 1044
church buildings, 139–141, 342, 1329–1330
church government
authority and discipline
bureaucratization, 69–70
denied and overthrown, 21, 38
influence of Rome, 69–70
as part of "the Establishment," 308
power grew faster than understanding, 134
replaced by state, 220
totalitarianism and abuse (*see under* church as corrupted)
courts
of arbitration, 76
church as reduced to a court, 1368
controlling women, 69–70
instrument of God's government, 77
local government, 76
organization
administrative work, 170–171
diaconate, 69–71, 107–110, 115
pastoral duties, 170–171
church history. *see also* the History Index
early church (*see* early church)
forgotten battles and victories, 610
medieval church (*see* medieval era, church)
Church of Armenia, 1431
Church of England, 1220
"Church of World Brotherhood," 202
Cicero, 981–982
Cilicia, 602
cinema, the, 144–145, 791–792. *see also* films
circumcision, 408, 905, 931, 1186
cities, 319, 744–751, 754–757, 770–772, 800–801, 849–852, 878, 1007, 1078–1079
citizenry
abuse of (*see also* slavery of the masses)
concentration camps, 407, 1002
controlled by state, 976–977, 1029–1030 (*see also* statism)
dissenters as insane, 409
as "enemies" of state, 219, 973, 997, 1037, 1069, 1091
murdered by state, 483, 485
20th century mass murders, 9–10, 293–295, 326, 399, 500, 510–511, 747, 841, 984, 1002, 1032, 1033, 1075
as "rabble," 296
slave labor camps, 9, 184, 248–249, 452, 1002, 1007, 1020, 1037, 1066
Christian duty (*see* politics, and Christian duty)
civil disobedience, 39, 367–368, 497
civil government as dependent upon, 269
class warfare (*see* class and social warfare)
duties to country, 1358–1360
failures of,
demand for perfection, 359
and evil rulers, 1363
faith in statism, 25–26, 28–29, 219, 877–880, 1201
impotent Christianity, 102
lawlessness of citizens and statism, 219, 354 (*see also* antinomianism, results in the culture, statism)
reflected in politics, 526, 878, 893, 965, 1051
wanting socialist benefits without controls, 26, 267, 611, 819, 879, 1112, 1266
Western abandonment of theology, 368
worship of the state, 598, 643, 904, 1028, 1055, 1123, 1136
freedom of (*see* freedom)
frustrations with the state, 738, 991, 996, 1010, 1029–1030, 1080–1081, 1082–1086, 1087, 1094, 1119
disillusionment and revolt, 26, 28–29, 436–439, 512–516, 526, 556
as hostile toward rulers, 1090
unrepentant self-pity of, 824–825
voting and elections (*see* voting and elections)
Citizens for Law Enforcement Needs, 535

citizenship, 745, 747, 753, 803, 849, 905, 1117, 1358, 1389, 1397
citizenship, etymology, 849
city life. *see* cities
city of Enoch, 744
City of God (Augustine), 605, 746
"City of God," 744, 746–748. *see also* society when Christian
civil government. *see also* statism
and Christian duty (*see* politics, and Christian duty)
citizenry (*see* citizenry)
elections and voting (*see* voting and elections)
forms of civil government, 39
aristocracy (*see* aristocracy)
autocracy (*see* autocracy and dictatorship)
bureaucratic (*see* bureaucracy, government by)
communism (*see* communism)
democracy (*see* democracy)
despotic (*see* despotism)
dictatorship (*see* autocracy and dictatorship)
fascism (*see* fascism)
feudalism (*see* feudalism)
libertarianism (*see* libertarianism)
Marxism (*see* Marxism)
monarchy (*see* monarchy)
oligarchy (*see* oligarchy)
republic (*see* republican government)
socialism (*see* socialism)
theocracy (*see* theocracy)
jurisdiction (*see also* law)
dependence on citizens, 269
duty to submit to Christ, 32, 194, 245–246, 250–251, 1014–1015, 1107, 1109–1110, 1371
accountability for rulers, 433–434, 642, 1087
as agent of "common grace," 624
greater culpability, 370
limited in Christianity, 1109–1112 (*see also* authority, Biblical)
as ministry of justice, 55, 211, 673, 1010, 1029, 1093–1097, 1110, 1127
to punish actual sins, 628
as terror to evildoers, 604–605
functions
capital punishment, 898, 916
courts (*see* courts)
executive, 95 (*see also* specific presidents)
intervening magistrates, 673
law enforcement (*see* law enforcement)
legislatures, 1017, 1050, 1102, 1128 (*see also* specific bodies)
local governments, 995
police (*see* police)
as part of the "Establishment," 308
abdication of true authority (*see under* statism)
denied and overthrown, 21, 27, 38 (*see also* anarchy, the authority crisis)
establishment of religion (*see under* religion and state)
involvement in economics (*see* economics, statist involvement)
justification of authority, 24–29
Western and Eastern view contrasted, 1087–1088
civil government, usage, 107, 1442
civilization, 94, 183–185, 188, 193, 214, 231, 289, 296, 317, 322, 337, 340, 349, 353, 363, 373, 381–383, 432, 452–453, 919–922
civil religion, 88–89, 651–652
civil religion, defined, 88–89
Civil Rights Act, 603
civil rights movement, 160, 241, 353, 603, 965–966
Civil War (American), 479–480, 493, 505–509, 1022–1023, 1034, 1258
Clark, George, 490
Clark, Gordon, 565, 1101, 1158
Clarke, Suzanne, 650
class and social warfare
castes, 654, 852, 893
vs. community, 850–852, 1004–1005, 1029–1030
conflict of interests as essential, 41, 196, 506–507, 509, 821, 864, 1022, 1027–1031
cultivated by evangelists, 341
envy as central, 668, 863–867, 1003–1005, 1073, 1084
hatred of all classes, 723
minorities (*see* minorities)
and present-orientation, 863–867
promoted by statists, 1029–1030
racism (*see* racism)
result of antinomianism, 408, 866
rich and poor, 248–249
rootlessness and cynicism, 1282

class and social warfare *(cont'd.)*
and selective depravity, 122, 290, 293–294, 296, 333–334, 342, 368–369, 414–416, 632, 764, 777
and selective rationality, 408, 458
shifting of authority, 39–40, 423, 458, 1003
shifting of elite loyalties, 441–442
and sovereignty of man, 41, 423, 458
unequal society produced by Marxism, 192, 458, 1005 (*see also* Marxism)
classes, 442–443
in America, 1431
God working with the lowly, 1388, 1400
governing class, 891–894
homosexuals as a class, 1136
lower class, 845–848, 852, 853–856, 860, 863–867, 873–876, 877–880, 881–884, 886, 1125
middle class, 319, 443, 723, 765, 791, 817, 838, 1070, 1071, 1124, 1126–1127, 1264, 1281
non-working, 1284–1286
parasitic, 881–884, 1000, 1281, 1285
poor class, 319, 338, 723, 767, 1264, 1431
powerful millionaires, 1264
privileged class, 1003–1005
rich class, 338, 339, 723, 725, 764, 775, 1000, 1126, 1281, 1431
study of class structure, 845–848
underground man, 829
upper class, 845–848, 853–856, 889, 1124
working class, 423, 443, 1281–1282, 1323–1324
classical philosophy and culture. *see also* Greece; Rome
abortion in, 546–547, 905, 1072, 1141
the arts, 783, 795–796, 835, 932, 1283
banishment of Aristides, 1073
and Christianity
clash with Christianity (*see* Rome, clash with Christianity)
influence on Christianity, 127, 132, 462, 620, 1172, 1176–1177 (*see also* Gnosticism)
and education, 1049
Greece (*see* Greece)
ideas (*see also* specific philosophies)
abstractionism, 577 (*see also* abstractionism)
atonement, 287–288
chance, 274
doctrine of "idea" or "form," 928
dualism, 635–636
the hero, 440–441
influence on the West, 1165
irrational, 201
laws of logic, 577
"necessity knows no law," 638–639
nihilism, 455
questioning fetus as a living soul, 546–551
rationalism, 635–637
influence on the West
academia, 968
architecture, 144
centrality of man, 1167–1168
the genius and the hero, 440–441
language, 274
natural law, 635–637
resumed after "Dark Ages," 963
philosophers (*see* specific people)
and religion, 1118
human sacrifice and atonement, 287–288
mythological characters, 933, 934–935 (*see also* specific names)
religion exploited for statist ends, 610, 1109
superstitions, 1118
view of god, 389, 577, 935
Rome (*see* Rome)
and statism (*see also* elitism, philosopher-kings)
antiestablishment action, 1003
divine right of rulers, 1083
divinity of the state, 440, 746, 1083, 1087, 1109
law as impersonal, 1200
natural law, 635–637
religion exploited for statist ends, 610, 1109
salvation by politics, 344, 588, 641, 1083, 1152, 1212, 1389
welfare state, 109, 330, 745, 1084, 1090
view of man, 247, 1049
cleanliness, 320, 481, 542, 1170
Clemens, Aurelius Prudentius, 1415
Clement of Alexandria, 1445
Clert, Iris, 800
Clinton, Bill, 752
clipper ships, 1242
Clowney, Edmund, 566
Cochrane, Charles N., 1118, 1120
codependency, 166
coercion. *see* violence and coercion
coexistence, 542–543. *see also* society when humanistic

Cohn-Bendit Daniel, 1123
Cohn-Bendit Gabriel, 1123
Cole, Stuart, 560
collectivism, 17, 21, 59, 223, 449, 624, 641, 1040, 1136
  replacement for God's authority, 59, 847, 1087–1092, 1274–1275, 1354
colleges. *see* universities and colleges
colonialism, 741, 871
Colorado, 549, 560, 1136
Colorado University, 459
Columbus, Christopher, 491–492, 944
"Come, My Soul, Thy Suit Prepare," 1305
Comic-Stripped American, The (Berger), *785*
comic strips, 785–786, 1327
Commodus, 1212
common grace, 624
communication gaps, 188, 271, 1355
communion, etymology, 865
communion, the doctrine, 271, 651, 1354–1355, 1386
communism. *see also* Marxism; socialism
  age of, 399
  in America, 240, 348, 542–544, 893
  anti-communism, 482–484
    hated by citizens in communist countries, 1143–1144
    overcoming communism, 893
  and Christianity
    and irrelevance of the church, 310
    tolerated by "Christians," 542–543
  communist nations (*see* specific nations)
  despairing rulers of communism, 438–439
  and the economy, 21, 226, 1101–1102
  failure of, 436–439, 976, 1142–1143, 1281
  Iron Curtain, 365, 819, 1080, 1091
  philosophies of,
    concept of equality, 244
    concept of freedom, 57, 1054, 1065
    environmentalism, 481
    moralism, 324, 342–343, 767–768
    natural law as foundation for, 635
    as predestination by the state, 982
    relativism, 467
    selective depravity, 767–768
    and sexual exploitation, 767
    universal ethics, 1357
  propaganda of, 389, 618
  statistics, 230
  success of, 436, 892, 1075–1076
  tactics of,
    aggression of, 259
    enemy manipulation, 658
    exploitation of the people, 775
    pretended elections, 258
    use of terror, 302, 510, 658
  underground youth, 438
Communist Manifesto, The, 482, 777–778
Communist Party, 202, 572–573
community
  based on common Creation, 919–922
  Christian (*see also* society when Christian)
    based on common faith, 738–739, 849–852, 1121, 1129, 1357–1358
    based on communion, 1354–1355
    covenant citizenship, 745
    dividing only over sin, 202
    and happiness, 350, 843
    priority of fellow believers, 1357–1358
    relationships mediated by God, 843
    submission to God's Law, 385
    total harmony of interests, 41, 821, 864–866
  and *the city,* 744–748, 849–852
  growing desire for, 818
  humanistic (*see also* society when humanistic)
    common religion replaced, 384–385, 738–739, 1044–1045, 1087
    false unity, 187, 202, 376, 1129
    "Great Community / Society," 205, 241, 243, 259, 362, 747, 1019, 1094
    loss of community, 1072, 1355
  importance of, 1354–1355
  and the police, 1072
  security in, 744, 1072
Community of Equality, 1036, 1037
competition, 696–697, 805, 990
complaining, 79, 1125, 1150, 1340
Comte, Auguste, 112, 260, 451, 767, 1091, 1097
Conarroe, Joel, 799
concentration camps, 407, 679, 1002
Confederacy, U. S., 479, 480, 509
confession of sins, 93–96, 833, 844, 1442
Confessions (Augustine), 1222
confirmation, the rite of, 573
conflict of interests
  basic to humanistic societies, 509, 579, 821, 1027–1031
  basic to modernism, 648, 750
  basic to paganism, 620
  and the Enlightenment, 506–507
  and the French Revolution, 506–507, 509
  vs. God's harmony of interests, 620
  and Hegelianism, 506–507
Confucianism, 372, 389

Congo, 662–663
Congress, U.S., 27, 31, 387, 508, 601, 667, 752, 974, 998, 1003, 1017, 1243, 1264
Connable, Alfred, 747
Connally, John, 1073
Connecticut, 993
conscription (draft), 266, 309, 437, 831
consent, 39–41, 404–406, 407–409
consent, redefined, 405–406
conservation. *see* ecology
conservatism, 212, 389
  anti-Establishment, 308
  and conspiracy theories, 213, 312, 812–813, 822, 1328
  counter-counter culture, 817–822
  Enlightenment faith of, 258
  faithlessness of
    and abortion, 1001
    anti-Christian tendencies, 813, 993–994
    false cleansing, 1134
    governed by nostalgia, 820–821, 961, 996, 1082, 1091
    humanistic influence on, 963
    ignoring Christian education, 29, 30–31
    impotency of, 1138
    impotency of, 267, 482–484, 539, 614, 963, 991, 1082, 1128–1129
    limiting or opposing Christ's Lordship, 404, 950–951, 1209–1210
    moral bankruptcy, 312
    Playboy and the good life, 355, 818
    relativism of, 31, 59, 267, 614, 648, 961
    salvation in politics, 202, 259, 316, 355–356, 539, 821, 1128–1130
    and statism, 26–27
    syncretism of, 202, 821
  hatred of, 243, 539–540, 542
  minority rule, 965
  "moral majority," 1138–1139
  and rationalism, 426
  resisting change, 372–373
  in rural areas, 856
  socialism of, 26
  and warfare, 309
conspiracies
  in American history, 261–262
  of the "Establishment," 303, 309
  the evil "minority," 844
  governing class, 891–894
  international, 977
  overcome by Christ, 8, 9, 23, 189, 1195–1196
  and selective depravity, 257–258, 264, 297, 892–894, 907, 1372
  as successful, 257–258, 264, 265
  theories and Satanism, 312, 1372
  theories and victim mentality, 213, 1195–1196, 1248
conspiracy, defined, 813, 892, 1195
Constantinople, 474
Constitutional Convention, 1022
constitutionalism
  and American culture, 1145
  defined and explained, 27
  departure from, 26–27, 159, 266, 306
  hatred of, 760
  limited powers and limited liberties, 961
  and sovereignty, 50, 194
  trusting in documents, 147–150, 448, 1036–1037
Constitution of the United States
  Preamble, 358
  Article 1, 266, 309
  Bill of Rights, 240–244
    "penumbras" and "emanations," 283
    and protection from federal government, 242
    "right to privacy," 283–284
  1st Amendment, 48, 86, 285, 387, 422, 424, 464, 507, 583, 596, 597, 603
  2nd Amendment, 234, 242
  3rd Amendment, 242
  5th Amendment, 658–661
  9th Amendment, 242
  10th Amendment, 242
  break with European civil theology, 599
  death of, 49–50
  as a *de facto* act, 671–672
  faith in, 147, 832, 1011
  federal government as limited, 159–160, 387, 1087, 1359
  noninterventionism, 348
  reinterpreted, 285
  and sovereignty, 47–48, 49, 55, 325, 599
  and syncretism, 200
constitutions in early America, 1113
Continental Congress, 1258
continuity of Old and New Testaments. *see* Old and New Testaments
contradiction, law of, 1158–1159
conversion. *see also* evangelism
  of barbarians, 1120–1121
  vs. coercion, 509, 591, 613, 674, 935, 1026, 1141, 1143–1144, 1153, 1443
  confrontation of sin, 1222
  in the early church, 1117–1118
  "easy-believism," 1224–1225

of the enemy, 286, 1026, 1143–1144
and the Kingdom of God, 1397
Conway, M.D., 534
Copernicus, 217
Corneille, Pierre, 199
Cornell University, 263, 699, 981
Cornforth, Maurice, 230
correctional facility, etymology and usage, 1014
Cotton, John, 56, 961
Council of Aix, 1110
Council of Ancyra, 546
Council of Chalcedon, 129, 130, 1096, 1136, 1448–1450, 1463
Council of Constantinople, 1096, 1164
Council of Ephesus, 1096
Council of Jerusalem, 90
Council of Nicaea, 1096
Council of Trent, 96
counseling, 84, 93, 118. *see also* psychiatry and psychology
counterfeit gospels. *see* false gospels
Counter-Reformation, 446, 588
courage and boldness, 210, 300, 584, 598, 774, 870, 872, 1288, 1292, 1310–1311
courts
and Christianity
banning Bible from courtroom, 643
church and school trials, 460, 584–586, 596, 598, 603, 606–607, 993–994, 995, 1019, 1199, 1207
church courts (*see under* church government)
dismantling Biblical nature of U.S. law, 632, 643
justice of God, 745–746, 1009, 1078 (*see also* justice, in Christianity)
plaintiff required, 1047
civil jurisdiction, 28
court procedure, 158, 659–661
failure of, 673, 827, 995
as humanist establishments, 1009–1010, 1053
jury, 158
as lawmakers, 26, 612
modern indulgences, 95–96
as "neutral," 463
and statism, 604, 1047
Supreme Court (*see* Supreme Court of the United States)
"sweetheart suits," 604
covenant, meaning, 623–625
covenants and covenantal theology
vs. antinomianism, 12 (*see also* antinomianism)
and baptism, 1184–1185
and blessing (*see* blessings from God, and covenantal faithfulness)
and causality, 678–679
and children (*see* children, covenant children)
and the church, 18
covenant citizenship, 745 (*see also* society when Christian)
and education, 18
entrance through Christ, 905
family as covenantal, 913, 1190–1191
God as personal, 12, 578
and God's judgment, 1219–1221 (*see also* judgment of God)
grace and law, 623–625
man as under covenant requirements, 268, 424
Old and New covenants (*see* Old and New Testaments)
and peace, 1030–1031
and polytheism, 623
and power, 17
and Reformed Theology, 12
and sovereignty of God, 623–625, 905–906
statist opposition, 18
as a treaty, 623, 1219
understanding history, 458
cowardice, 1212, 1275, 1287–1288
cowboy, the, 873–874
Cox, Harvey G., 759
Coyne, John R., JR., 861
Craig, Hays, 565
Craig, Samuel G., 1226
Cranch, Christopher Pearse, 784
creation, rejoicing in, 1198–2000
creationism. *see* science, Creationist
credibility gap, 1080–1081
credo, Greek, 930
creeds, 147, 148–149, 442, 597, 667, 938, 984, 987
crime
Christian solutions,
control of evil, 662–665
death penalty (*see* capital punishment)
restitution, 653–655, 1014
as defined by the state, 472, 492, 629, 995, 1045
end of humanism, 38, 217, 312, 750
antinomianism, 158, 535–536, 807–808, 1007, 1008, 1010

crime
end of humanism *(cont'd.)*
appeasing criminals, 228
and equalitarianism, 535–536, 962
and instant gratification, 888
and intellectualism, 38, 314
mindless crime, 276–277
as normal, 20, 219, 279–280, 312
as a right, 198–199, 272, 415, 962
inability to cope with, 227, 312, 315, 654, 827
correction and rehabilitation, 84, 346, 632, 1013–1014
and environmentalism, 1013–1014
increase of, 312, 315, 399, 664, 827, 1007, 1010, 1029, 1072
and law, 38, 242
medical model (*see* medical *vs.* moral model)
psychiatric testing of children, 310
and society
destroys society, 315–316
fault of society, 209–210, 632
and public schools, 399, 512–513
statist neglect of, 645–646
victims, 272, 280
in war, 1034–1035
criminals
among youth, 44, 664, 808
criminal as a hero, 431
as evolutionary pioneers, 1169
incorrigible and habitual, 84, 653–654
reformation of, 1013–1014
rights of, 747, 962, 1006, 1065
self-centeredness, 807–808
self-pity of, 932
self-righteous protest, 38
subverters of law order, 745–746
sympathy for, 829, 842, 1319
as victims, 228, 336, 460, 535, 884, 1006, 1013–1014
criminal syndicate, 84, 245, 309, 523, 605, 661
critical analysis, 42, 410–412, 1131, 1331
criticism of Scripture. *see under* Bible
Croce, 42
Cromwell, Oliver, 393, 683, 947, 988
Cromwell, Thomas, 91
Crossley, "Hen," 663–664
crusades, modern, 1028
Crusades and Crusaders, 473–475, 480, 1078
Cuba, 405
"cultism," faithfulness as, 1318
cults, 177, 343, 1081, 1219. *see also* specific cults
culture
as affected by sexual regulations, 858
Christian
the arts, 44, 139–141, 441, 793–794, 795–796, 1134–1135, 1217
cannot be reestablished by politics, 22, 251, 689, 733, 871–872
duty to work and influence culture, 174–175, 585–586, 1015, 1227
growth *vs.* instant gratification (*see* growth *vs.* instant gratification)
Holy Spirit's power to change culture, 169, 674, 1226
as influenced by Reformed theology, 1145–1146
practicality, 947
Protestant work ethic, 688, 691, 776, 856, 918, 1282, 1284
revival of, 167, 797
the culture war
Christian victory in, 286, 356, 529–530, 848, 954, 1137, 1144, 1146, 1154, 1181, 1201–1202, 1207, 1363–1364
elitist war on culture, 441–445
framework for understanding history, 1018, 1092, 1186, 1254, 1400, 1417, 1425
medieval view of, 593
Satan waging war against true Christians, 1253
of death (*see* death, culture of)
expressed by art, 795–797, 798–801
failure of the church
antinomianism results in loss of culture, 638, 643, 657, 709, 753, 1007, 1008, 1026, 1044–1046, 1129 (*see also* antinomianism, results in the culture)
to change culture by preaching, 168–169, 880, 1010
earning judgment for culture, 657, 1005, 1021, 1288
impotency of the church (*see* pietism, and impotency)
humanistic (*see also* antinomianism, results in the culture)
all cultures as equal, 1170
the arts as source of culture, 749, 787–790, 795–797 (*see also* art, humanistic)
authoritarian culture utilized by Marxists, 21

classical (*see* classical philosophy and culture)
of death (*see* death, culture of)
decadence (*see* decadence)
demonic culture, 797
destruction of the family, 900, 907
drug and alcohol abuse (*see* drug and alcohol abuse)
and insanity, 185, 1084
instant gratification *vs*. growth (*see* instant gratification *vs*. growth)
race as a source of culture, 740–741, 749, 813–814, 870
Romanticism, 796 (*see also* Romanticism)
and language, 274–275, 785, 796
media (*see* media)
vs. nature, 796
culture, meaning, 444
"culture as religion externalized," 740–741, 795–797, 839, 911, 919, 1145–1146
Cummings, E. E., 46
Cunard, Maud, 829–830
Cunard, Nancy, 829–830
cursings. *see* judgment of God
cynicism, 402, 465, 526, 710, 738–739, 767, 837, 961, 1009, 1282, 1405, 1411
Cyprian, 674
Czechoslovakia, 209

D

Dafoe, Dr. Charles A., 547
Dahlberg, Edward, 890
dancing, 788–789, 795–796
Daniel, 902, 1206
Dardanelles, 499, 976
d'Arusmont, William S. Phiquepal, 1037
Darwin and Darwinism
and natural law, 800
Origin of Species, 517, 1027
social Darwinism, 237–238, 694, 1027–1030, 1264
and war, 1027–1030
David, 307, 324, 814, 954, 1256, 1291
Davies, F.T., 394
death
and Christ
death for the Christian, 999, 1379, 1435, 1436–1437
destroyed by Christ, 178–180, 920, 1200, 1436
"gathered unto their fathers," 1379–1380
resisted by men of faith, 756
wages of sin, 523, 681, 714, 1063, 1195, 1436
culture of,
and abortion, 9, 217, 436, 1205
antinomianism and ultimacy of death, 321–322
and autonomy, 321–322, 811, 835, 1001–1002
vs. Christian culture of life, 1438–1439
the "death wish" of civilization, 1277
drug culture, 460, 797, 816, 1375 (*see also* drug and alcohol abuse)
and the ecology movement, 551, 803
the end for materialists, 1385–1386
and entertainment, 397–399, 835
and false gospels, 345 (*see also* false gospels)
futility of humanism, 802–804, 808–809
and hatred of God, 34, 218, 252, 321–322
and insanity, 185
love of death, 1438–1439
mass destruction, 9–10, 61, 205, 223–224, 227, 361, 368–369, 378, 429, 436–437
and nihilism, 218, 435
in the occult, 179–180
and relativism, 173, 452
and sovereignty of man, 1001–1002
twentieth century mass murders, 9–10, 293–295, 326, 399, 500, 510–511, 747, 841, 984, 1002, 1032, 1033, 1075
as destroyed by evolution, 920
inheritance and death taxes, 688, 731, 898, 916, 993, 997–998, 999–1000, 1020
statism and death, 999–1000
varying attitudes, 999, 1374–1375
deathbeds, 1374–1376, 1436
and dignity, 1376
drugs replacing deathbed scene, 1375
hospital deaths, 1376
Death of God movement, 30–34, 190, 251, 278, 280, 390, 469–470, 639, 927
death penalty. *see* capital punishment
Debrecen, Hungary, 563
Debs, Eugene, 535
debt
and antinomianism, 157, 680–681

debt *(cont'd.)*
in business, 157, 701–702
and children, 1273
debt economy, 677–681, 706–707, 709–711, 846–848
budgetary process, 727–729
credit, 701–702, 1273–1276
and economic crisis, 708, 1063
economic depressions, 701–702
inflation (*see* inflation)
loans, 701–702, 1273–1276
modern lifestyle, 721, 846–848
money backed by debt, 678–679, 684, 721
mortgaging the future, 1273–1276
and poverty, 1274
present-oriented, 677–679, 846–848
debtor's prison, 684
and fear, 1273–1276
and God's Law
in Christian culture, 683–684, 709–711, 1273–1276
debt-free living, 1363, 1445
and fellow believers, 1274
and the Sabbath, 709–711
six-year limit, 677–678, 683, 709, 1274, 1363
for special needs, 1273, 1363
and theft, 709–710, 717–719
tithing as debt to God, 1258, 1266
and unbelievers, 1273
racial reparations, 759–761
and slavery, 683–684, 709, 1273, 1274
and the state
in ancient nations, 1273–1274
and budget making, 727–729
and imperialism, 1273
international debts, 678
and legal tender laws, 717–719
national debt, 679–680, 713, 727–728
and taxes, 677–681
decadence and self-indulgence
in the church (*see* church as corrupted)
and class structure, 765–766, 775–779, 791–792, 845–848, 853–856, 868–869, 1143
and decline of Christian society, 1126–1127, 1143
existential pleasure, 183, 355
as a goal, 775–778, 852, 859, 921, 1143
and hopelessness, 677–679
instant gratification over spiritual strength, 449–450, 688, 708, 886–890
lust for perpetual youth, 37, 807, 890
and the new conservativism, 819–821
and the "noble" savage, 339
and perfectionism, 80
pleasure principle, 1405
present-orientation, 853–856, 868–869, 1126–1127, 1143, 1197
in ruling class, 765–766, 868, 1143
self-centeredness, 1143, 1190, 1197, 1308, 1352–1353, 1378, 1442, 1446
self-expression, 285, 299–301, 838–839
self-interest, 330–332, 840–841, 960, 1301, 1352–1353
self-realization, 282, 286, 359, 523–524, 555, 607
sin as a freedom (*see* freedom in humanism, from God and His order)
and utopian humanism, 777–778
decapitalization, 408, 657, 687–690, 691
Decatur, Stephen, 490
December 25, 1408, 1411. *see also* Christmas
decentralization, 108, 915, 1019, 1020, 1045, 1078–1080, 1098–1102, 1110
Declaration of Independence, 48, 197
Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen (French Revolution), 636, 644
de facto vs. de jure civil government, 671–672
Defiance: A Radical Review (1970), 382–383
Defoe, Daniel, 319
Deism, 237, 749, 1258
de Kooning, Willem, 537–538, 539, 540, 800–801
Delacroix, 447–448
democracy. *see also* voting and elections
and authority, 36, 40, 305, 355–356
Christianity as antidemocratic, 1040, 1045
in the church, 143, 145, 156, 599–600
a democratic universe, 9, 414–415
ends in anarchy and mob-rule, 22, 25, 27, 36, 210, 355–356, 747, 1084
and envy, 1084
and equalitarianism, 454–456, 1084
majoritarianism and general consent, 407 (*see also* consent)
the people as inherently virtuous, 339, 467–468, 747, 1040, 1057–1058
salvation by, 296
social contract theory (*see* social contract theory)

state incarnation of general will, 644–645, 1164
ends in totalitarianism, 27, 36, 40, 259, 306, 307, 356, 413–415, 642, 1040, 1048, 1057–1058
the façade of democracy, 160, 258, 995, 1040, 1060–1061, 1078
vox populi, vox dei, 25, 43, 91, 306, 380, 407, 423, 444, 617, 667, 1088, 1136, 1164
Democrats, 130, 204, 532, 588, 699, 815, 1007
demons. *see* Satan
demonstrations, 1140–1141, 1213
Demray, Donald E., 1287
Demuth, Helene, 767
Denis, Ruth Emma, 795–796
Denney, Reuel, 847
denominations. *see* disunity in the church; specific denominations and groups
Department of Human Resources, 995
Department of Public Instruction, 601
depersonalization
animalization and sexual perversion, 328, 1230
in education, 310, 914, 1402
of history, 192, 211, 221, 306, 813–815
of man, 249, 310, 355–356, 447, 782, 1023, 1123
of sin, 166
depravity. *see* original sin and depravity
depression, psychological, 836, 1236
Depression, the Great, 154, 360–361, 656, 698, 723, 888, 1112, 1292
de Rougemont, Denis, 883
de Sade, the Marquis. *see* Sade, the Marquis de
Descartes and Cartesianism, 153, 425, 507, 1036, 1163
despotism, 48, 624, 974–975. *see also* totalitarianism
detente, 612–614
determination. *see* predestination
Detroit, Michigan, 35, 710, 778
devaluate, defined, 712
Dewey, John
humanism of, 260, 280, 933, 936
influenced by Hegel, 391, 586
and philosophy, 21, 205
pragmatism, 624, 657
statist education, 344, 423, 608, 657, 1039–1040, 1293
Dexter, Richard, 945
diaconate, 55, 69, 107–110, 1147, 1441–1443. *see also* church government
Dickens, Charles, 1375
dictatorship. *see* autocracy and dictatorship
"dictatorship of the proletariat," 43, 202, 305, 408, 437–438, 444, 617–618, 636, 641, 778, 891, 974, 1010, 1088. *see also* Marxism
dictionaries, 670, 929, 983, 1290
Diderot, 413–414, 441
dietary laws, 14, 133, 521
Dietze, Gottfried, 1258
dikaios, Greek, 652
Dilmun, 875–876
Dimock, George E., Jr., 287–288
Dirks, 786
discipline, 696–697, 1084
discrimination, 1094–1095, 1322, 1334, 1347. *see also* selective depravity
disease, 335–336, 476, 754–757, 765, 771, 799, 845, 1219
disgust, living by, 1327–1330
dispensationalism, 14, 110, 633, 753, 1175–1177. *see also* eschatology, pessimistic; Old and New Testaments
disunity in the church
and criticism, 1333
disagreements, 1342–1343
division, 427, 1005
and envy, 1005
handling offenses, 1366–1367
heresy (*see* heresy)
importance of truth, 1096–1097
and limiting Scripture to the church, 1160
perfectionism, 80–81
and pettiness, 1340–1341, 1342–1343
divorce, 69, 118, 899, 1250, 1394
Doaks, Joe, 202
Dobrynin, Anatoly, 755
Dodd, C.H., 1187–1188
Dolan, Doris L., 535
Dolgun, Alexander, 451
Domhoff, G. Williams, 891–892
dominion
and Adam, 358, 517, 1113, 1231, 1271, 1332
calling of all men, 294, 1162, 1231
centrality of Christ
and the atonement, 131, 189
to bear fruit in Christ, 1449
begins with regeneration, 471–472, 1271
God's Law as a tool, 747–748, 1113–1114, 1129
the Great Commission, 946, 1196, 1225

dominion
centrality of Christ *(cont'd.)*
and the Holy Spirit, 481
instruments of God's order, 189, 294, 411, 455–456, 471–472, 1113–1114, 1162, 1271, 1329
to live in terms of God's Law, 294, 556, 981–982, 1129–1130, 1143, 1215, 1271
and the Lord's Prayer, 1233
as the right of Christ, 7
and Christian failure
denied by churchmen, 950, 1114, 1224–1225, 1232–1233, 1329
and judgment, 1383
and Christian responsibility
vs. antinomian escapism, 14, 1215
aura of Christian power, 1143
building rather than reacting, 673, 821, 1081, 1091–1092, 1124–1125, 1134–1135
centrality of the family, 907–908 (*see also* family, basic to social order)
Christian intellect, 402, 1120–1121, 1149–1150, 1277–1278 (*see also* pietism, anti-intellectual)
church as training ground, 110, 170
to control evil, 662, 665
and education, 939
finances, 723, 1124–1125, 1265, 1446
growth and maturity, 38, 169, 223, 358–359, 851–852, 1214–1215, 1277–1278, 1292
holiness requires dominion, 456
not to surrender, 831, 1232–1233
proactive calling, 194
progress and goals, 851–852
and Reconstruction, 215–216, 221, 303
rejoicing in creation, 1198–2000
restored calling of Christian, 189, 215–216, 292, 294–295, 374, 517, 809, 830–831, 872, 970, 1143, 1162, 1224, 1231, 1247, 1271, 1402, 1449
solving problems, 890, 1333
vision, calling, and vocation, 444, 807–809 (*see also* calling, vision, and vocation)
to work, 945–946, 1053, 1281–1283, 1286, 1329
and creation in the image of God, 1195–1196, 1215, 1231, 1232–1233, 1402–1403
explained, 1113–1114
false dominion, 1443
foundational, 1232–1233
and the future, 821, 880, 944, 1120–1122, 1124–1125, 1137, 1239
repeated through Moses, 1113
and society
and the city, 747–748, 849–852
and economics, 680–681, 684, 721–722, 723
progress and civilization, 774, 851–852, 881
Reconstruction *vs.* domination, 76–77, 471–472, 1114, 1124–1125 (*see also* Reconstruction, Christian)
and technology, 774
"dominion theology," 1113–1114
Donahue, Patrick A., 759–760
Don Bell Reports, 763
Donne, John, 410
Dooyeweerd, Herman, 560, 565
Dorcas, 1147
Dordt College, 563
Dostoyevsky, Fyodor, 366, 413, 436, 537, 800, 829, 1044, 1089
Douglas, William O., 283, 1096
dowry, 909, 1395
Dracula, 105, 398–399, 399–400
draft, 266, 309, 437, 831
"Dragnet," 782
dreams, 430
dress and modesty. *see* modesty and dress
Drucker, Peter F., 679–680, 854
drug and alcohol abuse
addiction, 268, 335, 708
death and suicide, 250, 550
drug culture, 460, 797, 816, 1375
escapism, 460, 834, 887–888, 1375–1376
and existentialism, 834
hopelessness, 303, 1125
intemperance, 1016
and "Jesus freaks," 120
narcotics and the free market, 984
and perfectionism, 887
and permissiveness, 887
and statism, 219, 918, 1042–1043
and students, 267, 316, 834
and victim mentality, 268
dualism, 1176, 1198–1199
destruction of morality, 14–15
vs. doctrine of incarnation, 793–794
wealth and poverty, 247–249
Dubuffet, Jean, 915
Duchamp, Marcel, 462

Dulk, Gilbert den, 560, 562
dunastes, Greek, 174
Duncan, George S., 1182–1183
Duncan, Isadora, 795
Durkheim, Emile, 272, 276, 279–280, 1169
Dutch liberal thought, 462–463
Dutch Reformed traditions, 562, 573
Dwight, Timothy, 968
Dylan, Bob, 540

E

early church
  faith and work of
    and abortion, 546–547, 1072, 1141
    charity and social work, 71, 76, 108, 247, 1110, 1147, 1441, 1445
    clash with Rome (*see* Rome, clash with Christianity)
    confidence in victory, 804, 1188, 1385
    diaconate, 1147, 1441–1443
    education, 76, 1117–1118
    and her architecture, 139–141
    vs. reactionary vigilante justice, 673–674
    world conquest, 80, 1188, 1441, 1445
  in Jerusalem, 109, 1117
  modern focus on, 82
  problems in
    classical influence on Christianity, 127, 132–134, 462, 620, 1172, 1176–1177
    rationalism, 132–133
    roots of retreat, 1216
    sin, 80
    syncretistic heresies, 1118
  "quarrelsome" Christian heroes, 1319
  Reformation return to early church orthodoxy, 163, 183–184
  status of early converts, 1117–1118
  teachings of,
    bound to God's Word, 130, 163
    celebrating the Nativity, 1408–1409, 1412, 1422
    condemning Neoplatonic escapism, 1110
    confession, 93
    God's Law as fully valid, 3
    limited regulations, 148
    name of Christ, 6
    vs. the occult, 1118
    postmillennial hope, 804
    systematic teaching of Bible, 163, 170
Easter, 1409, 1410, 1422
Easter, etymology, 1410
Eastern churches, 69–70, 393, 1449
Eastern cults and religions, 454–456, 534–536. *see also* specific cults and religions
"easy believism," 110, 136, 177, 1215, 1224–1225. *see also* evangelism
ecclesia, Greek, 67, 76, 303–304
ecclesiology. *see* church
ecology
  and abortion, 551
  Christian stewardship
    God's perfect ecology, 1200
    and land sabbaths, 654
    rebuilding wastelands, 1053
    superiority of private ownership, 1060
  and culture of death, 551, 803
  and economics, 778
  endangered species, 217
  "overpopulation," 551, 803
  pesticides, 513
  pollution, 513, 770–772, 778, 803
  and primitivism, 339, 770–773
  and revolution, 437
  romanticizing historical conditions, 770–773
  and statism, 772–773, 1060
  worship of nature, 1053
economics. *see also* economy
  Biblical
    competition, 696, 990–991
    debt (*see* debt, and God's Law)
    and dispensationalism, 14
    duty of Christians, 31–32, 356, 684 (*see also* stewardship)
    and the future, 677–681, 848, 853–856, 859, 864, 1242, 1283, 1286
    and hope, 677–681
    morality and character, 688–689, 864–867, 1242
    practicality of Scripture, 677, 1070
    progress and Christian morality, 864–866, 918, 1070–1074
    and sexual regulation, 858
    sovereignty of God, 50, 251, 330, 1070
    "thou shalt not steal," 1070
  capitalism (*see* capitalism)
  crisis
    anarchy, 20, 21, 319, 846–847
    and antinomianism, 683–684, 713–714, 718–719, 1102
    bankrupt humanism, 185, 748, 1288
    depression, 360–361, 759
    judgment of God, 1286

economics
crisis *(cont'd.)*
present-orientation, 848, 876
relativistic thinking, 1085
responsibility of the people, 812–815
and statist intervention, 700–704, 706–707, 1062–1063, 1067–1069, 1070–1074
subsidizing evil, 758–762
and taxation, 710–711
Gresham's law, 251
humanistic
based on human "integrity," 748
based on human "needs" and "lacks," 679–680, 728, 1264
based on human "rights," 21, 1270
"classical economics," 984
debt economy (*see under* debt)
denial of God's economic realities, 31, 875
and equalitarianism, 1073–1074, 1088
and existentialism, 678–680
and instant gratification, 840, 845–848
Keynesian economics, 678, 700–701, 1085
larceny, 713–716
nihilism and meaninglessness, 680
power blocs, 16, 990–992, 995
scarcity preferred to abundance, 779
and theft, 1070 (*see also* theft)
virtue as poverty and sin as luxury, 338–340
in the medieval era, 990–991
money (*see* money)
poverty (*see* poverty)
statist involvement
in agriculture (*see* agriculture, and statism)
benefits, 702
centralization of wealth, 732, 1019–1020
communism, 21, 226, 1101–1102, 1285 (*see also* communism)
for cradle-to-grave security, 877
and debt (*see* debt, and the state)
destroying society, 346, 705–706, 715–716, 1037, 1084–1085, 1102
confiscation and decapitalization, 700–704, 705–706, 709, 715–716, 778, 1030, 1073, 1084
economic crisis, 1062–1063, 1067–1069, 1070–1074
failures of statism, 698, 705–706, 765–768, 1067–1069, 1084–1085
sacrificing the people, 235, 706–707
undercutting work discipline, 1084, 1282, 1285
fault of the people, 812–815, 1100
federal monitoring, 1067–1069
licensing, 995, 1016
Marxism (*see* Marxism, and economics)
poverty solutions, 25, 234
protectionism (mercantilism), 16, 122
redistribution of the wealth, 1019–1020, 1070–1074, 1084–1085
and taxation, 702, 732, 1020, 1071, 1072, 1073, 1084, 1285
result of atheism, 694–695
and social Darwinism, 694, 1264
socialism (*see* socialism, and the economy)
social planning and utopianism, 25, 234, 359, 385, 698, 995, 1016–1018, 1270
subsidies, 122, 702 (*see also* subsidies)
during war, 1032–1033
work controlled by state, 369–370, 696, 1016, 1036–1037, 1060–1061, 1090–1091
supply and demand, 1071
and war, 698, 1025–1026, 1027–1031
wealth (*see* wealth)
economy. *see also* economics
agriculture (*see* agriculture)
anarchy in, 20, 21, 319, 846–847
banking
debt (*see* debt)
inflation (*see* inflation)
Keynesian economics, 678, 700–701, 1085
business (*see* business)
and character (*see* character, and the free market)
and ecology, 778
existential experimentation, 679
flow of goods, 679, 687–690, 715, 861, 864
gilds, 683
Industrial Revolution, 39, 648, 777–778, 854
insurance, 701, 848
national prosperity, 679–680, 698–699, 864–867

natural resources, 687
pensions, 701
power blocs, 16, 990–992, 995
progress, 687, 854–856
statist involvement (*see under* economics)
technology (*see* technology)
"underdeveloped" nations, 679–680
wealth (*see also* wealth)
debt (*see* debt)
decapitalization, 408, 657, 715–716, 780, 995
economic gaps narrowed in modernity, 648
investments, 677–678
ecumenical movement, 1096–1097
edah, Hebrew, 67
Eddy, Mary Baker, 1176
Eden. *see* Garden of Eden
Edersheim, Alfred, 1336, 1338, 1408, 1411
education, defined, 1217
education in Christianity
Christianity in public schools, 914–915, 1217
authorities portrayed as oppressive, 405
Christians using public schools, 815
and revivalism, 950
Christian schools
compromise with humanism, 684, 930–931, 939
must create new curriculum, 939
as "non-neutral," 464
parochial schools, 31
"social relevance," 121
state regulation, 584–587, 607–609, 610
superior to public school, 607–608, 815, 827, 929, 939, 1062
and the family, 1310
and Biblical control of children, 897–898, 916–918, 1404
primarily the duty of, 913
a form of government, 917–918
decentralizing society, 915, 1019, 1045
resisting humanistic tyranny, 1045
school authority, 21, 38
historically
Christian school movement, 1154
classical education, 932–933, 934–935
early America, 54, 913, 950, 1111
in the early church, 76, 1117–1118
in Israel, 54, 1117–1118
literacy lost to humanism, 105, 950
outreach to immigrants, 54, 881, 1111, 1124
and revivalism, 950
in the Soviet Union, 925
homeschooling, 907
failures of, 1062
many Founding Fathers homeschooled, 913
opposed by churchmen, 936, 1318–1319
socialization, 914
superior to public school, 1062
"liberal education," 776, 939
opposed and ignored
by autonomous man, 411–412
because abuses could ensue, 1062
by Christians, 14, 30
church and school trials, 460, 584–586, 596, 598, 603, 606–607, 629, 642–643, 733, 976, 993–994, 995, 1019, 1062, 1199, 1207, 1287
by conservatives, 29
"democratic spirit," 258
failure of churchmen, 102, 483, 936, 1318–1319, 1348
opposed by churchmen, 14, 120, 483, 936, 950
persecution, 280
private schools, 379
seminaries (*see* seminaries)
vital to Reconstruction
Biblical education, 30–31, 936–937, 938–939
Christian principle of authority, 356
and covenantalism, 18
death of humanism, 585, 643
and dominion, 235, 379, 539, 894, 915, 939
eschatology and education, 881, 950
expression of faith, 796, 1116
foundations of freedom, 412, 697, 939, 1055
God as Creator, 816
and governance, 76, 847
growth of, 955, 1112, 1130, 1132
importance of scholarship, 1230
and law, 936
must be relevant and future-oriented, 386, 432, 786, 885, 933, 1040, 1102
purpose of education, 881, 1217
religion must dominate education to thrive, 936–937

education in Christianity
vital to Reconstruction *(cont'd.)*
responsibility of the church, 925
strengthening of the family, 907, 921
supported by tithing, 1260–1261, 1265
warfare to modern establishment, 417–418
worthless without character, 1344
vouchers, 86–87, 610–611
education in humanism
began in the Garden of Eden, 410
"liberal education," 776, 939
messianic education
Christian battle against, 911–912, 1014
coercion and social control, 379, 608, 1045
equalization of children, 1019
humanism as established religion, 258, 285, 606, 657, 738, 936, 939, 1072–1073
moral bankruptcy, 193
natural innocence of children, 475, 476–478
origins, 344, 394, 417, 1040
rationalism of, 1165
as revolutionary device, 1362
subsidizing evil, 762
technology's role in, 918
transmission of religion, 327–328, 333, 936–937
utopian humanism, 36, 512–513
violation of First Amendment, 464
and morality
Christian battle against, 911–912
death as goal, 218, 884
depersonalization of life, 310, 914, 1402
inflation and, 688
in the law, 433–434, 750
lawless sexuality, 760–761, 914
meaninglessness, 386
moral bankruptcy, 193
myth of, 273
naturalism, 488
and pragmatism, 204
relativism, 532–533
sex education, 21, 285, 650, 760, 1165
and sexuality, 21, 285, 650, 758–763, 914, 1165
"values clarification," 375, 567, 657, 969
"progressive education," 657
public schools
believed to be victorious, 1154
busing, 1030
Christianity and conservativism, 18, 29, 30, 37, 54, 61, 221, 259, 380, 411–412, 497, 607, 732, 753, 1217
Christianity banned from influence, 387, 657, 738–739
indoctrination of Christians, 18
medical model, 335
as "neutral," 464
segregation, 27
seriously damaging children, 1401–1402
student counseling, 335
subsidies, 16–17, 240–241, 267, 328, 513, 610–611
rejection of history, 36
and social order
anarchy, 36, 1072
application of rationalism, 917–918
barbarism, 881
creating lower-class mentality, 847–848, 870, 881–883
and crime, 399
eliminating rewards and punishments, 696–697
and "equality," 193, 1019
existentialism, 748, 750, 834, 847
failure to build society, 22, 193, 346, 532–533, 609, 688, 748, 750, 758–763, 827, 881–883, 884, 893, 1401–1402
false view of freedom, 1064–1066
ill-equipping students, 227, 273, 311, 328, 827, 834, 847, 928, 1062, 1401
illiteracy, 928, 1062
neglect of truth and meaning, 1097
relativism replaces truth, 915
rise of the occult, 882
"socialization," 914, 1019
syncretism, 1145–1146
state ownership of children, 905
accreditation and certification, 54–55, 930–931
all education under state domain, 598, 601–602, 608, 639, 642, 737–739, 877, 925, 950
big education, 16, 244
brainwashing children, 595, 1040
in classical philosophy, 1049
clean-slate theory, 493
compulsory education, 267, 379

constant revolution taught, 36
"engineering children," 1040, 1072, 1401
experimentation on children, 1203–1204
producing rootless children, 657, 900, 969
propaganda, 881
school dress codes, 387
schools as state agencies
"Chinafication of America," 657
Christianity as personal option, 220
conformity as goal, 608
control of Christian community, 503, 642
destruction of humanistic culture, 193, 211, 273
destruction of the family, 897
enforced education, 738
false neutrality, 464
false protection, 244, 1049
as new god, 238, 1072
political goals of, 877, 976
reconditioning of children, 36–37
self-justification of the state, 732
slavery as goal, 532, 1051
and slavery of the masses, 532, 927, 930–931
social sciences, 493–495
supplanting the family, 493, 657, 900, 916, 969
universities and colleges (*see* universities and colleges)
vouchers, 86, 610–611
Edwards, captain of the *Emerald*, 663–664
Edwards, Jonathan, 1238–1239
egalitarianism. *see* equalitarianism
Egypt, ancient, 18, 344, 522, 752, 902, 983, 1049, 1109, 1166–1167, 1310, 1417
Egyptian campaign, 961, 1058
Ehrenfeld, David, 917
Eighteenth Amendment. *see under* Constitution of the United States
eighteenth century. *see* the History Index
eighth century. *see* the History Index
Einuadi, Luigi, 1068
Einwechter, William O., 151
Eiseley, Loren, 808
elderly, 37, 113, 217, 839, 899–900, 1378, 1435
elders. *see* church government
election of saints, 88–89, 1337
elections and voting. *see* voting and elections
eleventh century. *see* the History Index
Elijah, 642, 1010
Eliot, T. S., 60, 529
Elisabeth, 1394
Elisha, 1310
elitism. *see also* bureaucracy, government by; statism
ability by blood and rank, 296, 934–935
as anti-Christian, 975
and antinomianism, 648
interpretation of the Bible, 1172
historical examples
in Africa, 296
divine right of kings, 25, 39, 42–43, 91, 129–130, 194, 299–300, 355, 407, 644, 935, 963, 1399
and Marxism, 192, 777, 778–779
in the Renaissance, 441
hypocrisy of, 1030
elite above the law and morality, 252, 413–415, 443, 600, 647, 780, 824, 838, 934–935
hatred of establishment by new elite, 765–766, 1123
in the name of "anti-elitism," 604
shifting of elite loyalties, 441–442
war on culture, 441–445, 443, 468, 779, 780
licensure and control, 53, 55
and mental health, 780
philosopher-kings, 39, 305, 362, 635, 778, 974–975, 1036–1037, 1101–1102, 1211 (*see also* intellectualism, and elitist rule)
general will embodied in elite, 405–406, 407, 443–444, 1164 (*see also* democracy, state incarnation of general will)
and industry, 778–779
intellectual rule, 40, 778, 883, 1036–1037, 1132
rationalism, 401–403, 407, 416–418, 635–636, 1164
pride and arrogance, 779, 934–935, 1101–1102
and fundamental goodness of man, 961
justice defined by elite man, 409, 1088–1089
man as tools of the elite, 452, 1123–1124
and personal passion, 299–301, 647–648
predestination by elite man, 980, 1036–1038

elitism
pride and arrogance *(cont'd.)*
and selective depravity, 305, 307, 369, 413–415
and selective rationalism, 408–409, 1099
sin as resistance to elitist rule, 648, 985, 1017, 1042, 1045, 1048, 1066
sovereignty of elitist man, 1037, 1447
and salvation by state, 643, 974–975
in universities and colleges, 408
Ellenberger, Henri F., 1235–1236
Ellul, Jacques, 187, 730
El Salvador, 196
Emerald, the, 663–664
emergency measures of statism, 1023, 1032–1033, 1067
emergency workers, 748
emotionalism, 419–420
corruption of the church, 124–125, 173, 426, 428, 1342
"God is no buttercup," 1303–1304
of the "Jesus movement," 860
and pietism, 119, 125, 173, 186
and preaching, 173, 880
replacement for the Holy Spirit, 426, 783
vs. the sovereignty of God, 426
surface faith, 166
exploitation of feeling, 782–784, 803
feelings as revelational, 783
in giving and charity, 28, 1261
hatred of trials, 1293–1294
and humanistic art, 926
love defined as emotion, 1325
modern melodrama, 791–792, 803, 926
and paganism, 784
preferred to reality, 124
present-orientation, 879
vs. reason, 879
religion seen as women's emotionalism, 419
and Romanticism, 419–420, 426, 783
self-righteous passion of modernism, 300, 782, 1250–1251
employees. *see* business, labor
End of Ideology, The (Bell), 1091
energy, 1297–1298
Engels, Friedrich, 980, 1027–1028, 1100–1101, 1285
England, 104, 486, 689, 711, 753, 864, 1143
English Civil War, 28
engus, Greek, 791
Enlightenment
as an age of terror, 1201
basic faith explained, 258
birth of humanism, 486
and Christianity
anti-Christianity, 305, 437, 446, 502
Christian scholarship devalued, 1121
influence on Christian thought, 153, 1172
and pietism, 1121–1122
doctrine of freedom, 58, 197
conflict of interests, 506–507
results in anarchism, 318
doctrine of government
conflict of interests, 506–507
man as source of law, 330, 423
natural law, 636
philosopher-kings, 305
results in anarchism, 318
return of principle of necessity, 639
social planning, 258, 305
the state, 208, 371, 482–483, 588–589
doctrine of man
clean-slate ideal, 1102–1103
doctrine of sin, 305, 307, 433
reforming man, 1013–1014
view of women, 419
doctrine of Nature, 979–980
doctrine of reason (*see also* rationalism)
criticism as infallible, 42
influence on the church, 153
natural goodness of the rationalist, 305
pagan mindset, 132
and Nietzsche, 420
pilgrimages in, 398
entertainment. *see under* media
entole, Greek, 1253
entrepreneurship. *see under* business
environment, God as our total, 457, 578–579, 1162
environmentalism
corrupting the church, 166, 489, 1014
counterfeit gospel, 481
and education (*see* education in humanism, messianic education)
evading responsibility (*see under* responsibility in humanism)
humanist doctrine of man, 190, 579
and black issues, 207–208
and crime, 1013–1014
denial of sin, 813–815
natural innocence of children, 475, 476–478

and parenting, 911–912
proliferation of evil, 190, 290
as totally irresponsible, 1099
and lack of progress, 316, 864, 1125
medical model (*see* medical *vs.* moral model)
and politics
and anarchy, 318
and class structure, 845
inability to cope with crime, 1013–1014
Marxism, 228, 248, 318, 354
revolution, 318
social planning, 1099
state as savior, 187–188, 245, 481
statist promotion of, 187–188, 209, 258, 355–356, 762, 1058
and taxation, 355
victim mentality of citizens, 966, 1058
and prison systems, 1013–1014
sinners demanding a good world, 1073
and slavery, 215
victim mentality
of Adam, 813–815, 1248
and bitterness, 1351–1353
blaming civilization, 430, 431
blaming class, 248
blaming conspiracy, 812, 832, 864, 1195–1196, 1248
blaming God, 379, 1351–1353
blaming ignorance, 762–763
blaming one's past, 1283, 1320
blaming society, 61, 336, 379, 1004, 1058
blaming the church, 823–824, 1352
blaming the Establishment, 834, 1125
blaming the gods, 783
blaming the state, 823–824
blaming the world, 1125
drug and alcohol abuse, 268
and selective depravity, 1442
and self-esteem, 1248–1249
and self-pity, 1004
environmentalism (ecology movement). *see* ecology
envy
vs. Christian contentment, 867, 1073–1074
cultivated by evangelists, 341
and disunity in the church, 1005
and inflation, 709–710
and murder, 856
and politics, 1005
and class warfare, 668, 863–867, 1003–1005, 1073, 1084
and democracy, 1084
disguised as "justice," 656–657, 668, 779
and minorities, 657
and racism, 1003–1004
and sacrifice of justice, 656, 717, 1089
and social instability, 668
and socialism, 656–657, 715
and statist welfare, 668, 1004
and present-orientation, 863–867
and success, 1073–1074
and theft, 1005
"thou shalt not covet," 668
vs. work, 1005
Episcopalians, 496, 542
epistemological self-consciousness, 34, 452, 537–540
epitrepo, Greek, 602
equal, translated, 1077
equalitarianism (egalitarianism). *see also* equality
absurdity of, 1077–1078, 1088
better than liberty, 697
and breakdown of authority, 21
and breakdown of freedom, 1054–1056, 1058–1059
and breakdown of justice, 827, 1074, 1088
and breakdown of law, 20, 654
and crime, 535–536, 962
and democracy, 454–455, 1084
and Eastern thought, 534–536
and economics, 1073–1074, 1088
equality of good and evil, 962
and heaven, 454–455
"Liberty, Fraternity, and Equality," 414
origins of the "equality" concept, 191
and revolution, 192
and social stagnation, 454–456, 852
equality
and anarchy, 21, 40
and education, 193, 1019
and the Enlightenment, 1077–1078
equalitarianism (*see* equalitarianism)
as a false gospel, 367–368, 780
inequality disguised as, 780
and Marxism, 21, 192 (*see also* class and social warfare)
negated by predestination, 325
and pragmatism, 21
and racism, 198, 258, 1004
reduction of men, 191–192
and statism
basic to modern liberal law, 325, 385
and communism, 244
and the U.S., 244, 1079

equality, meaning and usage, 1077
Erasmus, 94, 95, 378, 379, 465, 945
Erastianism, 394, 395
eros, Greek, 183
escapism
and antinomianism, 14, 1215
corruption of the church, 1175–1177, 1350, 1377–1378
delaying decisions in a crisis, 876
denying reality, 61, 350, 428–430, 460, 1174–1177
drug and alcohol abuse, 460, 834, 887–888, 1375–1376
entertainment, 1376, 1423
irrelevance as cultural goal, 776–777, 890
living in the past (*see* history, past-bound focus)
and Neoplatonism, 1110
from stress, 1290
unthinking routine, 1376
eschatology
in America, 871, 946, 1234, 1237–1241
Antichrist, 18, 391, 543
and definition of the church, 68, 949
effect on living, 949, 1234–1241
general resurrection, 793–794
new heavens and new earth, 793–794
pessimistic, 1236–1237
all other eschatologies as evil, 1175
amillennialism, 570, 949, 1153, 1237
dispensationalism (*see* dispensationalism)
failure of God, 523
of humanists, 321, 363
premillennialism, 950, 1153, 1234–1241
Rapture, 110, 174, 221, 489, 643, 1175–1177, 1212, 1219, 1232, 1234, 1237, 1241, 1304
results in society, 949
retreat and defeat, 136, 174–175, 303, 1092, 1129, 1153, 1205–1206, 1232, 1385, 1411
and revolution, 303
tribulation, 1232, 1234–1241, 1237
postmillennialism (*see* postmillennialism)
redemption of the material, 793–794
Revelation as only a church book, 424
Second Coming of Christ, 178, 791, 1177
superficial progress, 192–193
understanding of eschatology discouraged, 1241
utopian humanism (*see* utopian humanism)
Establishment, the. *see also* elitism
and conspiracy theories, 303, 308–312
courts as humanistic establishments, 1009–1010, 1053
faults of, 309–312, 1085–1086
and selective depravity, 303, 764–769
total failure of, 827
as god of humanism, 303
nihilism of, 436–437, 495
Pelagianism of, 208–211
and revolution
against all authority, 308
anarchistic power, 365
antiestablishment anger, 1080–1081, 1085, 1091, 1119
antiestablishment becomes the Establishment, 765–766, 1123
Christian warfare against, 59–60
civil rights, 353–354
in classical era, 1003
conservative, 308
false freedom, 298
of hippies, 1119
movements, 829–831
sympathy for the outlaw, 829
tool of the establishment, 761, 1058
and victim mentality, 834, 1125
and youth, 258–259
estate and calling, 225, 256, 374, 807–809, 823–824, 990, 1143, 1144, 1284–1285
estate planning, 999–1000
Esther, 140
ethnology, 339
etiquette, 320
Eugene, Prince of Savoy, 499
Euripides, 287, 932
Europe and Europeans. *see also* specific places
and Christianity, 666–667, 814, 1142
church attendance, 156
dollar crisis, 1073
and humanism, 413, 417, 473–474, 590, 863, 1069, 1201
and pilgrimage, 398
and pornography, 1285
royalty of, 775, 863
and slavery, 491
welfare, 1270
euthanasia, 272, 549, 1001–1002
Evangelicalism
antinomianism in, 126
irrelevance, 119
modernism, 136
rationalism, 137–138
reduction of God to love, 634, 1304

revivalism, 119, 136
and Romanticism, 784
in the United States, 101
evangelism
and Bible knowledge, 186
and Christian Reconstruction, 579
by deacons, 109
the Great Commission
and dominion, 946, 1196, 1225
expansion of Joshua's commission, 1196
health of the nations, 1149–1150, 1169
rejected by churchmen, 1225
replacement by humanism, 964
salvation and duty, 1177, 1196, 1227, 1445
teaching the Law, 1149–1150
and the victory of Christ, 1218
missions
across classes and races, 866–867
American mission work, 1131, 1142–1143
faith of missionaries, 216, 1203
missionary power, 613, 882, 946, 964, 1035, 1142–1144
to old Europe, 491
power of missionary hymns, 1392
modern opportunity, 83, 894, 1444
problems in,
"easy believism," 110, 136, 177, 1215, 1224–1225
focus on numbers, 467
replacing glory of God as focus, 186
revolutionary-oriented, 187–188, 341
statist action, 262, 813
and self-discipline, 22
vs. sentimentalism, 1323–1324
in terms of God's sovereignty, 22, 568–569, 1203
conversion not coercion, 509, 591, 613, 674, 935, 1026, 1141, 1143–1144, 1153, 1443
converting the enemy, 286, 1026, 1143–1144
as victorious, 1239
Evans, Humphrey, 1075
Evans, M. Stanton, 89
Eve, 199, 358, 410, 472, 813–814, 913, 1199, 1248
evergreen Christmas tree, 1408, 1410, 1419, 1432
evidentialism, 427, 1163. *see also* apologetics
evil. *see also* specific evils
arrogance of, 281–282, 803, 1279
and Christian responsibility
and the abdication of righteous, 823
and "Christian" suffering, 1212
civil government as terror to evildoers, 604–605
correct response to, 1329–1330
faithfulness in midst of, 29, 1349–1350
leaders as champions of evil, 1065
overcoming evil doctrine, 249, 298, 366, 501, 544–545, 894
submission not a surrender to, 1363
tolerated in name of "love," 1322–1324
embraced in principle, 179
evil ambition, 16–17, 161, 824, 1030, 1093, 1264
in politics, 161, 523–524, 761–763
as preferred, 499–501, 835, 842, 1279, 1328
subsidized, 22, 209, 228, 354, 677–679, 701, 762–763, 1262
as ultimate, 834–835, 843, 1372
fear as, 1256–1257, 1273–1276
and God's sovereignty, 628, 662, 1167, 1275, 1372
judgment and evil rulers (*see* judgment of God, and evil rulers)
overcoming evil on earth, 9–10, 256, 1129–1130, 1181, 1196, 1207, 1234
over evil, 1275
the "problem" of evil, 1167
inability to cope with
blasphemy, 1212
due to Pelagianism, 210, 1128, 1372
evil fate, 834
false religion of love, 227, 662
merely denouncing, 553, 1327
pity for evildoers, 228
and rationalism, 263, 267–268
salvation by documentation, 268, 297, 803, 894, 991, 1081, 1327, 1349
smiling face of, 523–524, 867
living beyond good and evil, 307, 313–317, 391, 801, 1009–1012, 1020–1021, 1096–1097, 1099, 1203–1204
locating evil (*see also* selective depravity)
conspiracies, 257–259, 264
and guilt, 333–334
mis-location and revolution, 215–216, 308, 312, 324, 361, 367–371
selective obedience, 300
in war enemies, 1027–1030, 1032

evil *(cont'd.)*
natural to a fallen world, 1351–1352, 1372
the occult (*see* magic and the occult)
and pagan view of god, 633, 783
redefined in humanism
as the frustration of desire, 889, 1293
as luxury, 338–340
by man, 467 (*see also* original sin and depravity)
by Marx, 324, 631
pain replacing sin as greatest evil, 1206
power inherently evil, 338, 765–766
as sourced in Christianity, 975
as success, 248, 1073–1074
as wealth, 338–340, 720–721, 725, 1004–1005, 1072–1073
Satan (*see* Satan)
self-destruction of, 995–996
sin (*see* original sin)
"evil spoken of," being, 1317, 1318
evolution. *see under* science, humanistic; science, humanistic and evolutionary
"executive privilege," 934–935. *see also* elitism, hypocrisy of
existentialism
and antinomianism, 381–383, 875, 879
in the church, 120–121, 136, 183, 879
concept of freedom
anarchy, 20–21, 44, 191, 314, 319, 452, 748, 847
destruction of norms, 331
and history, 422–423, 493–494, 834
humanistic experience, 136, 398, 466–468
hypocrisy of, 58
sin and crime indulged, 415
state as god, 391
total collapse of society, 191, 313–317, 748
total irresponsibility, 834, 846–848, 874–876, 1119
and totalitarianism, 363
ultimacy of consent, 404–406
worship of feeling, 782–784
concept of reality, 135, 402, 426, 432, 868, 869
and criticism, 1331–1333
and infallibility, 44–45
limiting man to the moment, 1235
philosophy in science, 493
rejection of history, 422, 875–876, 883
and death, 191, 470, 803, 1234
and impotence, 846–847, 869
lack of rationality, 402
and meaninglessness, 869, 978, 1235
drug and alcohol abuse, 834
vs. God's total meaning, 135, 469–470
suicide, 978
and original sin, 252
present-orientation, 874–876, 1234–1241
and social order
anarchism, 20–21, 44, 191, 314, 319, 452, 748, 847
anti-order, 750
and class warfare, 867
and economics, 678–680
education, 748, 750, 834, 847
vs. estate and calling, 807–809, 867 (*see also* estate and calling)
goal of utopian humanism, 1045
governed by needs of the moment, 879
and isolationism, 803–804
limiting faith, 497
and sexual perversions, 45, 363, 782, 879
social gospel, 136
transient law, 422–424, 457–458, 1020
and youth, 44 (*see also* youth)
Ezekiel, 155

F

Fabianism, 391, 762, 961
Fabian Society of England, 192
Fairfield, California, 596
faith
anxiety, 1287–1288, 1291, 1297–1298, 1306, 1377
community based on common faith, 738–739, 849–852, 1121, 1129, 1357–1358
as comprehensive
appeal of Marxist faith, 254–256, 257
history and meaning, 438, 458, 469, 1321
and Reconstruction, 1151
and total meaning, 1235
vs. discouragement, 1297
false faith
easy-believism, 136, 177, 1215, 1224–1225
emotionalism (*see* emotionalism)
faith in faith, 75, 1337

identified with institutional church, 496–497
lost in a trial, 860
minimal faith, 166, 589, 953, 1115
and pietism, 172–173
reduced to moralism, 22, 104, 177
replaced with negation, 1115
in revolutionary change, 373, 730, 760–762, 851–852
self-centered, 1146, 1197, 1301
trumped by unity, 187
without obedience, 753, 1222, 1271
and family, 919–922
vs. fear of man, 143, 1144, 1196, 1275, 1287, 1288, 1350, 1354
God as priority, 1301–1302, 1305
closeness to God, 1251
and fear of God, 1350
justification by, 1178–1183
pleases God, 1305
the supernatural gift of God, 914
and total surrender to God, 1196
vs. intellectualism, 137–138, 311, 410–412, 975, 1136, 1189
loss of and social crisis, 184, 1288, 1289
impotency indicated by violence, 1020, 1120, 1142–1144
replaced by brute force, 121–122, 1121
totalitarianism, 993–994
of Mary, mother of Jesus, 1396–1397
and obedience, 1196, 1253, 1302, 1305, 1397
development of capitalism, 122, 688–689
in early America, 1050
expectation of rewards, 1305
faith and action, 169, 471, 937, 1146, 1348
faith and force, 26, 37
and God's Law, 1215, 1253
and marriage, 1102
needed in Reconstruction, 438–439, 619, 674, 763, 862, 1124–1125, 1146, 1226
our first line of defense, 1142–1144, 1181
and patience, 1295–1296
and prayer, 1306
and precision, 172–173
proven by trial, 860, 1275, 1297–1298
and repentance, 1228–1229
resisting death, 756
and social repair, 438, 1181, 1288, 1289
vs. total understanding, 1252
vs. occult superstition, 1118
faith, defined, 438
Faith Baptist Church, 602–603
faithfulness
and blessings from God, 678, 880, 1268–1269, 1274–1275
as "cultism" and "fanaticism," 1318
in economics, 681 (*see also* stewardship)
in the midst of evil, 29, 1349–1350
multigenerational, 991, 1379–1380
as obedience (*see* faith, and obedience)
persecution from family, 1318–1319 (*see also* persecution)
and worship, 1358
fall of man, 472. *see also* original sin and depravity
false gospels
beauty, 183
children as salvation, 476
church as savior, 82, 1044, 1128
conservativism, 202, 259, 316, 355–356, 539, 821, 1128–1130
criticism, 1331–1333
crusading spirit, 473–475, 476–478, 479–481
"cure-all remedies," 832
documentation, 268, 297, 803, 894, 991, 1081, 1327, 1349
easy-believism, 110, 136, 177, 1215, 1224–1225
God as a "spare tire," 1316
Jesus as fire insurance, 83, 169, 564, 586, 589, 1007, 1115, 1129, 1162, 1224, 1293, 1354, 1449
environmentalism, 481 (*see also* environmentalism)
equality, 367–368, 780
freedom from morality, 741, 884
the "good guys" of humanity, 290–291, 293–294, 296
inner light, 1013–1014
love as redeemer, 252, 1324
man as savior, 1226
modernism, 325
money as savior, 340, 344, 346, 515, 761–762
passing of time, 306
programs as savior, 473–475, 1128–1130
messianic education (*see under* education in humanism)
work programs, 1014
psychiatry, 176–177, 1014

false gospels
psychiatry *(cont'd.)*
positive thinking, 1328–1329
reason, 197, 355–356, 417, 1179 (*see also* rationalism)
results in death, 345
Romanticism, 429
Satan's plan for salvation, 1108
science as savior, 417, 918, 1044–1045 (*see also* science, humanistic)
slavery, 889
state as savior, 344 (*see also* statism)
in ancient paganism, 588–589, 979, 1049–1050
and atheism, 641–642
communism, 342–343
embraced by churchmen, 105, 390–392
and environmentalism, 187–188, 245
filling needs neglected by private institutions, 645–646
hope in elections, 159, 355–356
and infallibility, 43
and Marxism, 187–188
messianic education (*see under* education in humanism)
overcoming death, 25
politics as savior, 355, 473–475, 480, 964, 965–966, 967, 970, 1044–1045, 1082–1086, 1128–1130, 1338
prisons as reformatories, 84, 1013–1014
remaking man, 417
and selective depravity, 296, 476–478, 648
sin defined socially, 306, 363, 1044–1045
social gospel, 62–63, 325 (*see also* social planning)
unity, 187, 865–866
utopianism (*see* utopian humanism)
war as savior, 473–475, 479, 964, 1027–1031
revolution, 486, 759, 768, 964
salvation by murder, 293–295, 296–298, 302–303, 435, 964
works-morality, 325, 334
godliness without a God, 251, 262
passionate selective obedience, 299–301
false religion
abomination and idolatry, 521–522
cultural suicide, 340
false hope, 1255
heart of all sin, 461–462
lacking moral perfection, 11
lacks doctrine of infallibility, 11–12
and meaninglessness, 461
part-time service to man, 743
and providence, 455
and totalitarianism, 631
vague ultimate goodness, 455
view of god, 389–390
Falwell, Jerry, 650–651
family
attacked and supplanted
by anarchy, 320
as an unwanted responsibility, 874, 1054, 1055
Bolshevik "human incubation" attempt, 900
in China, 650
and the decay of culture, 900, 907
distrusted by the church, 909–910, 944–945
distrusted by the state, 878, 909–910
by the Enlightenment, 899
"expert" opinions, 310, 907–908
extinction of the family, 313–314
hated in humanism, 269, 282, 899–900
by media, 900
by modern culture, 900, 907
by public school, 36, 657
redefined by state to redefine society, 737–739, 901–903
by Romanticism, 420
and socialization, 914
by state, 219, 233, 243, 253, 284, 359, 416–417, 595, 642, 919, 973, 1036, 1049
by university, 36
"voluntary family," 595–596, 901
authority and headship
as an answer to social anarchy, 22, 539
corrupting doctrine of headship, 375
denied and overthrown, 21, 280, 786, 908
importance of, 908
myth of consent, 405
as oppressive, 36
as part of the "Establishment," 308
priestly role of father, 913
unjust domination of women, 269, 270
basic to social order, 539, 1356–1357

belonging, 919–922
central in Reconstruction, 294, 356, 751
centrality of women, 416–418
central to dominion, 907–908
control of children, 897–898, 916–918, 1404 (*see also* children)
family as basic government, 897–898, 907–908, 916–918
family records, 898
family reunions, 898
man's first human obligation, 1357
multigenerational support, 907
Puritan respect of family needs, 1251
welfare, 898, 916–917, 1265–1266
widows and orphans (*see* widows and orphans)
and Biblical language, 898
business, 900, 993, 997 (*see also* work)
children (*see* children)
dysfunction
abortion, 282, 546–551, 811 (*see also* abortion)
abuse of children (*see* abuse, child abuse)
abuse of parents, 314, 320
and anarchism, 22, 320, 539
and bitterness, 1352
and church counseling, 84–85
failure of parents, 316, 375, 526, 899–900, 1255–1256, 1312–1313, 1320, 1359
honoring abusive parents, 1320
the Iks, 313–317
lack of self-control, 888
leaving family for Christ's sake, 919, 1312, 1318
parents as environmentalists, 911–912
persecution of the faithful, 1318–1319
recreation as central, 908
sacrificed for lesser priorities, 1356
vigilante justice, 673
education, 1310 (*see also* education, and the family)
and Biblical control of children, 897–898, 916–918, 1404
primarily duty of family, 913
privacy in the home, 21, 243
supplanted by state schooling, 493, 657, 900, 916, 969
faithful families, 919–922
closeness, 1433–1434
as covenantal, 913, 1190–1191
family worship, 907, 913
"gathered unto their fathers," 1379–1380
"family of God," 69–71
fatherhood (*see* fathers and fatherhood)
and God's Law, 900, 909–910, 913–914, 917–918, 1312, 1356–1357
grandparents, 899–900, 907
marriage (*see* marriage)
motherhood (*see* mothers and motherhood)
and paganism, 913, 920
perverted by Plato, 226
and private property, 897, 916
business, 900, 993, 997
family trusts, 898
as productive, 685, 846
welfare, 898, 916–917, 1265–1266
and the Protestant Reformation, 921–922
fantasy, 144, 437, 879, 1076
farming. *see* agriculture
fascism
in America, 602–604, 1039
church as "fascist," 598
control of religion, 737
defense of racism bill, 602
form of socialism, 596, 603
and justice, 642
label of totalitarianism, 684
as non-Christian culture, 796
philosophy of, 36, 296, 1039
preceding legal revolution, 1048
and selective rationalism, 408–409
fascism, defined, 596–597, 603–604
fashion, 776, 779, 791, 869, 879
Fasnacht, Randall Craig, 920
fatalism, 803, 834–835, 932–933
Father God, 908, 920–921, 1087, 1309, 1380, 1384. *see also* God
fatherland, etymology and usage, 1087–1088
fathers and fatherhood. *see also* family
abusive, 320
Biblical view of, 909–910, 913, 921, 1419, 1433–1434
children leaving, 919, 1010
children's love of, 1309
dedication of children to, 904
false views of, 801, 908
fatherly counsel, 70, 303, 1297, 1341
hatred of, 437, 492
honor of, 1320–1321
humanist fathers, 228
inheritance from, 900
love of ungodly children, 1312

fathers and fatherhood *(cont'd.)*
Rushdoony's father, 1341, 1419, 1431–1432, 1433–1434, 1436
state as, 977, 1050, 1087–1089
Father's Day, 909
Faust (Goethe), 34, 288, 428
fear
and debt, 1273–1276
of economic collapse, 60
as evil, 1256–1257, 1273–1276
of fear, 1275–1276
of freedom, 1049–1050
of the future, 1236–1237, 1286
of God
and Biblical authority, 1276
and faith, 1350
vs. fear of man, 143, 1144, 1196, 1275, 1287, 1288, 1350, 1354
vs. fear of Satan, 1196, 1275
vs. self-interest, 167
a grievous sin, 1144, 1275, 1287
and guilt, 1275
of personal condemnation, 1058
of the state, 400, 1143, 1195, 1276, 1287
of stress, 1292
and suicide, 1236
and worship, 1276
fear, etymology, 1276
Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), 819
Federalist Papers, 717
Federal Register, 1017
Federal Reserve System, 31, 1068
feminism
and abortion, 551 (*see also* abortion)
doctrine of sin or injustice, 334
ex-feminists, 1138
in Goethe, 288
insulting men, 811
and lesbianism, 280
origins in Romanticism, 419–420
as a paradigm, 800
and "sensitivity training," 176
women's rights movement, 270, 271, 280, 1055
Fenton, Elijah, 555, 836
Ferdinand of Spain, 870–871
feudalism, 367–371, 496, 826, 990, 1078
fiat, meaning and etymology, 1100
Ficino, Marsilio, 183
Fiedler, Leslie, 448–449, 768
Field, Frank L., 407
fifteenth century. *see* the History Index
Fifth Amendment. *see under* Constitution of the United States
fifth century. *see* the History Index
Fifth Seal, The (Aldanov), 381
"Fifty-Year Debt Cycle, The" (McMaster), 710
films, 124, 144–146, 541, 780, 791, 803, 835, 837, 1327, 1341, 1438
finances. *see also* economics; stewardship
the budgetary process, 727–729
and Christian responsibility, 723, 1124–1125, 1265, 1446
and the denial of sin, 728
and the family (*see* family, and private property)
family trusts, 898
importance of social financing, 1257, 1263–1267
and the providence of God, 729
Finney, Charles G., 426, 950
First Amendment. *see under* Constitution of the United States
first century. *see* the History Index
Fishwick, Marshall W., 542
Fitz Gibbon, Constantine, 364
Fitzmyer, Joseph A., 1399
Fitzpatrick, John Bernard, 204
Flanagan, Grayce, 1213, 1439
Fletcher, John Gould, 1242
Flood of Noah, 133, 245. *see also* Noah
Florentine Academy, 184
Forbes, John Murray, 261
Ford, Gerald, 381
Ford, Henry, 363, 710
Ford plant, 776
foreigners. *see* immigration
foreign relations. *see* international relationships
forgiveness, 93, 324, 492, 837, 959–960, 962
"For God and country," 1356–1360. *see also* patriotism
fornication, 314
Forster, E. M., 363
Foucault, Michel, 61
foundations, 1109–1112, 1146, 1201
Founding Fathers, 59, 251, 599, 913, 1022, 1359
Fourteenth Amendment. *see under* Constitution of the United States
fourteenth century. *see* the History Index
fourth century. *see* the History Index
Fourth of July, 1411, 1412
Foxe, John, 88
France
Albigensian Crusade, 474
farming in, 1053
French Revolution (*see* French Revolution)

immorality in, 775
Knights Templar, 1047
under Louis XVI, 646
movement of Islam into, 1303
national renewal, 947
nobility of, 777, 780, 868
original peoples, 24
Paris, 398, 800, 1102, 1123
pre-Revolution, 28
shift to humanism, 104
Versailles, 144, 963
in World War I, 1034
Francis, St., 247, 934
Franciscan order, 1121
frankincense, symbolism of, 1406
Frazer, James George, 774
Frederick, John, 1399
Frederick II, 42–43, 208, 473, 1047–1048
freedom, defined, 1054–1056, 1064–1066
freedom in Christianity
in America, 57, 59, 1054, 1124, 1239, 1438
Christian missions movement, 613
freedom of religion, 583
future-orientation, 1124–1125
as land of freedom, 964
private social financing, 1124–1125
Providence, 237, 238
relative to other cultures, 1431–1432
a religious principle, 1360
of speech, 488, 642
in the U.S. Constitution, 160, 234, 240, 241, 242
and Christian education, 412, 697, 939, 1055
the creeds, 984
in God's Law, 57, 1052–1053, 1326
and Christian authority, 20 (*see also* authority, Biblical)
from compulsory self-incrimination, 658–661
created in the Image of God, 220–221, 414, 1064
freedom of religion, 602–603, 650–651, 1008
love as basis of civil liberty, 1326
and private property, 1257–1259, 1260
sin not forcibly prevented, 1042–1043, 1184, 1199
theft of freedom as the basic theft, 994
in God's sovereignty
defining all things, 50
harmony of interests, 620–621, 866–867
and the Lordship of Christ, 329, 602, 742, 1052–1053, 1055–1056, 1107
mandatory law and order, 41
statist denial of, 985
and submission, 1364
witness to, 613
Holy Spirit, 92, 697, 1165
and postmillennialism, 1239
as responsibility (*see also* responsibility of Christians)
and Christian education, 412, 697, 939, 1055
faith and obedience (*see* faith, and obedience)
good character, 161, 968
liberty under law, 56, 199, 263, 273, 883, 1064–1066
vs. security in the state, 369
to work and plan, 883
in the salvation of Christ, 889, 1049, 1050, 1052–1053, 1055–1056, 1059, 1090
acknowledging personal sin, 215
freedom from sin, 20, 492, 631, 970, 1042, 1055–1056, 1066, 1222, 1224, 1389, 1424
from guilt, 837, 842
"if the Son therefore shall make you free," 1066
and the Lordship of Christ, 1113–1114
freedom in humanism
championed by totalitarians
in communism, 56–61, 1054, 1065
conditioning of man, 493
defined by the state, 197, 1001–1002, 1007–1008
in the French Revolution, 1064
in Marxism, 58–59, 202, 223, 268, 1065
power to the state, 1078
religion of humanism, 283–284
religious toleration, 9, 220, 483, 583–586
replaced with social planning, 1062–1063, 1065–1066
revolution as a way to freedom, 40–41, 59–60, 1124, 1137
statism as actualization of freedom, 213–215, 390–391, 973, 1049, 1055–1056
subsidizing revolutionists, 761–762
as the welfare state, 122
and the fundamental goodness of man, 1057–1058

freedom in humanism *(cont'd.)*
from God and His order
and abortion, 286, 811, 1001–1002 (*see also* abortion)
from the clock, 1282
contempt of others, 282
divorced from history, 461, 493, 732, 1053, 1054–1056, 1057–1058
divorced from responsibility, 122, 420, 889, 1001–1002, 1065–1066, 1293
false liberation, 517
freedom from morality, 415, 741, 884
increase in crime, 472, 808
is sin, 464–465, 605, 1021, 1222
lack of justice, 1011
"liberation theology," 599–600
lower class thinking, 883
new world order dream, 539
results in slavery, 59, 1261
as right to exploit, 901
as right to kill, 1001–1002
self-government, 902
self-realization, 1045
and sexual perversion, 420, 431, 782
surrender of dominion, 1282
turn to the primitive, 527
illusory, 220, 405–406, 409, 1001–1002, 1057–1059, 1089
lost due to decline of faith, 400, 413–415, 481, 591, 603, 605, 629, 645, 761, 993–994, 1053
redefined, 405–406, 973, 1001–1002, 1054–1056
consent as ultimate, 39–41, 404–406, 407–409, 1058
discovery of self, 1282
in the Enlightenment, 58, 197
in equalitarianism, 1054–1056, 1058–1059
in existentialism (*see* existentialism, concept of freedom)
expression of self, 286, 331, 839, 927
freedom from frustrations, 1293
as freedom from needs and wants, 1065, 1270
as freedom from work, 1053, 1090, 1282
in the French Revolution, 1064
by Kant, 58
in Marxism, 58–59, 202, 223, 268, 1065
present-orientation, 889
rationalism as source of liberty, 197
as relativism, 198
in the Renaissance, 58
in socialism, 40, 1007
by state schools, 1064–1066
as wishes being satisfied, 887, 1270–1271
security preferred to freedom, 349, 629, 645, 703, 1054–1055, 1057, 1062–1063, 1090–1091
vs. Christian freedom and responsibility, 369
as distrusted, 499, 1049–1050, 1062–1063, 1080–1081, 1099
in Fall of Rome, 349, 351
and scientific social planning, 273, 1099–1100
slavery as freedom, 223, 443, 603, 703, 1054–1056, 1090
as total autonomy, 318–319, 375–376, 449, 1021
academic freedom, 44, 760–761
anarchy, 257, 748, 803–804, 893, 1052, 1089, 1150
as barbarism, 796, 887, 1052–1053
negation and revolution, 40–41, 366, 435, 761–762
and original sin, 1066
results in loss of freedom, 1001–1002
free market. *see* capitalism
freemasonry, 204, 296
freewill offerings, 1258–1260
free will of man, 1042–1043, 1050. *see also* Arminianism; Pelagianism
French Church at the Hague, 1209
French Revolution
barbarism in war, 1034
characters in (*see* specific names)
Declaration of the Rights, 636, 644
destruction of old order, 645–646
failure of, 1070
and imitation of nonworking rich, 775
impact of, 105, 766, 1071–1072, 1137
philosophies of,
concept of freedom, 1064
conflict of interests doctrine, 506–507, 509
hatred of Christianity, 184, 502, 544, 648
moral subversion, 414
natural law, 635, 636
strengthening humanism, 949
utopian humanism, 544
reduction of France's population, 485
Reign of Terror, 544, 1058
as revolution against God, 1054

state as sovereign, 423
war on the church, 441
Freres du Monde, 187
Fretageot, Marie Duclos, 1037
Freud (Rushdoony), 1122
Freud, Sigmund, 184, 217, 280, 344, 356, 384, 386, 402, 447, 492, 780, 1122, 1248, 1291
Friendman, Milton, 1288
Froebel, Friedrich, 477
Fromme, Lynette, 381
Frothingham, Octavius Brooks, 1449
fuehrer principle, 39
Fulbeck, Jack, 849
Fuller, Margaret, 405
Fuller Seminary, 137
fundamentalism, 126, 137–138, 153, 266, 634, 944, 951, 953, 1175, 1429
funerals, 999–1000
Furlong, William Barry, 817–818
future. *see also* eschatology
and Christianity
American freedom and future orientation, 1124–1125
blueprint of postmillennialism, 362, 590, 848, 1129, 1238
and children, 908
and Christian dominion, 821, 880, 944, 1120–1122, 1124–1125, 1137
education must be future-oriented, 933
and God's judgment, 880
and God's Law, 880, 884–885, 889, 1286
and God's sovereignty, 1286, 1414
history proceeds from the future, 774, 1197, 1372, 1430
hope for the future, 804, 848, 852, 872, 1040, 1124–1125, 1143–1144
and meaning, 1235–1236, 1283
no other foundation but Christ, 206, 1023–1024, 1120–1122
and obedience, 884, 1124–1125
and trials, 1320–1321
visualization of the, 1235–1241
and class structure, 845–848, 853–856, 874
and cynicism, 402–403
and economics, 677–681, 848, 853–856, 859, 864, 1242, 1283, 1286
capitalization, 853–856, 897–898, 918
debt as mortgaging the future, 1273–1276
and poverty, 845–848
women providing future-orientation, 847
fear of the future, 1236–1237, 1286
"gambler's mind," 879
and gender issues, 847
lack of future-orientation
consumption-oriented conservatism, 820–821
and economics, 678–681
failure of the state, 349
and hedonism, 1197
intellectual bankruptcy, 1120–1122
and life expectancy, 1234–1241
lower class mind, 871–872, 879
new barbarians, 834
and poverty, 845–848
related to moral standards and laws, 859
Marxism as future-oriented, 121
and meaninglessness, 1197
vs. present-orientation (*see* present-orientation)
and utopian humanism (*see* utopian humanism)

G

Gabo, Naum, 915
Gabor, Mark, 782
Gabriel, 1395
Gaebelein, Frank E., 342
Gage, John, 788
Gaia cult, 796
Galahad, 478, 832
Galatian people, 24
Galileo, 111–112
gambling, 198, 775, 868, 879, 1271
Gandhi, 436
Garden of Eden
animals in, 1235
beginning of world's war with God, 1417
and the dominion mandate, 1113, 1231, 1332, 1442
as garden and city, 744
as God's chosen place, 116
humanist education began in, 19, 375, 410
prophesies of Christ, 7
state as false garden, 414, 1042–1043, 1080–1081
work in, 358, 723
Gardner, A.G., 878

Garfinkel, Bernard, 1023
Garrison, William Lloyd, 59
Garth, Samuel, 555, 836
Gasset, Jose Ortega y, 860
Gataker, Thomas, 944–945
Gaullieur, Henri, 1088
Gauls, 24
Gautier, Theophile, 766
Gay, Peter, 446, 1331
Gear, Norman, 544
Geiler, Johann, 823–824
Geist (Spirit of the age), 92, 1449
gender issues
  decline of male character, 847
  and future orientation, 847
  gentlemanly conduct, 810
  male superiority, 416–418
    corruption of the headship doctrine, 375
    women disallowed from property management, 419
  war of the sexes, 419–420 (*see also* class and social warfare)
  women (*see* women)
  "women and children first," 810–811
genealogies, 574, 898
Genesis, 126–127, 132, 133, 396–397, 567, 574, 1101, 1132, 1172
Genet, Jean, 276
genetics, 886, 1168
Geneva, 113–114, 394
genie, Arabic, 440
genius, 440–445
genius, etymology and meaning, 440
genocide, 510–511. *see also* citizenry, abuse of
Gentiles, 1184, 1186
gentlemanly conduct, 810, 868–869, 870
George, Stefan, 442
George III, 508, 765, 853–854
George IV, 765
George VI, 47
Georgia (country), 1078, 1079
Germanic peoples, 389
German Ideology, The (Marx), 1100
German Reformed, 564
Germany and Germans
  ancient, 339, 389, 638, 824
  conspiracy about, 892
  elimination of, 549
  expelled from Spain, 870
  Hamburg, 310
  Hitler's attitude toward, 294
  influence of Islam in, 1303
  legal positivism in, 273
  losses at American hands, 1028
  monetary collapse in, 466
  Nazi Germany (*see* Nazi Germany)
  religion in, 753
  and ruling elite, 296
  and selective depravity, 290
  shift to humanism, 104
  socialism in, 213, 624, 1009, 1040
  state church in, 753
  students, 1095
  tax revolt in, 672
  universities in, 408
  in World War I, 1034
Germino, Dante, 407
Gershman, Herbert S., 318, 319
Ghana, 1444
Ghost Dance, 1255
Giacometti, Alberto, 801
Gibbs, David C., Jr., 584, 607
Gibbs-Smith, Charles Harvard, 1065
Gibeah, 801
Gideon, 600, 1383–1384
gifts, ancient, 1404
gilds, 683
Gilgamesh, 465
Gillingham, John, 620
Ginsberg, Allen, 477
giving and charity. *see also* welfare
  central to Reconstruction, 249, 720, 732, 1124–1126, 1201–1202, 1257, 1260, 1446–1447
  common in the U.S., 1131–1133
  during the Depression, 1112
  donating to Christian campaigns, 1127
  duty of Christians, 721, 1449
  emotional and impulsive, 28, 1261
  gleaning principle, 1131–1132, 1263
  vs. materialism, 1126–1127
  in the medieval era, 1110–1111, 1124
  and the middle class, 1126–1127
  minimal giving of Christians, 83, 102, 732, 1126–1127, 1261, 1446
  outreach to crumbling economies, 1444, 1446
  and poverty, 247, 248, 1274, 1444, 1446–1447
  private giving illegal in Soviet Union, 1090
  private support of ministry, 86–87, 1444
  profit *vs.* non-profit, 685
  and the Reformation, 113–115, 248
  "tipping" God, 1268–1269
  work of the early church, 71, 76, 108, 247, 1110, 1147, 1441, 1445
Gladstone, William Ewart, 500, 1344
Glass, Charles, 968

Glazer, Nathan, 767, 847
gleaning principle, 1131–1132, 1263
Gnosticism, 132, 396–397
Gnosticism, meaning, 396
God
faith in (*see* faith, God as priority)
fear of (*see* fear, of God)
God's reality as ultimate, 410–412, 1168–1169, 1195–1196
holiness of
and the "problem" of evil, 1167
revealed in His law, 668
immediacy, 791
incarnation (*see* incarnation)
judgment of (*see* judgment of God)
as mindful of man, 791
and His Law, 1200
mediates all relationships, 843
mercy of (*see* mercy)
next of kin to His people, 1390–1391
in our trials (*see* trials and God's blessing)
patient with man, 1295–1296
relationship with man, 165–167, 867
our ground of being, 1308
our total environment, 457, 578–579, 1162
as personal, 12, 578
providence of (*see* providence of God)
revelation of Himself
in creation, 1159
as the Father (*see* Father God)
I Am that I Am, 721, 1166–1169
ignorance of theology, 166–167
knowable, 1167–1168
nature expressed in His Law, 272–273, 647, 652, 668, 1161–1162, 1200
as opposed to all false definitions, 392
our starting point for thinking, 1163
and propositional truth, 462
through Scripture, 1157–1162
self-conscious and personal, 457, 471
sovereignty of (*see* sovereignty of God)
as terrible, 1219–1221, 1303
transcendence
aseity, 165
beyond time, 1234–1241
cannot be defined, 1166–1167
cannot be limited, 1307
incomprehensible, 1167, 1218, 1304
self-defining, 1304
self-determining, 1251, 1304
total government, 984–985
as truth, 11
ultimate power, 1195–1196
the Trinity
economical *vs.* ontological Trinity, 165–167
Father (*see* Father God)
Holy Spirit (*see* Holy Spirit)
Son (*see* Jesus Christ)
unchangeable, 593, 1097, 1167, 1176, 1206
God, as a word, 3, 47
God, discussion of the word, 3, 47, 389–392
God in humanistic view, 389–392
in antinomianism, 3–4, 5, 6, 14, 126–128
to be blamed for problems, 783
in classical paganism, 389, 577, 935
as comprehensible, 1167, 1304
as limited, 1216
as needing man, 135–136, 394
"proven" by man, 1163
as subjected to human reason, 135–136, 137–138, 593, 1158–1159, 1171
"Death of God" movement (*see* Death of God movement)
as the Establishment, 303
revolution and failure of people's god, 26, 192, 212, 255, 259, 263, 879
state as God walking on earth, 55, 92, 130, 641, 737 (*see also* statism, claim to sovereignty)
as Everyman, 264
as fallible, 13
in false religion, 389–390
as the first cause, 389
good god *vs.* evil god, 633, 783
impartial view, 1161
as impersonal goodness, 455
as decency and goodwill, 324
reduced to love, 634
in Islam, 390
man as god (*see* sovereignty of man)
as a Marxist, 342
as oppressive, 36, 208
as reason, 426
and "science," 128
as evolving, 126–128, 397, 1172
Nature as predestinating force, 457, 693, 979–980
time and process as god, 127
as the self, 377
as a "spare tire," 1316
syncretistic version, 203, 390
and unconditional love, 959–962, 1219

God in humanistic view *(cont'd.)*
in utopian humanism, 128
as "wholly Other," 951
God's Law. *see* Law of God
goel, Hebrew, 1390
Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von, 34, 288, 413, 773, 778
gold, symbolism of, 1405
gold and silver standard. *see under* money
Goldberg, Arthur, 243
Goldberg, Joe, 818
Golding, William, 468
Goldman, Marshall I., 772
Gold Rush, the, 1279
Goldstein, Al, 818
Golgotha, 105
"good life," the, 721, 1270–1272
Goodwill Industries, 1263
Gorbachev, Mikhail, 684, 1007
"Gorbachev Republicans," 684
Gordon, S. D., 1176
Gospel
counterfeit gospels (*see* false gospels)
evangelism (*see* evangelism)
grace, and law (*see* grace and law)
Lordship of Christ (*see* Lordship of Christ)
postmillennial hope (*see* postmillennialism)
salvation (*see* salvation)
Gospel of the Child, 476–477
Gosse, Edmund W., 555, 836
gossip, 1369
Goths, 1003
Gotti, John, 198
Goubert, Pierre, 645
Gouge, William, 944
government
church as, 917, 1078 (*see also* church, jurisdictional boundaries)
civil government (*see* civil government)
family as, 897–898, 907–908, 916–918 (*see also* family, basic to social order)
school as (*see* education in Christianity, a form of government)
self-government as basic, 902–903, 1055–1056, 1442 (*see also* self-government)
state as only government, 1442
various spheres, 107, 1442
government, meaning and usage, 107, 916–917
grace
and baptism, 906
and character, 911
cheapening, 1247
church as ministry of, 1093
common grace, 624
common need, 768
vs. credit with God, 1244, 1347, 1377
equated with unity, 1096–1097
and God's mercy, 1316
and God's sovereignty, 906 (*see also* salvation, and God's sovereignty)
man as "deserving" of, 1316
man's total need for, 1244, 1246–1247, 1316, 1347
"of the state," 17
only answer to sin, 768, 1124, 1369
and peace, 1030–1031, 1369
social graces, 320
grace and law
divorced in humanism, 1093
divorced in pietism, 1093, 1209, 1220
and doctrine of the covenant, 623–625
grace and judgment, 1369
inseparable, 334, 880, 1093
as "irreconcilable," 634
law as "done away with," 162, 651–652, 1093
opposed by Satan, 117
Graham, Billy, 137, 188, 245, 310, 391, 565, 951
grammar, 274, 928–929
Grand Inquisitor, The (Dostoyevsky), 1044
Grant, Ulysses S., 205
gratitude
for American birth, 1431
to God, 276, 1307
healing effects of, 1345
for heritage, 1431
ingratitude of modern man, 1150, 1373
to pastor, 1341
in prayer, 1306
for salvation, 492
Gray, Thomas, 555, 836
Grayson, Melvin J, 803
Great Britain and British, 234, 490, 502–503, 727–728, 739, 966, 1054, 1071, 1303. *see also* Parliament
Great Commission. *see under* evangelism
"Great Community / Society," 205, 241, 243, 259, 362, 747, 1019, 1094. *see also* society when humanistic
Great Depression. *see* Depression, the Great
Greece. *see also* classical philosophy and culture
banishment of Aristides, 1073
interest in the occult, 1118

natural law, 635–637
paganism in, 834–835
philosophy (*see also* specific philosophers; specific philosophers)
atonement, 287–288
chance, 274
doctrine of "idea" or "form," 928
dualism, 635–636
the hero, 440–441
influence on Christian thinking, 1176–1177
influence on the West, 1165
irrational, 201
"necessity knows no law," 638–639
and statism, 207, 635–637, 968, 1003, 1049, 1109
tragedy, 783, 835, 932, 1283
view of man, 207, 1049
greed, 291, 341–343, 408, 474, 711, 961, 1143, 1271, 1308
Greek Church. *see* Eastern churches
Greek language. *see* specific Greek words
Greeley, Horace, 1174
Greenland, 267, 1129
Greenspan, Alan, 701
Gregory I (Pope), 71
Gregory of Nyssa, St., 133–134, 794
Gregory VII, 1093
Grenfell, Wilfred Thomason, 1314
Gresham's law, 494
Grigson, Geoffry, 1065
Griswold v. Connecticut, 243
Groseclose, Elgin, 1062
Grosheide, F. W., 179
Grover, Alan N., 606–609
Grover Cleveland, 758
growth *vs.* instant gratification
maturing as the responsibility of Christians, 38, 169, 223, 358–359, 851–852, 1277–1278, 1292
personal growth *vs.* past-bound focus, 1320–1321
and trials as opportunities for growth, 1292, 1320–1321
in work, 688, 691, 819, 845–848, 879, 880, 888
guilds. *see* gilds
guilt
abandoning the concept, 1009, 1119
as a bond of men, 842–843
Christian freedom from, 837, 842
false atonement (*see* atonement, false)
false guilt, 333–334, 339, 759, 837
and fear, 1275
fuels persecution, 842, 1417
ideas in psychology, 21, 761, 1119
and impotence, 837
and madness, 799
manipulation, 249, 354–355, 837, 1004, 1072, 1353
as medical or scientific not religious, 336, 384, 1121
misdirecting blame, 813–815
primordial past, 492, 1248
as product of Christianity, 834, 1009
protection of the guilty, 280
reparation for past generations, 505
replaced with self-esteem, 1248–1249
and the "repressive past," 1119
and sadomasochism, 288, 799
and selective depravity, 632
for sins of others, 759
a social asset, 280, 1004
white guilt, 333–334, 354–355 (*see also* selective depravity)
Gulag Archipelago (Solzhenitsyn), 10, 452, 483, 1075
gun control, 234, 1016
Guthrie, James, 73
Guyon, Madame, 186

H

Habakkuk, 1178, 1180
Hagner, Donald A., 137–138
Halakhah, the, 1336
Hale, Nathan, 503
Hallesby, O., 1306
Hallowell, John H., 624
Halverson, Guy, 761
hamartia, Greek, 1187, 1246, 1247
Hamburg, David A., 548
Hamilton, Alexander, 878, 949–950
Hamilton, G.V., 782
Hamilton, Steve, 390
Hanani, 959
handmaid, translation, 1396
Hans, 785–786
happiness and joy. *see also* blessings from God
Christian spontaneity, 838
of Christmas, 1386, 1388, 1409, 1412, 1417, 1419–1420, 1422
and economic faithfulness, 681
joylessness and restlessness, 361, 836–837, 1373
and the priesthood of every believer, 444
study of Scripture, 1299, 1434

happiness and joy *(cont'd.)*
of true Christianity, 806, 816, 945, 1118, 1162, 1198, 1409, 1434
as ultimate goal, 350
harems, 473, 1212
harmony of interests
in Christian community, 41, 821, 864–866
vs. conflict of interests, 620
and God's sovereignty, 620–621, 866–867 (*see also* society when Christian)
and progress, 1029
vs. racism, 41
in service to God, 1343
and vitality of civilization, 1145–1146
Harper's Ferry, 1022
Harrington, James, 362
Harris, Frank, 279–280
Harris, Geoff, 1402
Hart, Johnny, 1322
Harvard Divinity School, 759
Harvard Law School Association of New York, 667
Harvard University, 263, 776, 795, 845, 1080
hashish, 460. *see also* drug and alcohol abuse
Hasmoneans, 5
Hasting, James, 796
hate, 883, 959, 1032, 1144, 1322, 1352
Hazlitt, Henry, 700, 777
headship doctrine, 375. *see also* authority, Biblical
health and medicine
and abortion, 548, 550, 631, 642 (*see also* abortion)
and Christian progress, 1110–1111
and death (*see* death, varying attitudes)
disease, 754–757
doctors, 549–550, 1065
"even the youths shall faint," 1297
and future-orientation, 1234–1241
God's laws of physiology, 250
and gratitude, 1345
"health of the nations," 1149–1150, 1169
historical epidemics, 771
historical pollution, 770–772
hospitals, 113, 1110–1111, 1376
humanism and inner pollution, 513
mental disorders (*see* mental disorders)
obstetrics and gynecology, 547
plagues, 754–757
psychiatry (*see* psychiatry and psychology)
punitive medicine, 596
Reconstruction in, 848
relativism in, 311
and statism, 25, 628, 999, 1111
"health" homes for children, 595–596
"health of the nations," 1149–1150, 1169
heaven
Biblical view of, 1377–1378, 1436–1437
and "Christian" escapism, 1350, 1377–1378
and equalitarianism, 454–455
Hebden-Taylor, Stacey, 539–540
Hebrew language. *see* specific Hebrew words
Hebrew midwives, 1141
Hebrews. *see also* Israel; Jews
application of Biblical Law, 126, 151, 889
Egyptian abomination, 522
families, 913
God's purpose for, 1166
Hebrews, book of, favored in early church, 69
hedonism, 303, 952, 1197
Heer, Friedrich, 820, 871
Hefner, Hugh M., 282, 818
Hegel and Hegelianism
concept of reality, 320 425, 1036, 1101
concept of the *Geist,* 1164, 1449
conflict of interests, 506–507
faith of modern man, 26, 59
father of social evolution, 391, 586, 694
immanence, 984
and the law, 667
love of *Rameau's Nephew,* 413
scientific planning man, 979–980
self-designated elitism, 405
state as God walking on earth, 55, 92, 130–131, 599, 621, 641, 737
Heidegger, Martin, 537
hell
awaiting Christ's enemies, 484
cannot prevail against the church, gates of, 303, 424, 600, 831
doctrine of heaven and, 840–841
as end of autonomy, 271, 415, 523–524, 618, 768, 804
false doctrines of, 133, 203
and God's Word, 1331
"hell is other people," 191, 319–320
"hell on earth," 9, 329, 485, 536, 1296
humanistic, 980–981
hunger for, 1294
and instant gratification, 359
Jesus as savior from, 1007
Marx's imagery of, 648
option of given by God, 1042
rich man in, 725

salvation from, 1040, 1129, 1149, 1215, 1224
Warren's new heaven and, 880
Hellenism, 457, 620, 635, 944, 968, 1158
Helm, Paul, 1157
Henry, Carl, 564–565
Henry, Patrick, 490, 717, 1360
Henry II, 422
Henry IV (Emperor), 1093
Henry VII, 765
Henry VIII, 91, 422, 765, 921
Hentoff, Nat, 1124
Herbert, Frank, 531–532
heresy. *see also* specific heresies
and church councils, 1096 (*see also* specific councils)
corrupting the church (*see* church as corrupted)
dividing Old and New Testaments, 633–634 (*see also* Old and New Testaments)
Gnosticism, 132, 396–397
and the Holy Spirit (*see* Holy Spirit, and heresy)
the Inquisition, 1047–1048
of love (*see* love, in heresy)
and the nature of Christ, 1448
the original sin as, 1136
postmillennialism as "heresy," 110, 120, 174–175, 1225
power of, 633–634
syncretism, 1118
view of God (*see* God in humanistic view)
heresy, defined, 81
hermits, 136, 1110
hero, Greek idea, 440–441, 835
hero, Roman idea, 830
Herod, 8, 9, 902, 1310, 1392, 1401, 1405, 1412, 1417
Herodotus, 522, 935
heroin, 460. *see also* drug and alcohol abuse
Herzan, Franziskus, 975
Hess, Thomas B, 537
Higginson, Thomas Wentworth, 260, 261
Hilarian, 1118
Hilckman, Anton, 1087–1088
Hildebrand (Gregory VII). *see* Gregory VII
Hills, Edward F., 151, 569
Hinduism, 257, 389, 455, 534
Hines, William, 754–755
hippies
anti-establishment, 1119
and autonomy, 320, 498, 554
contempt of work, 776
false idea of sin, 338
"Jesus Freaks," 120
and nihilism, 538
and primitivism, 1081, 1098, 1099
result of lack of societal discipline, 758
Hislop, Alexander, 1408, 1410
Hispanics, 1279, 1442
historical revisionism
and the church, 1131
and civil rights revolution, 243–244
and denial of original sin, 460
evolutionary framework, 139, 151–153
false distortion by Christianity, 459–460, 1047
as justification of evil, 1279
"living in the past," 494
and relativism, 510–511
and statistics, 510–511
War for American Independence, 503
history. *see also* the History Index
and the 9th commandment, 510
change and permanence, 372–374
church history (*see* church history)
dating system, 804
frameworks for understanding history
conspiracies, 813, 1195–1196
continual shaking, 1384–1385, 1400
cyclical view, 1184, 1211
development of original sin, 1018, 1168, 1184, 1186, 1424
experience as ultimate, 466
God's purposes, 223, 458, 724, 813, 1197, 1293, 1321, 1397
an accumulation of Christian victories, 422, 775, 1392
covenantal, 458
"first the blade," 1425
God's blessings, 1321, 1400–1401
God's sovereignty, 494–495, 939
incarnation as turning point, 1390, 1397, 1400–1401, 1414, 1422–1423
meaning and faith, 438, 458, 469, 1321
past proceeds from the future, 774, 1197, 1372, 1430
sin and salvation, 490–492, 1190, 1384, 1400
war between God and His enemies, 1018, 1092, 1186, 1254, 1400, 1417, 1425
wealth-building for God's Kingdom, 724, 1397

history
frameworks for understanding history *(cont'd.)*
hopeful modern turning point, 317, 351–352, 448, 501, 646, 828, 955, 992, 1040, 1069, 1103, 1116, 1119, 1132–1133, 1139, 1154, 1288
humanistic science, 460, 494
learn or repeat, 1320
personal history, 492, 813, 1293–1294, 1320
a struggle out of darkness of Christianity, 1047
past-bound focus, 494
and irrelevance, 82
vs. personal growth, 1320–1321
primitivism as ideal, 338
return to golden age, 349–350, 819, 824
and social failure, 514–515, 824, 1081, 1119, 1283
rejection of history
and barbarism, 834–835, 882–883
"debunking" of, 1328
depersonalization of, 192, 211, 221, 306, 813–815
in education, 36
in the Enlightenment, 258
in existentialism, 422, 875–876, 883
forgotten, 490–492, 875, 1423, 1431
meaning rejected in history, 493–495, 875, 1197
replaced by the social sciences, 459–460, 493–495
revisionism (*see* historical revisionism)
suspicion of source documents, 459–460, 494
study of history, 1235
history, defined, 493–495
Hitler, Adolf
anti-Semitism of, 293
break with Stalin, 500
on chemical and biological warfare, 755
and false justification, 467
guilt of, 338
as "hero," 442
humanistic dream of, 260
illusion of state, 1055
influenced by Tacitus, 339
influence on modern politics, 596
as justification of abortion, 548–549
and the National Socialist movement, 796 (*see also* Nazi Germany)
as new barbarian, 883
opposition to Christianity, 408
"Power to the People," 40, 306
and racism, 1129
rise due to separation of justice from the law, 1009
triumph of, 213
Hoagland, Hudson, 275–276
Hobbes, Thomas, 496, 617
Hobbesianism, 319
Hodge, Charles, 178, 1182
Hodge, Ian, 682, 684
Hoeksema, Herman, 156, 1253–1254
Hoffer, Eric, 767
Hoffman, Abbie, 209
Hoffman, Paul, 1011
holiness
Christian, 454–456, 1231, 1251–1252
in Christ's birth, 1394, 1395
does not imply the spiritual, 248
expressed by law, 84, 647, 668, 1035
and God's Holy Spirit, 149
and God's image, 217
and God's law, 84
"holier than God," 1250
humanistic, 802, 803, 993–994
immoral resistance to, 1161
man called to, 156, 414, 455, 739, 1064, 1215, 1230
man's exercise of, 223
vs. perfectionism, 80–81, 1199–1200 (*see also* legalism)
separation from sin, 1231
in service to God, 652, 722, 1217
and Student Crusade, 477
suffering as, 1212
Hollywood, 45, 1261
Holmes, Oliver Wendell, Jr., 280, 666–667, 1009
Holroyd, Michael, 700
Holy Grail, 478, 832
Holy Land, 94, 475, 476
Holy Roman Empire, 90, 95, 129–130. *see also* Roman Catholicism
Holy Spirit
contempt for,
by the church, 1164–1165
and church bylaws, 148
gift of God
baptism of, 1184–1185
and dominion, 481
and expectations of God, 1214–1215
and freedom, 92, 697, 1195
governing redeemed man, 149, 285, 1184–1185

"justified by the Spirit," 1183
power to change culture, 169, 674, 1226
the rebirth, 1189–1190
and saving understanding, 1159
sign of the Messianic age, 1184–1185
true filling, 427
working in the church, 1164–1165, 1226
and heresy
replaced with human emotion, 426, 783 (*see also* emotionalism)
replaced with human power, 80–81, 121, 481, 969, 1226, 1369
replaced with human reason, 1164–1165
state sovereignty, 90–92
superseding the Law of God, 133
home life. *see* family
Homer, 805
homeschooling. *see under* education
homosexuality
and antinomianism, 100, 272, 488, 801
and art, 799, 801
and child sexual abuse, 673, 901–902, 1212
in the church, 48, 158
cultivated in prisons, 96
for the experience, 782
and God's Law, 521, 626
inversion of values, 669
homosexuals as heroes, 276, 282, 431, 442
love of death, 799–800
promoted by the state, 48, 433
as a "royal privilege," 935
and "sensitivity training," 176
silencing Christianity, 281, 283, 584–585
"voluntary family," 595
of James I, 988
lesbianism, 280
and the occult, 179
rights movement, 86, 270, 281, 603, 1136
"right to privacy," 283, 284
and self-expression, 286
honor
God's honor, 235, 239, 540, 908, 1289, 1315, 1363
of God's law, 910, 1007
of immorality, 15
of laymen in church, 157
of legitimate authority, 29
martyrs dishonored, 299
of men, 490, 1125, 1279, 1364
of parents, 477, 538, 897, 909–910, 1320–1321, 1357
of Pharisees, 1339
of policemen, 35
of ungodly civil authorities, 1370–1371
Hooker, Richard, 393–394
Hoover, A.J., 1439
Hoover, Herbert, 160, 698, 699
Hoover, J. Edgar, 228
Hoover Institution, 976
hope
in change by war, 866, 1025–1026, 1028
of Christians
and Biblical economics, 677–681
of Christian parents, 1190–1191
church usurping God's place, 1044
in the midst of trials, 1320–1321
modern turning point, 317, 351–352, 448, 501, 646, 828, 955, 992, 1040, 1069, 1103, 1116, 1119, 1132–1133, 1139, 1154, 1288
postmillennial hope, 804, 848, 852, 872, 1040, 1124–1125, 1143–1144 (*see also* postmillennialism)
and victorious living, 837, 1081, 1154, 1196
and denial of sin, 465, 742, 1129
and economics, 677–681
in elections, 159, 355–356 (*see also* politics, salvation in)
in evolution, 1168–1169
false hope of false religions, 1255 (*see also* false gospels)
of humanist triumph (*see* utopian humanism)
in pagan statism, 1388–1389, 1415 (*see also* statism, salvation by the state)
hopelessness
and decadence, 677–679
and drug and alcohol abuse, 677–303, 1125
and the Fall of Rome, 303, 996, 1083
and meaninglessness, 206, 455, 1071, 1430
and the sexual revolution, 303
and social instability, 436, 448, 512–516
in voting and elections, 303
Hopkins, Samuel, 871, 1239–1241
Hopper, Edward, 799–800
Hosea, 86, 87
hospitality, 71, 108, 113, 899, 960
hospitals, 113, 1110–1111, 1376
"Hound of Heaven, The," 801
House of Lords, 192
Howe, Dr. Samuel Gridley, 261

How to Win Friends and Influence People (Carnegie), 176
Hugo, Victor, 766
Hull, Raymond, 320–321
humanism. *see also* specific subjects
  as anti-human, 217–218, 612, 648 (*see also* death, culture of)
  failure of, 212, 255, 540, 585–587, 710
  religion of,
    blessing expected despite sinfulness, 167, 1255–1256, 1271
    declared by U.S. Court, 463–464, 607
    establishment of, 32, 37, 52, 284, 285–286, 325, 329, 333, 378, 917, 1096
    false gospels (*see* false gospels)
    as Satanic, 590–592
    second oldest religion, 117
    taught in schools, 606
    utopianism (*see* utopian humanism)
  "secular humanism," 1208–1210
  self-destructive, 802–804, 1089–1091, 1119, 1123–1124, 1205–1206
humanism, defined, 18, 227
Humanist Manifesto I and *II*, 379
humanitarianism, 231, 342, 603, 700, 731
humanitarianism, defined, 227
humanity, usage and meaning, 920
human sacrifice, 179, 287–288, 805, 905, 935, 1264
human trafficking, 747. *see also* prostitution; slavery
Hume, David, 277, 425, 679, 789–790, 1163
Humphrey, George M., 237
Humphrey, Hubert, 763
Hungary, 262–263, 563
Hunt, Morton, 315–316
Hunter, Andrew, 479
Hunter, Daniel, 479
Huntford, Roland, 364, 596, 604, 605, 642, 986
Hutschnecker, Dr. Arnold, 310
Huxley, Aldous, 363, 986
Huxley, Julian, 127
Huxley, Thomas, 275
Hyatt, Thaddeus, 261
hymns, 74, 1129, 1392, 1409, 1422, 1425
hypersensitivity, 1342–1343. *see also* pettiness
hypocrisy
  of antinomianism, 15
  of the elite (*see* elitism, hypocrisy of)
  of Phariseeism, 1337–1338 (*see also* Pharisees and Phariseeism)
  in politics, 742, 1338 (*see also* politics)
hypostasis, Greek, 274
hysteria, 322

I

Ibn Ezra, Abraham, 1260
Idaho, 1060
idealism, 373, 553, 710, 862, 960–961, 1226
Ideas (Grigson and Gibbs-Smith), 1065
idolatry
  abominations as idolatrous, 521
  Arianism as, 395
  in Christianity, 1147
  free-market economics as, 984
  holy dread for, 1248
  "the new idolatry," 461–462
Ik people of Africa, 313–317, 1066
Il Penseroso (Milton), 934
images in the church, 140
immaturity. *see also* maturity
  instant gratification *vs.* growth, 449–450, 840, 847–848, 886–890
  institutional preventions of sin, 1042–1043
  lust for perpetual youth, 37, 807, 890
  medical model, 336
  result of humanism, 37
immigration, 1279
  America as a "promised land," 1131, 1142
  Biblical law for the stranger, 745
  Christian outreach to immigrants, 54, 881, 1111, 1124
  of Irish Catholics, 204
  national borders, 271
  and political elections, 967
  speaking foreign language in U.S., 865–866
  and wealth, 1431
immorality of humanism. *see* antinomianism; morality in humanism
immortality, 436, 476, 1200
impatience, 1199–1200, 1295–1296. *see also* patience
imperialism
  in the church, 68, 70, 588, 814, 1110
  debt and statist imperialism, 1069, 1273
  growth of, 344
  in socialism, 231, 871, 1264
  and taxation (*see* taxation)
  and war, 191, 935, 1023, 1025–1026, 1032
impotency
  in the church

and antinomianism, 5, 6, 33, 119, 310, 651, 674, 1114
and the failure to tithe, 102, 1206
people leaving impotent churches, 803
and pietism, 104–105, 119–123, 173, 289, 447, 464, 586, 598, 664–665, 827, 830, 953, 1015, 1121–1122, 1151
and the political arena, 102
and prayer, 1224
of conservativism, 267, 482–484, 539, 614, 963, 991, 1082, 1128–1129
and the denial of sin, 1128
and existentialism, 846–847, 869
of faith indicated by violence, 1020, 1120, 1142–1144
and the Fall of Rome, 991
"God has no impotent sons," 1143
and guilt, 837
of humanistic power, 238
of institutions as cultural solution, 991, 1023, 1086
of intellectualism, 311, 314, 354, 382, 411
of liberalism, 893–894
and meaninglessness, 1097
and neutrality, 463
and rationalism, 410–412
and relativism, 311
and selective depravity, 1143
of the student movement, 28, 553, 831, 894, 1119
of voting and elections, 245
incarnation
and absolute truth, 1097
challenge to reason, 1399–1403
as continued in the church, 131, 1449
God becoming man, 130, 393–394, 1164, 1390, 1395–1396, 1399–1403
great joy of, 1388 (*see also* Christmas)
harmony of the material and spiritual, 793–794
and orthodoxy, 129
in paganism, 129–130
and salvation, 1419
and statism, 131, 644, 648, 1448 (*see also* democracy, state incarnation of general will)
as turning point of history, 1390, 1397, 1400–1401, 1414, 1422–1423
and the victory of Christ, 1383–1387, 1419–1420, 1425
incest, 40, 272, 282, 380, 875. *see also* abuse, sexual abuse
income tax. *see under* taxation, types of taxes
India, ancient, 1109
India and Indians, 98, 201, 216, 225, 226, 490, 532, 534, 855, 1096
Indian Ocean, 491
Indians, American. *see* Native American Indians
Indies, 875–876
individualism
and abuse, 320
and anarchism, 319–320
and barbarism, 314–316, 320 (*see also* barbarism and rootlessness)
and evasion of responsibility, 270–271, 420
isolationism
destructive end of humanism, 329, 799–800
vs. historic American isolationism, 205
statism and social isolation, 1265
and meaninglessness, 694
quest for self-realization, 282, 331, 555
indulgences, 93–96, 1215
Industrial Revolution, 39, 648, 777–778, 854
infallibility of Scripture. *see under* Bible
infant baptism. *see under* baptism
inflation
and bad character, 709–710, 846–848, 879, 1274
consequences of, 255, 466
and decapitalization, 687–690, 691–692, 715
and devaluation, 712–714
"for God and country," 1356–1360
form of theft, 989
government reaction to, 705
harms economy, 721, 758–759, 851, 1071
management by the state, 235
result of debt, 679
runaway inflation, 31, 759, 1069, 1102
saving the economy, 1356
and taxation, 31, 702
as transfer of property to government, 1100
and wages, 100
and the welfare state, 812–815
inflation, defined, 709
information, defined, 928
infralapsarianism, 81
Ingram, T. Robert, 295, 385, 1124
inheritance
as Biblical, 897, 909, 916–918
and capitalization, 897–898
disinheritance and God's judgment, 273, 848, 1288

inheritance *(cont'd.)*
disinheritance and rebellion, 1266
disinheritance of Christian children, 1318–1319
double portion, 897, 916
and heritage, 1431
and lack of work, 1284–1286
of land in the Bible, 1257
treatment of widows and orphans, 993, 997–998, 999–1000
"we are spending our children's inheritance," 899–900
inheritance and death taxes, 688, 701, 731, 898, 916, 993, 997–998, 999–1000, 1020
iniquity. *see* sin
Inland Revenue Commissioners, 1071
Innocent III (Pope), 473–475, 1047
Inquisition, 1047–1048
insane asylums, 415, 438
insanity and culture, 185, 436, 1084. *see also* mental disorders
instant gratification *vs*. growth
contempt for work, 758–760, 775–778
decadence over spiritual strength, 449–450, 688, 708, 886–890
and humanistic politics, 449–450, 759, 840, 846, 878, 1199–1200
and impatience, 1199–1200, 1295–1296
and miracles, 1200, 1201
and the occult, 449–450, 860, 966
and revolution, 361, 841, 879, 888, 1199–1200
and sinfulness in work, 358–359, 429, 840, 861
and suicide, 359, 888
and utopian humanism, 355–356, 449–450, 758, 879, 1282, 1296
Institutes of the Christian Religion (Calvin), 1121, 1162
institutions
based on faith, 1102, 1146
becoming irrelevant, 823, 826–827
impotent solution, 991, 1023, 1086
and power, 17
insubordination, 437, 816. *see also* anarchy
insurance, 701, 848
insurance, "Gospel" as merely. *see under* false gospels, easy-believism
intellectual authority of Christianity, 1120–1121, 1149–1150, 1277–1278. *see also* pietism, anti-intellectual
intellectual history, 201, 262
intellectualism. *see also* academia; rationalism
vs. character, 1344
vs. Christian faith, 137–138, 311, 410–412, 975, 1136, 1189
and class structure, 40, 248, 723, 777–779, 870, 883
critical analysis, 42, 410–412, 1131
and elitist rule, 40, 778, 883, 1036–1037, 1132 (*see also* elitism, philosopher-kings)
hatred of free industry, 777–779, 1101–1102
impotency of, 311, 314, 354, 382, 411
interest in occultism, 382
and law, 38, 314, 647–648, 750
and morality, 38, 314, 1131
and nihilism, 382, 436, 438, 760
relativism as favored, 767, 927, 1170
and statism, 1036–1037, 1132, 1404
subsidized, 765, 1201–1202
view of crime, 38, 314
Intercollegiate Society of Socialists, 260, 261
interdependence, 269, 321, 696–697
Internal Revenue Service (IRS)
calls to abolish, 355
charitable trust doctrine of, 597
efficiency of, 1068
investigating racism, 601
production of records, 660
profit *vs*. non-profit, 685–686
reclassification of the church, 596
regulated by Congress, 1003
source of morality, 645
subsidization of the press, 733
and "sweetheart suits," 604
taxation of Christian schools, 584
as a Tower of Babel, 592
international relationships
detente, 612, 977
diplomacy, 1027
evil states as trusted and defended, 499–500, 976, 1370
foreign aid, 500, 976, 1069, 1073
immigration (*see* immigration)
international debts, 678
interventionism, 191, 205, 346, 964, 1025–1026, 1131, 1338, 1370
isolationism, 205
lending money, 698, 1032
missionary power, 964, 1142–1143
one world order, 191, 202, 286, 305–307, 324, 667–668, 1007
League of Nations, 376, 667, 1128
United Nations, 191, 209, 376, 523, 898, 1007, 1128
and universal ethics, 1356

and world salvation, 344, 390, 1075, 1388
peace treaties, 494, 499, 866
restitution and foreign policy, 653
subsidizing terrorist groups, 731, 1032
and war, 1027–1028, 1034–1035 (*see also* war)
world peace, 348, 1094, 1338 (*see also* postmillennialism; society when Christian)
interpretation of Scripture. *see under* Bible
interracial marriage, 865, 1079
interventionism. *see under* international relationships
investments. *see under* business
"Invisible Hand," the, 679, 693–695
Iphigenia at Aulis (Euripides), 287–288
Iphigenia in Tauris (Goethe), 287–288
Iran and Iranians, 1303
Iraq, 1035, 1303, 1338
Ireland, 864, 1143
Irenaeus, St., 133, 1164
Iron Curtain. *see under* communism
Iroquois Indians, 887, 889–890
irrationalism, 808, 1084–1085, 1163
Isaac, 944, 1166
Isabella of Spain, 870–871
Islam and Muslims (Mohammedans)
call for black separation, 1079
equality for, 603
Frederick II secret Muslim, 1048
Kimball and "Christian" dualism, 464
the *Koran,* 152
modern resurgence, 464
no neutrality with Christianity, 1432
state as true church, 107
view of god, 390
isolationism *vs.* interventionism. *see under* international relationships
isos, Greek, 1077
Israel. *see also* Hebrews; Jews
concept of city in, 745
education in, 54, 1117–1118
and fulfillment of prophesy, 8, 1175
modern, 100, 253
Old Testament Israel (*see* Old and New Testaments)
in pre-Christian world, 588
replaced by church, 1232 (*see also* Old and New Testaments, continuity of the church)
rulers silence prophets, 597
and syncretism, 200–201
tithing in, 1258–1259
war in, 1035
Italy and Italians, 1068, 1303
Fascist Italy, 983, 1040
Italian Renaissance, 926
Ostrogoth kingdom, 515
I think therefore I am (Cogito, ergo sum), 425, 507
IUDs forced in China, 650

J

Jackson, Andrew, 480
Jacob, 7–8, 1166
Jacobinism in the U.S., 509
Jacobins, 443, 648. *see also* French Revolution
James, 1117, 1308
James (brother of Jesus), 83, 103, 1447
James, Henry, Sr., 472
James, William, 205
James I, 570
Japan, 527, 1028
Jeffers, Robinson, 217–218
Jefferson, Thomas, 144, 490, 878
Jehoshaphat, 959
Jehu, 959
Jeremiah, 155, 1291, 1446
Jerome, 1260
Jerusalem, 68, 109, 342, 1087, 1117, 1274, 1446
Jesuits, 390, 1361–1362
Jesus, meaning, 1395
Jesus (Joshua) ben Sirach, 763
Jesus Christ. *see also* Lordship of Christ
atonement of (*see* atonement by Christ)
church as Body, 130, 1449
deity and incarnation, 130, 393–394, 1164, 1448 (*see also* incarnation)
false versions of, 83, 155, 279 (*see also* false gospels)
federal headship of, 644–645
historical life
the Annunciation, 1394–1398
birth, 9, 1383–1387, 1388, 1391–1392, 1404, 1408–1409, 1412, 1417, 1424 (*see also* Christmas)
faithfulness in midst of evil, 29
harsh teachings, 155
Herod hunting the Christ child, 902
the Magnificat, 1399–1403
offensive to leading churchmen, 1189, 1318
persecution of, 902, 1318
and Pilate, 330

Jesus Christ
historical life *(cont'd.)*
sinlessness of, 1247
temptation of, 342, 1108
as King, 605, 804, 1253, 1371, 1384, 1395, 1400, 1405, 1412, 1414, 1417, 1422, 1439
"the government shall be upon His shoulder," 1107
lordship of
freedom under, 994
nature of, 1448 (*see also* incarnation)
offices and names of,
Counsellor, 1384
the Door, 1207
Everlasting Father, 1384
God's Passover lamb, 256
as High Priest, 110, 112, 1406
the Light of the world, 981
Lion of Judah, 7–8
Mighty God, 1384
as Potentate, 174–175, 1371
the Prince of Peace, 8, 1030, 1384
the Redeemer, 1390–1391
Rock of Ages, 1440
Shiloh, 7–10
Tree of Life, 1149, 1449
the True Vine, 1449
Wonder of the Ages, 1384
prophesies of (*see* prophesies of Christ)
rejected by the world, 1417, 1422
resurrection of, 1218 (*see also* resurrection)
salvation through (*see* salvation, through Christ alone)
as the second Adam, 130, 285, 644–645, 1179–1180, 1247, 1271, 1384, 1389, 1391, 1397, 1400–1403, 1422, 1424–1425, 1449
"Jesus freaks," 120
Jews. *see also* Hebrews; Israel
anti-Semitism, 184, 213, 290, 293–294, 378, 379, 408, 549, 1003, 1078, 1094–1095 (*see also* racism, and selective depravity)
baptism of proselytes, 905
baptism of the Holy Spirit, 1184
as chosen of God, 633
under *de facto* Roman rule, 671
faith of, 494
false accusations of, 288
future orientation of, 847
hatred of, 738
intermarriage with Spaniards, 870
Jewish conspiracy, 892, 1003
Jewish Targums, 7
Judaism (*see* Judaism)
and the name of God, 5
obedience to the Law, 889
pride of, 236
priorities in 17th century, 1121
protection of families, 909
religious faith banned in U.S., 433
survival through loss of civil government, 898
taxation of, 108
victimhood of, 1442
Jezebel, 1109, 1141
jinn, Arabic, 440
Job, 116, 1197
jobs. *see* business, labor
John, 1117, 1140, 1308
John, King of England, 621
John Birch Society, 234
John of Salisbury, 367
Johnson, Edward, 946
Johnson, Lyndon B., 31, 160, 201–202, 234, 763, 965
Johnson, Paul, 787
Johnson, William, 1241
Johnston, Pamela, 1303
Johnston, Quentin, 1303
John the Baptist, 1394
John VIII (Pope), 90
Jonas, David, 1020
Jonas, Doris, 1020
Jordan, 1035
Jordan, W. K., 1124
Joseph, husband of Mary, 1310, 1389, 1394, 1395, 1405
Joseph, son of Jacob, 1317
Joseph II, 975
Josephus, 1260
Joshua, 116–117
Journal of Christian Reconstruction, 341, 742
joy. *see* happiness and joy
Joyce, James, 774
jubilee, 710
Judah, 7–8, 200–201, 597
Judah, defined, 7
Judaism, 390. *see also* Jews
Judas, 541, 542
Judea and Judeans, 670–671, 1445
judging
critical analysis (*see* critical analysis)
"don't be judgmental," 1335
and grace, 1369
inherent to man made in God's image, 550

"judge not, that ye be not judged," 1324, 1334–1335
"judge righteous judgment," 1334–1335
and the myth of neutrality, 1334
political candidates, 720–721
rationalism (*see* rationalism)
in terms of God's Word, 410, 480, 522, 591, 637, 866, 1222
judgment of God
for abortion, 550, 1219, 1401
attempts to escape, 775
begins in the house of God
for antinomianism in the church, 156, 158, 657, 1005, 1021, 1288
cleansing and disinheritance, 273, 848, 1288
earning judgment for culture, 657, 1005, 1021, 1288
and failure to take Christian dominion, 1383
and the future, 880
and His covenant, 168–169, 1219–1220
for lack of tithing, 1127, 1260, 1268
on professing Christians, 4, 245, 273, 514, 743, 848, 1205–1206, 1217
for sinful prayers, 1313
and disease, 756–757
for economic sins, 678, 703, 848, 1005, 1063, 1127, 1286
and evil rulers
for destruction of His people, 18
God judges evil rulers, 1399
taxation as judgment, 710
using evil rulers to judge, 1363
and future-orientation, 880
for historical sins, 97–99
and the modern world
for antinomianism, 253, 268
and the decay of justice, 992, 1205
denial of Christ's power, 10
ending of an age, 756–757, 992, 1024, 1069
of falsely wise men, 1406
forthcoming judgment, 703, 1063, 1232
and guilt, 280
Marxism, 260
minimized by moderns, 98, 211, 1219–1221
prayer for God's judgment, 1137
preparing for, 1180, 1349
of scientific planners, 1204
and utopian humanism, 235, 251, 992
rejected by revolutionists, 391
restitution is effected, 654–655
using slavery, 1260–1261
a victorious deliverance, 235–236, 245, 253, 271, 954–955
wages of sin is death, 157–158, 523, 681, 714, 1063, 1195, 1436
and Christ's atonement, 1180, 1324
"God is no buttercup," 1219–1221
grace and judgment, 1369
and the victory of Christ, 1205–1206, 1392
Judson, Adoniram, 1203
Jung, Carl G., 344, 860, 1291
Jupiter, 830, 1064
justice
in Christianity
and atonement (*see* atonement)
based on eternal justice, 543, 1006–1008
"blind" justice, 297
Christian delight in, 1231
Christian duty, 17, 486–487, 1113–1114
as abdicated, 823, 1007, 1113–1114, 1129, 1209
and baptism, 1184–1185, 1187
for citizens and noncitizens alike, 745–746
civil government as ministry of justice, 55, 211, 673, 1010, 1029, 1093–1097, 1110, 1127
in the courts, 745–746, 1009, 1078
foreign to a fallen world, 1351–1352
goal as God's order, 659–661, 1006–1008, 1231
and God's Law as standard, 652, 1161
and God's sovereignty, 131, 648, 652, 920–921, 1006–1008, 1011
and hell, 543
and the Lordship of Christ, 535–536, 643, 651, 652, 994, 1023
and mercy, 665, 992
no respecter of persons, 1078
and regeneration, 361
and restitution, 653–655, 659–660
and righteousness, 1006–1008, 1011, 1113–1114
as separated from love, 634, 635
humanistic
antinomianism and worldwide injustice, 618, 637, 650, 992, 993–994, 1006–1008, 1031, 1205–1206
and atheism, 650, 1203

justice
humanistic *(cont'd.)*
defined by the elite, 409, 1088, 1088–1090
defined by the state, 363, 465, 605, 641–643, 648, 650–652, 667–668, 995
denial of, 650
divorced from law, 1009–1012, 1231
divorced from truth, 1096–1097
and equalitarianism, 827, 1074, 1088
and fascism, 642
fear of personal condemnation, 1058
feministic, 334
independence from God, 617
man as god, 191, 409
in Marxism, 618, 641, 642
and meaninglessness, 800–801, 835
in Nazi Germany, 618, 641, 1009
and "neutrality," 463
pardons and indulgences, 95–96
radical morality, 667
as redefined by the state, 605
redistributive state, 1020–1021
rejection of God's justice, 651, 994, 1023, 1088–1089, 1096–1097
and relativity, 555
replaced with "technicalities," 1053
right to violence, 199
sacrificed for envy, 656–657, 668, 717, 779, 1089
sacrificed for equality, 827, 1074
sacrificed for power, 399, 467, 471–472, 523, 995
sacrificed for pragmatism, 205–206
sacrificed for sentimentalism, 1312–1313
sacrificed for the original sin, 1006–1007, 1053
sacrificed for the sovereignty of man, 409, 748, 1001–1002, 1074
sacrificed for unconditional "love," 959–962
slavery of, 1057–1059
"social justice" (*see* social justice)
and social planning, 159, 485–487
state as voice of natural law, 636
vigilante "justice," 673–674
vengeance, 94
justice, translated, 1006, 1011
justice, usage, 667–668
justification, 1178–1183. *see also* atonement by Christ
Justin Martyr, 1118

K

Kahler, Erich, 874, 915
Kahm, H.S., 760
Kahn, Herman, 817, 819
Kalish, Donald, 760
Kansas, 479
Kant and Kantianism, 135
concept of freedom, 58
concept of law, 497–498
concept of reality, 425, 507, 1163–1164
peace as fundamental right, 195–196
results in anarchism, 318, 319
Kappel Commission, 31
Karlin, Marvin, 1080
karma, 98, 389. *see also* Buddhism; Hinduism
Katzenjammer Kids, 786
Kaufmann, Walter, 650, 651, 1009, 1011
Kellogg-Briand Pact of Paris, 148, 196, 1128
Kelly, Douglas F., 163–164
Kelly, Thomas, 73
Kempis, Thomas A., 775
Kendall, Willmoore, 407
Kennedy, Edward (Ted) Moore, 1284–1286
Kennedy, John F., 27, 348, 613, 698, 918, 1091
Kennedy family, 210, 1286
Kentucky, 569, 584, 699
Kentucky Fried Chicken, 699
Kenya, 313
Kerr, Clark, 1216–1217
Keynes, John Maynard, 678, 700, 848
Keynesian economics, 473, 678, 700–701, 1085
Khmer Rouge, 485
Khrushchev, Nikita, 254, 893
kibbutzim, 253
kidnappings, 294, 889, 1354
Kieckhefer, Richard, 1047
Kierkegaard, Søren, 120, 391, 449, 834
Kimball, John C., 464
kindness masking evil, 523–524, 867
King, Martin Luther, Jr., 234, 353, 965–966, 1175
King, Rodney, 657, 1004
Kingdom of God. *see also* Lordship of Christ
baptism as Kingdom sacrament, 1184–1185, 1188
begins with regeneration, 872
conflict with the kingdom of man, 590–592, 593, 597, 606, 967, 1190
and conversion, 872, 1397 (*see also* evangelism)

and definition of the church, 67–68, 76
and dominion (*see* dominion)
duty of every Christian, 592, 721, 723, 1129–1130, 1195–1196, 1214–1215, 1271, 1280, 1351, 1377, 1425, 1442, 1445 (*see also* Reconstruction, Christian)
a government, 109
as limited to the church, 563–564, 570
and power, 17 (*see also* power, Christian power)
progress through history (*see* history, frameworks for understanding history, God's purposes; postmillennialism)
redemption of the material, 793–794
total priority of, 136, 1147–1148, 1445
King James Version, 521, 602
Kingsburg cemetery, 1436
Kinsey, Alfred, 488, 1007
Kinsmen-Redeemer, 1391–1392
kleptomania, 1006
Knights of Malta, 1110–1111
Knights Templar, 990, 1047
Knollys, Hansard, 530
knowledge
education in Christianity (*see* education in Christianity)
education in humanism (*see* education in humanism)
epistemological self-consciousness, 34, 452, 537–540
as established by God's Word, 1168, 1216–1218
heart *vs.* head knowledge, 462, 1251 (*see also* pietism)
"knowledge is power," 36
as man-made, 1439–1440
and obedience, 1368
and presuppositionalism, 1168 (*see also* presuppositionalism)
priority of knowledge, 1230
of reality (*see* reality)
salvation by, 1189
Know-Nothing Party, 204
Knox, John, 91, 300, 367
Koneczny, Feliks, 1087, 1145
Koningsberger, Hans, 552, 555
Koran, 152. *see also* Islam
kos, meaning, 145
Kosygin, Alexei, 201–202, 543
Kristol, Irving, 555, 767
Kroner, Pauline, 788
Kronstadt mutiny, 354
Kruschev, Nikita, 893
Kubin, Larry, 805
Kuh, Katharine, 915
kulaks, 1003
Kurdish forces, 1429
kurios, Greek, 54
Kuwait, 1303
Kuyper, Abraham, 563, 565, 624
Kwan-Yin, 454, 456, 534–536
Kyriakondoma, Greek, 67
Kyriakos, Greek, 67
Kyrios, Greek, 47, 54

L

labor. *see under* business
Lactantius, 920
Laing, Ronald D., 208–209
L'Allegro (Milton), 934
Lammerts, Walter, 1168
Landau, Emma, 1242
Landers, Ann, 264, 336
land tax. *see* taxation
language
and culture, 274–275, 785, 796
exploited for power, 365
harsh language in Christianity, 1219–1220
Latin studies, 933
philosophy of, 274, 929
and reason, 462
speaking foreign language in U.S., 865–866
and systematic meaning, 928–929
vocabulary and thinking, 274
Lansdell, Henry, 1260
lapsarianism, 81
larceny and economics, 713–716
Lardner, George Jr., 761
Larsen, Otto N., 311
Lasswell, Harold, 767
Last Adam. *see* New Adam, the
Last Judgment by Michelangelo, *801*
Las Vegas, 714
Late, Great Planet Earth, The (Lindsey), 1122
Latin, 463, 473
Latin America, 690, 1022, 1281
Latin poetry, 776
Laufenberg, Heinrich von, 1190
law
Christian view
and accountability to God, 1009, 1021, 1025
and atonement, 99, 289, 632, 652

law
Christian view *(cont'd.)*
balance of law and liberty, 56, 263
cannot save man, 316, 325
canon law, 130
common law, 550, 832, 970
and defining sin, 306
and grace (*see* grace and law)
lacking in fallen man, 315
law of the sea, 810
Laws of God (*see* Law of God)
as moral, 591–592, 631–632
"of the Spirit of life," 1008
and revelation of God, 666–667, 1008
rule of law, 194
and sovereignty of God, 130, 131, 423, 592, 621, 629, 636, 647, 1009, 1021
theonomy (*see* theonomy)
Western shift from Christian to humanistic, 105, 330–331, 752–753, 1009
classical (*see* classical philosophy and culture, and statism)
common law, 550–551
and crime, 38, 242 (*see also* crime)
law enforcement (*see* law enforcement)
restitution, 653–654, 1014
heretical view
love replaces law, 654
as higher order
moral expression, 28, 32, 37, 51, 266, 273, 325, 333, 592, 936, 1217
natural law, 330–331, 635–637
order of Melchisedec, 1008, 1406
physical laws, 250
religious expression, 745, 1008, 1021, 1066, 1072, 1096
sanctity of the law, 667
supplants and negates lower law, 639
"voice of equity" doctrine, 367
humanistic
autonomy
vs. God's Law, 567, 572, 578–579, 626–627, 1025, 1114
and man's sovereignty, 423, 457, 617–619, 621, 623–624, 647–649, 661, 666–669, 808
and original sin, 358–359
rejection of right and wrong, 1009–1012
based on man's needs, 27, 255, 266, 638–639
based on man's reason, 457, 507, 647–648, 1008
based on man's rights, 196, 281
protection of the guilty, 280, 747, 962, 1006, 1065
based on the strong man's whims, 968, 990, 1007–1008
crisis, 336, 348, 654
defined by each individual, 381, 639, 1008
defined by the church, 130, 1008
defined by "the people," 26, 359, 1010
defined by the state, 251, 423, 434, 666, 753, 1010, 1045
and abortion, 48, 284, 548–550, 597, 642, 1001–1002 (*see also* abortion, and the state)
based on social experience, 458, 666–669, 1009
crime defined by state, 472, 492, 629, 995, 1045
and emergencies, 762
façade of legal tradition, 647–648
fiat law and sovereignty, 604, 621, 636, 644–645, 732, 1017, 1100–1102, 1114
gun control, 234
is fundamentally unjust, 651–652, 1007–1008, 1010
legal positivism, 273, 554–555, 624, 1009
licensing, 995
neglect of existing law, 901
omnipotence of criticism, 1331–1333
possessor of the Spirit, 92
pragmatism, 458, 612, 1007–1008, 1035
public policy, 48, 597, 602, 1048
public *vs.* private realm, 638–639
reasons of state, 639
regulations as always growing, 335, 901, 995, 1016–1018, 1062–1063
social contract, 614
tool for immoral politics, 591–592, 614, 654, 733, 1007–1008, 1010
used to steal, 233–234
divorced from grace, 1093
divorced from justice, 1009–1012, 1020–1021, 1089–1090
exploited for power, 458, 824, 990, 1020
and liberal "equality," 20

medical model, 335–337
overprescription, 148–150
and sadism, 272–273
salvation by law, 296, 334, 369, 1013–1015, 1016–1018, 1019–1020, 1042–1043, 1062–1063
as transient, 617–619
brute force replacing law, 1089
counted offenses always growing, 335
and existentialism, 422–424, 457–458, 1020
immunity of elite (*see* elitism, hypocrisy of)
instrument of class power, 458, 654, 1010
no absolutes, 328, 1009–1012, 1020
as political tool, 654, 660, 1010, 1020
as respecter of persons, 234
selective depravity, 291, 296–298 (*see also* selective depravity)
social instability, 36, 40, 251, 266, 329, 334, 372–374, 380, 1010
social planning replacing law, 458, 612, 647–648
tantrum legislation, 359
vox populi, vox dei (*see under* democracy)
lawmakers (*see* legislatures)
law, defined, 666–669
Law, John, 516
law, translated, 1008
law enforcement, 28, 336. *see also* police
lawlessness. *see* antinomianism; crime
Law of God
antinomianism (*see* antinomianism)
ceremonial, 162 (*see also* Old and New Testaments, era of the Old Testament)
and Christian living
and child dedication, 904–906
"love thy neighbor as thyself," 867, 1325–1326
and peace, 1386
personal responsibility, 619, 1124, 1215
priorities in, 1358, 1437
requires future-orientation, 880
as comprehensive standard for judgment, 410, 480, 522, 591, 637, 866, 1222
bringing state under, 589, 1011, 1014–1015, 1023–1024, 1207
modern need for God's Law, 184–185, 636–637
and politics, 161
universal accountability, 98–99, 113
used in early America, 1113
false views
distorted and misused, 342, 593–594
divided as ceremonial, civil, and moral, 626, 947, 1161
as "done away with," 162
Holy Spirit supersedes God's Law, 668
limited as private religion, 638–640, 650–652
as "primitive," 126
replaced with man-made rules, 1336–1339, 1354
replaced with universal ethics, 1356
as symbolic, 133–134
fundamental premises
covenants (*see* covenants and covenantal theology)
duty of man *vs.* rights, 196 (*see also* rights of man, *vs.* duty)
as expression of God's nature, 272–273, 647, 652, 668, 1161–1162, 1200
as fixed, 335
freedom to sin, 1042–1043
as habitat of man, 252, 1200
as "law of liberty," 631, 1165, 1222
limits man (*see* authority, Biblical, limits on man's authority)
and love of God, 276–277, 652
as only valid law, 964
as precise and specific, 591, 1200
replaced with "virtue," 104, 647–648, 1355
restitution, 653–655
and the sovereignty of God, 1168–1169
standard for all institutions, 588–589
standard for justice, 652, 1161
stressed care for poor, 247
and Jesus Christ
and Christ's atonement, 334, 653–655, 1013, 1324
continued by Christ, 1260
the Lordship of Christ, 1113–1114, 1215
obedience and faith in Christ, 1215, 1253
as our schoolmaster, 1182–1183
Ten Commandments
1st commandment
idolatry (*see* idolatry)

Law of God
Ten Commandments
1st commandment *(cont'd.)*
sovereignty of God (*see* sovereignty of God)
2nd commandment
images in the church, 140
3rd commandment
blasphemy (*see* blasphemy)
4th commandment
Sabbatarianism, 360–361
Sabbath (*see* Sabbath)
5th commandment
and the family, 909–910, 1357
honoring father and mother, 1320
6th commandment (*see also* murder)
and abortion, 546–547, 1001
and American law, 244
and Christian love, 277
and selective depravity, 293–294
7th commandment (*see also* sexual crimes and perversions)
and adultery, 15, 162, 244, 277, 307, 752, 909, 947, 1323, 1326, 1357–1358, 1363
and American law, 244
and Christian love, 277
and the family, 909–910, 1357
homosexuality, 521, 626
8th commandment (*see also* theft)
and American law, 244
and Christian love, 277
and economics, 1070
and the family, 1357
legalized theft, 669
property protected, 263–264, 725
stealing children from God, 905
9th commandment
and American law, 244
false witness, 659
in history, 510
perjury, 164, 463, 659
political lies (*see* politics, humanistic)
10th commandment
see also envy, 668
covetousness, 669
debt (*see* debt, and God's Law)
envy, 668
and the family, 909–910, 1357
property protected, 725
banned by churches, 969
banned in courthouses, 433
banned in state schools, 753
death penalty (*see* capital punishment)
theonomy (*see* theonomy)
Lawrence (town in Kansas), 480
Lawrence, Amos A., 261
Lawrence, D. H., 442
Lawrence, St., 1441
law schools, 632, 1010, 1065
Lawson, Bryon S., 1287
lawyers, 336, 963, 997, 1010, 1065
Lazarus, 725
League for Industrial Democracy, 260
League of Nations, 376, 667, 1128
Leary, Timothy, 884
Lebanon, 1035
Le Bec, 1121
Lebedoff, David, 604
Lee, Robert E., 480, 1034
leftism. *see* liberalism
legalism. *see also* Pharisees and Phariseeism
and antinomianism, 282, 323–325, 342–343, 591–592, 1336–1239
appeals to God's Law as, 618
censoriousness, 1368
in the church, 80–81, 148–149, 1337 (*see also* church as corrupted, with totalitarianism and abuse)
controlling other people, 591–592, 1336–1339
creeds and regulations, 148–150
"holier than God," 1250
perfection *vs.* holiness, 80–81, 1199–1200
and pride, 81
replacing God's Law, 1336–1339
results in modernism, 1250–1251
legislatures, 1017, 1050, 1102, 1128. *see also* specific bodies
Lehrman, Lewis E., 680
Lenin, Vladimir
economy of socialism, 701, 703, 821, 892–893
establishment of world Marxism, 121–122
"hero" of nineteenth century, 442
humanistic faith of, 190
idolized by middle class, 40
and moral bankruptcy, 525–526
power of "charisma," 883
precedence of politics, 877
taught Mussolini, 603
totalitarianism of, 1040, 1064
utopian dream, 361
worshiped by humanistic states, 1066

Lenski, Gerhard, 1395
Leo I (Pope), 129, 130, 1448
Lermontov, Mikhail, 436
Letters of Junius, 26
Leupold, H.C., 744
Levi, Mario Attilio, 1084
Levites, 54, 107–108, 925, 1259, 1265, 1443
liber, meaning, 776
"liberal education," 776, 939
liberalism
  anti-Christian, 325, 1001–1002
  and child abuse, 901
  degeneration into totalitarianism, 1009
  failure of liberal moralism, 552–556
  impossible dream, 539, 865, 893–894
  and impotency, 893–894
  losing faith in state, 1082–1083
  and materialism, 624
  the New Left, 36, 58, 193, 209, 210, 213, 767, 778, 779, 780, 880, 985, 1282
  the Old Left, 209
  and racism, 45
  and sovereignty, 325
  stressing change, 373
liberation theology, 341–343, 599–600
Liberman, Noel, 760
libertarianism, 31, 142, 684, 984, 1309
Liberty Bell, 1258
libraries, 144
license, translated, 602
licensure. *see also* social planning
  of the church, 53, 583–584, 931
  in economics, 995, 1016
  and elitist rule, 53, 55 (*see also* elitism)
  religion in Rome, 107, 610
"Lida" from *Sanine,* 435
Liebman, L., 836
life, sanctity of. *see* sanctity of life
Ligouri, St. Alphonse de, 119
Lilliputians, 491–492
Lilly family, 891
limitations of men, 1084–1085. *see also* authority, Biblical, limits on man's authority
Lincoln, Abraham, 508, 1174
Lindberg, D.R., 705
Lindsay, John V., 1124
Lindsey, Hal, 1122
Lindstron, Paul, 937
literature, 349, 441, 933, 934
Little, David, 1091
"Little Lessons Along the Road" (Read), 1100
liturgy, etymology, 53, 207
liturgy in the church, 143, 163, 1374–1375
Lloyd George, David, 43
Lloyd-Jones, Martyn, 1145–1146
local work of Reconstruction, 1116, 1359
Locke, John, 36, 40, 394, 404–405, 407–408, 476, 682–684, 963
Loeb Classical Library, 932
Lofton, John, 1242
London, 233, 568, 754, 850, 988, 1102
London, Jack, 261
Long, Huey, 604
lord, defined, 12
Lord meaning, 585–586
Lordship of Christ. *see also* specific subjects
  and Calvinism, 113, 145
  and Christian atonement, 10, 18, 237, 285, 333, 376, 586 (*see also* atonement by Christ, and society)
    and freedom from sin, 20, 492, 631, 970, 1042, 1055–1056, 1066, 1424
  and Christian duty (*see also* individual responsibility, Christian)
    commanding His church now, 1226
    opposing totalitarianism, 109, 597, 607, 1023, 1048, 1109–1112
    total surrender to Christ, 1196, 1222–1223
    to work and influence culture, 174–175, 585–586, 1015, 1227 (*see also* Reconstruction, Christian)
  as comprehensive, 953–955, 970 (*see also* sovereignty of God, and His total Lordship)
    changes all of society, 1151
    in every discipline of life, 1146, 1216–1218
    vs. individual consent as ultimate, 404–405
    vs. injustice of man, 651, 994, 1023
    nothing "secular," 1208–1210
    over spiritual and material, 1176, 1208–1210
    over the state, 32, 194, 245–246, 250–251, 1014–1015, 1107, 1109–1110, 1371
    provides meaning to life, 282
    source of authority and freedom (*see* authority, Biblical; freedom in Christianity)
    and total obedience of Christians, 304, 585, 1214–1215, 1244
    vs. tyranny of man, 18, 50, 644, 994, 1023, 1056, 1107
  denial of (*see also* antinomianism)
    as basic theft, 994
    by churchmen, 1224–1225

Lordship of Christ
denial of *(cont'd.)*
and selective depravity, 303, 480
and evangelism (*see* evangelism, the Great Commission)
as foundation of social order and freedom, 329, 742, 1107 (*see also* freedom in Christianity)
absolute law, 27, 28, 36, 40, 57, 211, 253, 263, 266, 272–273
answer to taxation problem, 670–672
authority (*see* authority, Biblical)
cultivates harmony of interests, 620–621, 866–867
establishment of justice, 535–536, 643
future has no other foundation, 206, 1023–1024, 1120–1122
mandates social order, 41
our security, 256, 268
and regeneration, 271, 291–292
vs. statism, 585
as His right, 7–10
His right as sovereign Lord, 585–586
invoked in His name, 5–6
limited or opposed by conservatives (*see also* conservatism, faithlessness of)
in Arminian logic, 950–952
limited to the spirit, 1209–1210
Locke's myth of consent, 404
limited or opposed by the church
and antinomianism, 92, 464–465, 631, 651, 953, 1015, 1113–1114, 1129, 1209, 1439–1440 (*see also* antinomianism, in the church)
false definition of the church, 67–68
limited to the church, 424, 1038, 1160, 1217–1218
by limiting jurisdiction of the Bible, 1159–1160, 1217–1218
spirit of democracy (*see* democracy, in the church)
meaning of, 938–939
as purely spiritual (*see* pietism)
Lord's Prayer, 1233, 1308, 1314
Los Angeles, 348, 513, 1084
Los Angeles riots, 1004
Los Angeles Times, 233, 234
Lot's wife, 1081
Louisville, Kentucky, 569, 642
Louis XIV, 104, 142, 144, 145, 179, 496, 644, 765, 775, 777, 868–869, 963
Louis XV, 644
Louis XVI, 646

love
abolishing love, 1322
antinomian false love of God, 167
as basis of civil liberty, 1326
byproduct of relationship with God, 867
of death (*see* death, culture of)
exclusivity of, 1322–1324
God's love
and Christ's atonement, 97, 1390–1392
and His Law, 276–277, 652
for His sincere children, 1309
reduction of God to love, 634, 1304
as ultimate, 564, 651–652
and hate, 1322–1324
in heresy
atonement replaced by love and feeling, 187, 288, 634, 1324
from *eros* to *agape,* 183
Jesus as "sweetness and light," 155
as the redeemer, 252, 1324
revising the Bible, 161
separated from justice and law, 634, 654
substitute for atonement, 187, 288, 634, 1324
support of Marxist revolution, 389
of life, 218
of others
of enemies, 959–960
as "fulfilling of the law," 867, 1323, 1325, 1357–1358
of God's enemies, 959–960
loving your neighbor, 867, 1325–1326
priorities in, 1357–1358
redefined in humanism
as antinomianism, 1322–1324, 1326
in the church, 187, 252
as a crusading weapon, 477, 480, 489
as emotion, 187, 288, 634, 1324, 1325
from *eros* to *agape,* 183
experience as central, 466
as hate, 883
by hippies, 353
as human right, 195
as indulgence, 391, 786
by Marxism, 389
and moral disarmament, 541–545, 662–665, 786
in public schools, 227
Romanticism, 428–429
sexuality and promiscuity, 183, 277, 391, 1007, 1326, 1405
as tolerance, 1322–1324

as tolerating evil, 1322–1324
self-love, 1346
vs. sentimentalism, 1323–1324
unconditional love, 959–962, 1219
love, usage, 389
Lowell, Robert, 799
lower class mentality, 846–847, 852, 860, 868, 870, 872, 879, 882, 888, 889. *see also* classes, lower class
lower-class mentality, defined, 867
Luce, Henry R., 237
Lucretius, 979
Ludorf, John, 993
Ludwig II of Bavaria, 756, 765
Lukacs, John, 860, 1095
Luke, 1117, 1226, 1399, 1417
Luther, Martin, 91, 95–96, 236, 571, 921, 925, 1178–1179, 1399
Lutheranism, 153, 483, 573, 747, 944, 1160
luxury as evil, 338–340
Lynd, Staughton, 209
Lysenko, 330
Lyte, Henry F., 852

M

Macauley, Thomas Babington, 214–215
Macedonian Empire, 1404
Machen, John Greshem, 365, 566, 1223
Machiavelli, Niccolo, 205, 378–379, 465, 496, 710, 824, 970
Macklin, Theodore, 700
Maclure, William, 1037
Maddox, John, 803
Madison, James, 717
mafia. *see* criminal syndicate
Magi, meaning, 1404
Magi, the, 1404, 1412, 1414, 1422
magic and the occult
and ancient Greece, 1118
and antinomianism, 180, 382, 415
and basic irrationalism, 1085
Black Mass, 179–180
and death culture, 179–180
vs. faith of the early church, 1118
and the Fall of Rome, 448, 1081, 1118
and homosexuality, 179
and humanistic education, 882
and humanistic power, 471–472, 527
and humanistic science, 179, 471–472
and instant gratification, 449–450, 860, 966
and intellectualism, 382
and meaning, 133
modern interest, 439
necromancy, 176
as the new authority, 34, 44–45, 382, 1081
and nihilism, 448
and Romanticism, 428
Satanism (*see* Satanism)
and words as magic, 449–450
Magna Carta, 683
Magnificat, the, 1386, 1399–1403, 1415, 1422
Magritte, Rene, 800
Maimonides, 1260
majoritarianism, 407. *see also* democracy
Makan, 875
Making of a Counter Culture, The (Roszak), 1123
Malatesta, Sigismondo, 399
Malaysia, 663–664
Malcolm. *see* Molech
Malraux, Andre, 528
Malta, 1110–1111
mammon, meaning and usage, 720
Mani, 633
Manichaeism, 338, 633, 1176, 1199, 1307
man in Christian view
as under covenant requirements, 268, 424
all called to dominion, 294, 1162, 1231
God's vicegerent in history, 578
separation and holiness, 454–456
total responsibility to serve God, 1162, 1244
created differences, 1162
created in image of God, 217, 220, 255, 294, 409, 416, 1230
to be heir of creation, 75
and Christ incarnate, 1402–1403
common desire for peace, 326, 361
communicable attributes, 1064
and dominion, 1195–1196, 1215, 1231, 1232–1233, 1402–1403
and freedom, 220–221, 414, 1064
vs. humanistic demeaning of man, 722, 980–981, 1195, 1215, 1230
inherent judgment of sin, 550
inherently religious, 739, 1168
and man's purpose, 917–918, 1195, 1215, 1231
priority of knowledge, 1230
as responsible, 1064, 1215, 1265
and time, 1235
unable to be programmed, 980–981
and urge to order, 17, 1064

man in Christian view *(cont'd.)*
in erroneous doctrine
donum superadditum, 136, 564, 566
man's soul as central, 447, 466, 944, 950, 1121–1122
as needed by God, 135–136, 394
as fallen, 472, 1230–1231, 1265 (*see also* original sin and depravity)
common need for atonement, 288, 295, 379, 409, 480, 1189–1190, 1449–1450
free will (*see* free will of man)
as limited, 152, 1084–1085, 1309
nothing without God, 46, 409, 1244
God as ground of being, 1308
God as mindful of man (*see under* God)
God as our environment, 457, 578–579, 1162
need for meaning, 529, 978, 1070–1071
progress of, 223, 374
status based on character, 1078
a whole being, 620
man in humanistic view. *see also* specific topics
abasement of man
as an acting performer, 791–792
as an economic animal, 722
behaviorism, 1099, 1123–1124
dehumanized, 409, 452, 801, 1032, 1123–1124, 1230, 1265
as disposable, 223, 373–374, 452, 805
frailty of reason, 447
hatred for image of God, 217
idolization of primitive man, 773–774
as irrational and meaningless, 184, 276, 277
as an experimental animal, 253, 310, 748, 811, 1123, 1203–1204
basic state of man
anarchy as basic state of man, 21, 40, 404
a blank slate, 36, 394, 1036
fundamental goodness of man
in an evil environment, 190, 207
and anti-Christian statism, 326–329
conspiracy theories, 213
division between Christianity and humanism, 594
"doctrine of love," 227
doctrine of selective depravity, 305–307
and elitism, 961 (*see also* elitism)
and freedom, 1057–1059
idealism of humanism, 710
just needs right information, 621, 762
"myth" of evil, 290
natural innocence of children, 475, 476–478
and "positive thinking," 176
primitive virtue, 339
recant by humanists, 313–317, 365
and relativism, 467–468
and Romanticism, 430
and victim mentality, 268, 1249
as plastic and malleable, 220, 237, 245, 1123–1124
extinction of mankind, 218
schizophrenic view of man, 263
in science (*see* science, humanistic, view of man)
selective depravity (*see* selective depravity)
sovereignty of man (*see* sovereignty of man)
in specific ideologies
classical philosophy, 207, 247, 1049, 1167–1168
dualism, 620
Enlightenment doctrines (*see* Enlightenment, doctrine of man)
environmentalism (*see* environmentalism, humanist doctrine of man)
evolutionary, 220, 1230, 1402
existentialism, 1235
Marxism (*see* Marxism, view of man)
rationalistic (*see* rationalism)
relativism, 172–173, 467–468
Romanticism, 1013–1014 (*see also* Romanticism)
in statist view
able to remake man, 417
and collectivism, 191
mass man, 211, 1028
nothing without the state, 1049–1051
as political animal, 416, 588, 635, 979, 1049, 1102, 1168
property of the state, 1049–1051
as puppets of conspiracy, 1195–1196
taxation and depersonalization, 249
as tools of the elite, 452, 1123–1124

and totalitarianism, 238
as ultimate lawgiver, 414, 423, 458
Mann, Horace, 54, 260–261, 327, 512, 877, 1040, 1111
Manson, Charles, 381
Man Who Watched Trains Go By, The (Simenon), 187
Mao Tse-tung, 365, 442, 467, 657, 761, 883, 982
Maranatha, meaning, 1367
Marcel, Gabriel, 120
Marcion and Marcionism, 633–634. *see also* Manichaeism
Marcu, Valeriu, 710
Marcus Aurelius, 1211–1212
Marcuse, Herbert, 208, 1119
marijuana, 460, 1125. *see also* drug and alcohol abuse
Markham, Edwin, 1323–1324
Marlowe, Christopher, 34, 457
marriage
and abuse
abuse of wives, 118, 147, 320, 1361 (*see also* women, and abuse)
antinomian hypocrisy, 15
harems, 473, 1212
praying for a miracle, 1312–1313
and "spiritual masochism," 1251
unjust domination of women, 269, 270
with an unbeliever, 623, 914, 1312–1313, 1364
false unions, 376
attacked by humanism, 269–270, 1036
antinomianism and marriage problems, 15
extinction of, 314
as unspiritual, 1176
divorce, 69, 118, 899, 1250, 1394
faith and obedience in, 1102
based on common faith, 1102
disciplined marriage, 921
and dominion, 907–908 (*see also* family, basic to social order)
and interdependence, 269–270
one flesh, 913–914
peace in, 195–196
premarital counseling, 921
priority of the spouse, 1357
and responsibility, 270
wife as helpmeet, 270
the first marriage, 913–914
interracial marriage, 865, 1079
remarriage of widows and widowers, 1250–1251
and sex
adultery (*see* adultery)
Christian enjoyment of sex, 914, 944–945
erroneous celibacy, 921, 944–945
Marshall, John, 48, 49
Mars Hill, 897
Martin V, 105
martyrs. *see* persecution of the church
Marwedel, Emma, 477
Marx, Karl
and alienation of man, 537
attack on critical analysis, 411
and autonomous humanism, 1074
Christ's triumph over Marx, 1196
evil redefined by Marx, 324, 631
existentialism of, 423–424
myth of consent, 405
religion as opium, 528
character and person of,
as an aristocrat, 777–778
economic failures of, 254
as idealist, 961
influenced by Hegel, 391, 586, 1449
love of *Rameau's Nephew,* 413
political ties and friendships, 260
sexual exploitation of his maid, 767
and environmentalism, 356, 815
influence on education, 173
salvation by revolution, 354
enemies as evil, 324
tax revolt, 672
and war, 1027–1028, 1030
study of by Communists, 573
and totalitarianism, 1102
as anti-specialization, 1100
concept of freedom, 57, 1065
Lockean ideology, 683
philosophy of immanence, 984
predestination by man, 979–980
and scientific socialism, 363, 1027, 1080
on the working man, 1285
Marxism. *see also* Marx, Karl
and art, 775–776
belief in natural law, 636
and Christianity
anti-Christian, 796, 1066
embraced by Christians, 388, 390–391, 760
ex-Marxists-turned-Christians, 1139
and failure of churches, 121–122, 187–188
God as a Marxist, 342
hatred of God, 194, 259

Marxism
and Christianity *(cont'd.)*
love as support of Marxism, 389
and persecution, 184, 249, 438–439, 483
separation of church and state, 387–388
surrender of church to, 1441
dictatorship of the proletariat, 39, 43, 202, 305, 641, 1088
and economics, 202, 219, 230, 254–255, 700, 740–741, 778, 1019
class warfare, 458, 632 (*see also* class and social warfare)
equality, 192
Locke as father of Marxism, 683
materialism, 254–255
unequal society produced by Marxism, 192, 458, 1005
evidence of human sacrifice, 905
as a failure
decay of, 122, 259, 525–526
and disillusionment, 553
false success of Marxism, 230, 255
inability to cope with reality, 263
hatred in, 892
in journalism, 603
and liberation theology, 341, 599
moralism, 324
and original sin, 252, 264
man as absolute, 187–188
redefining good and evil, 631
and pragmatism, 254–255
preceding legal revolution, 1048
revolutionary, 318, 354
strength of,
in competition with nihilism, 435
as a faith for all of life, 254–256, 257
future-oriented, 121
and idealism, 961
totalitarianism and statism (*see also* specific countries)
and anarchy, 21, 40, 235, 423–424
and authority, 21, 36, 43, 251, 305
brute force and coercion, 32, 268
City of Man, 747
communism (*see* communism)
control of religion, 737
enslaving force, 452
freedom, 58–59, 202, 223, 268, 1065
infallibility of the state, 451, 982
and justice, 642
justice under Marxism, 618, 641, 642
Mussolini as a Marxist, 603
a new aristocracy, 778–780
peace, 201–202
predestination by the state, 982
and slave labor camps, 184, 248–249, 1020, 1066
socialism (*see* socialism)
social planning, 40, 230, 423
state ownership of life, 1001
subsidizing terrorism, 731
view of man
environmentalism, 228, 248, 318, 354
man as absolute, 187–188
man as disposable, 452
man as sovereign, 1074
predestination by man, 979–980
selective depravity, 291, 293–294, 296, 324, 408
selective rationalism, 408, 458
working man as oppressed, 1285
and the West
Marxism in America, 563
and U.S. interventionism, 1025
Western indifference to threat, 187
Mary (mother of Jesus), 1389, 1394–1398, 1399–1402, 1405, 1415, 1422
Mary, Queen of Scots, 765
Mary II, Queen of England, 711
Masaryk, T. G., 836
masochism, 1251. *see also* sadomasochism
Mason, George, 878, 1259
Masons. *see* freemasonry
masses
benefited by Industrial Revolution, 777–778
despised by the elite, 779
determine good and evil, 467
mass man created by humanism, 211, 1028
noble savage doctrine, 339
power of the masses, 40
self-government of, 881
slavery of (*see* slavery of the masses)
materialism
and advance of Marxism, 254–255
vs. Christian giving, 1126–1127
exclusion of God from life, 617–619
and modern statism, 624, 973
result of spiritual emptiness, 1084
mathematics, 191, 193, 984, 1077
Matisse, Henri, 798
Matta, Roberto, 801
matter, 1176, 1198–2000
Matthew, 1395
maturity and growth

Christian responsibility, 321 (*see also* responsibility of Christians)
of church members, 149
and dominion, 38, 169, 223, 358–359, 851–852, 1214–1215, 1277–1278, 1292
holiness *vs.* perfectionism (*see under* legalism)
immaturity (*see* immaturity)
options to sin, 1042–1043
trials as an opportunity to grow, 1292, 1320–1321
Maxwell, Dan, 742
McCulloch v. Maryland, 49
McGovern, George, 212, 598
McHale, John, 980
McIntire, Carl, 950
McIntyre, Ellsworth, 937
McKay, Donald, 1243
McKayle, Donald, 789
McMaster, R. E., Jr., 710, 1032
McNamara, Robert, 698, 1032–1033
meaning
causes as a source, 457, 800–801
faith and meaning of history, 438, 458, 469, 1321
faith and total meaning, 1235
and the future, 1235–1236, 1283
and God's sovereignty, 135–136, 322, 457–458, 978
God's total meaning, 135, 457, 469–470, 929, 939, 1118, 1430
and information, 928
man as source, 135, 457–458, 612, 800–801, 979–981
man's need for, 529, 978, 1070–1071
in the occult, 133
and relativism, 372–373, 457
replaced by technology, 451, 824, 1091, 1097
meaninglessness and nihilism
of academia and intellectuals, 382, 436, 438, 760
and antinomianism, 454–456, 538–539, 969
and abortion, 9, 217, 436, 1205
and autonomy, 135, 322, 457, 1430
in popular media, 835
and rape, 801
and art, 447, 451, 537–538, 800–801, 874, 969
and the church, 177
in classical humanism, 455
destruction as a result, 259
and Eastern thought, 534, 1096
and existentialism (*see* existentialism, and meaninglessness)
and history, 493–495, 875, 1197
and hopelessness, 206, 455, 1071, 1430
and death, 218, 435, 756
and the future, 1197
and suicide, 1071
and humanistic science, 321, 538–539
and evolution, 447–449, 1197
and immorality, 276–277, 1197
and impotency, 1097
and learning, 875
man as beast of prey, 363, 366
and morality (*see* morality in humanism)
and society
"accidental man," 277–278
among hippies, 538
among youth, 438, 1071, 1097
and anarchy, 322, 435
and cultural expression, 800–801, 835
denial of God, 424, 531–533
and economics, 680
false freedom from God's law, 413–415
and individualism, 694
loss of justice, 800–801, 835
man as disposable, 451–453
moral bankruptcy, 525–530
neglect of truth and meaning in education, 1097
new barbarians, 835, 1091
"new nihilists," 437
and revolution, 435, 436
social Darwinism, 694
in the Soviet Union, 45
and stagnation of society, 454–456
suicidal humanism, 188
and total planning, 978
utopian humanism, 184, 414, 436
work replaced with nihilistic terrorism, 435, 861, 880
vs. truth, 61, 184, 188, 276, 311, 1096–1097
and atheism, 531, 538–539, 694, 1203
and false religion, 461
myth of neutrality, 463
reality, 537–538
rejection of God's Providence, 454–456
Meany, George, 237
media
Arts and Media Conference, 561
and Christian Reconstruction, 1134–1135
entertainment
the cinema (*see* cinema)

media
entertainment *(cont'd.)*
films (*see* films)
Hollywood (*see* Hollywood)
preaching as, 168–169
theater (*see* theater)
music (*see* music)
the press (*see* press, the)
promoting sin and humanism, 688, 1136, 1201, 1341
anti-family, 900
and cynicism, 837
interest in mental illness, 780
meaninglessness and nihilism, 835
subsidized by the state, 234, 1201
mediation by God in all relationships, 843
Medi-Cal, 548
medical *vs*. moral model, 335–337, 632, 1006, 1014
Medicare, 296, 999
Medici, Catherine dé, 299
medicine. *see* health and medicine
medieval era. *see also* the History Index
and art, 441
church
architecture, 139
confronting statism, 42
cult of the infant Jesus, 125
destruction of, 563
exclusive focus on, 82
Gospel of the Child, 476–478
indulgences (*see* indulgences)
the Inquisition, 1047–1048
medieval popes, 610
power and inner collapse, 1083
power to move the people, 168
and private charity, 1110–1111, 1124
and selective depravity, 764–769
shift to pietism, 104–105, 1121–1122
spiritualism, 947
as "totalitarian," 984
wealth of, 1110
crusades (*see* Crusades and Crusaders)
economics in, 990–991
the pilgrimage, 398
political ideas
aristocracy, 458, 826–827 (*see also* feudalism)
class differences, 247
idea of the *fatherland,* 1087
law-order, 666
"necessity knows no law," 638–639
political theology, 90, 130, 496
rise of humanism, 183, 458
rise of the state, 1089
"the dark ages," 752–753, 963
view of culture war, 593
Mediterranean, 491
Medo-Persia, 1404
Meese, Edwin, 603
Mehring, Walter, 528
Melchisedec, 1008, 1406
Melek. *see* Molech
Meluhha, 875–876
Melville, Herman, 349–350, 874
Melville, Joy, 1338
mental disorders
in artists, 799–800
cultivation of insanity, 185
and elitism, 780
and gratitude, 1345
hatred of God's image, 217
in "heroes," 44
and humanist statism, 433–434
of inbred monarchs, 765–766
and legal irresponsibility, 1006
mental illness as "liberating," 780
and present-orientation, 1236
"psychic epidemics" our greatest danger, 860
result of antinomianism, 433–434
testing for criminals, 310, 1014
and total autonomy, 376, 433–434
mercantilism (protectionism), 16, 122. *see also* economics
merchant, translation, 1273
Mercier de la Riviere de Saint-Medard, Paul Pierre, 974
mercy. *see also* grace
of Christians, 1316
flourishes where justice prevails, 665, 992
"for His mercy endureth forever," 1316
of God withdrawn, 992
humanistic, 454, 534–536
and justice, 665, 992
"mercy-killings," 1001
Merk, Frederick, 881
Merryman, J.H., 621
Messianic Character of American Education, The (Rushdoony), 1099, 1153–1154
messianic education. *see under* education in humanism
Methodists, 575
Methvin, Eugene H., 773
Mexican-American riots, 665
Mexico and Mexicans, 710, 873, 1063
Meyer, Leonard B., 789
Micah, 1251

Michelangelo, 441, 801
Michigan, 234, 508, 566
microphotographing of checks, 1067–1068
middle ages. *see* medieval era
middle class. *see under* classes
Midian, 1166
midwives, the Hebrew, 1141
Milcom. *see* Molech
military
  conscription (draft), 266, 309, 437, 831
  growth of, 1028, 1142
  militia, 266
  professional army, 309
  relying on, 1142–1143
  standing armies, 1028
  trust gap between leaders and soldiers, 1121
  in the United States, 1142
  and the U.S. Constitution, 160, 348, 831
  volunteers, 309
  youth expected to be ready martyrs, 1072, 1083
Mill, C. Wright, 892
Mill, John Stuart, 59, 331, 694
Millard, Olivier, 187
Millay, Edna St. Vincent, 783
Miller, David, 658
Miller, Deane, 658
Miller, Henry, 829
Miller as a sir name, 991
Milton, John, 410, 768, 798, 934, 1199
Milwaukee, 770
mind as fallen, 152, 469–470, 1006–1007, 1084, 1157–1158, 1165. *see also* original sin and depravity
Mindlin, Albert, 229
miners of the Old West, 1279
Minkowski, E., 1236, 1240
minorities. *see also* class and social warfare
  black issues (*see* Black issues)
  and envy, 657
  exploited by churches, 121
  minority rule, 408
  rights and irrationalism, 198
  and "sensitivity training," 176
  and "social justice," 1093–1097
  strength of, 1143–1144, 1202
  targeted by statists, 1078–1080, 1093–1095
miracles
  and the Children's Crusade, 476
  of evolution, 1163
  expected despite sin, 1123–1124, 1255
  instant gratification *vs.* growth, 1200, 1201
  in place of action, 1310–1313
  and the temptation of Christ, 1108
mischief, translated, 652
Mishna, the, 1336
missions. *see* evangelism
Missouri, 997
Moberg, Sven, 1040
models for behavior, 1401–1402
moderation, translated, 791
modernism
  and Arianism, 395
  and the church
    attempt to merge with humanism, 593–594
    compromising views of Creationism, 1172
    early church, 132–134
    failure of church as central, 119, 803, 1441
    and Marcionism, 634
    modernism as product of revivalism, 951
    more effective than conservatives, 1129
    origins in attacks on Mosaic law, 126
    revision of the faith, 82, 130–131, 136, 161–162
    and scholarship, 137
    secular *vs.* sacred, 1208–1210
  Gnosticism of, 396
  imprecision in ideas, 172–173
  in Judaism, 132
  as non-Christian culture, 796
  original sin as basic to, 135
  and rationalism, 132–134, 135, 593
  regaining true humanity, 112
  results in anarchism (*see* anarchy, and philosophy)
  social crisis, 768, 1033
    and barbarism (*see* barbarism and rootlessness)
    mass murders of 20th century, 9–10, 293–295, 326, 399, 500, 510–511, 747, 841, 984, 1002, 1032, 1033, 1075
    results in anarchism, 318–322, 452
modernism, usage, 134
modesty and dress, 148, 387
Moffatt, James, 1120, 1187
Mohammed. *see under* Islam
Molech, meaning, 598, 904
Molech (state) worship, 598, 643, 904, 1055, 1123
molestation of children. *see* abuse, child abuse

Molnar, Thomas, 443, 883
Moloch. *see* Molech
monarchism, 407–408
monarchy, 214, 257, 296, 369. *see also* specific monarchs
claim to the throne, 24, 25
decline of, 765–766, 775
divine right of kings, 25, 39, 42–43, 91, 129–130, 194, 299–300, 355, 407, 644, 935, 963, 1399
inbreeding, 765–766
irrelevant ceremonial function, 765, 777
"King's Touch," 25, 91
king's two bodies, 90
Magnificat as banned, 1399, 1415
pursuit of pleasure, 765–766, 775, 863
royal mistresses, 764
royal pardons, 95
superficial ceremonial function, 765–766
undercutting the nobility, 868
monasteries, 871, 921, 1110–1111
monasticism, 68, 802, 1013–1014, 1110, 1208–1209. *see also* pietism
money. *see also* wealth
counterfeit, 229, 251, 688, 701, 705
dangers of, 247
debasing coins, 226, 251, 516, 712
economics (*see* economics; economy)
as form of wealth, 705, 723
and God's Law, 683–684
gold and silver standard, 49, 50, 100, 251, 466, 688, 705
and Biblical faith, 683, 718, 952
as God-created wealth, 703, 718
and international trade, 713
"not enough gold in the world...," 712
paper preferred, 150, 892, 1099–1100
replaced with debt backing, 678–679, 684, 721
rising price, 713
as stable, 851
statist price controls, 700, 703
U.S. Constitution a hard money document, 717–718
U.S. history of honest coinage, 592
international lending, 698, 1032
legal tender laws, 717–719
national treasuries, 713
"New Order" on U.S. dollar bills, 718
paper money, 31, 49, 229, 516, 688, 851
devaluation, 712–714, 721
fiat nature of cash, 516, 679, 701, 703, 709, 1099–1100
and socialism, 821, 892, 1099–1100
total breakdown of, 705
private property (*see* private property)
saving money, 688, 691, 700, 705, 847
statist control of, 229, 516, 705
devaluation of money, 712–714, 721
prices of precious metals, 700, 703
social planning and money, 346, 718–719
tithing (*see* tithing)
and the U.S. Constitution, 160, 717–718
wealth defined as money, 723
worship of money, 720–721, 766
love of money, 721, 726
as salvation, 255, 340
monopolies, 683, 990–991
Monroe Doctrine, 613
Montesquieu, 226, 749
Montgomery, Zach, 512
Moody, Dwight L., 1314
moralism, defined, 323
morality and God's sovereignty, 11, 194, 252, 276–277, 339, 554, 628, 631, 714, 859, 1171
morality and society
and class structure, 859, 864–867
and economics, 688–689, 864–867, 1242
in the governing class, 892–894
modern crisis, 768, 1089
moral force of civilization, 525
and progress, 864
removing "Church morality from legislation," 605
as test of citizenship, 747
during war, 1032
morality in humanism
antinomianism limits moral authority, 15, 281–282, 404, 591, 631 (*see also* antinomianism, results in the culture)
defined by man
fiat morality, 1100–1102
meaningless apart from man, 187
government by the group, 1274–1275
morals as personal values, 272, 434, 552–556, 935
and pragmatism, 612
as self-realization, 555
a social construct, 376–377, 380, 552–556, 935
mere denunciations of evil, 553–554, 1327–1328
as a myth, 280
Pharisaical morals, 1347 (*see also* Pharisees and Phariseeism)

externalism, 334, 481, 1337
idealism, 710
as perfection, 358–359, 385
reform by man's power, 473–475
separated from theology, 794, 859, 867
as the simple life, 338–340, 1098–1099
defined by the state, 252–253 (*see also* statism, claim to sovereignty)
based on selective depravity, 291, 294, 296–298, 306–307
exchanged for pragmatism, 204–206, 254–256, 273, 378, 452, 1089–1091
state as naturally the highest good, 207–208, 219, 370, 636, 641, 645, 973, 1016–1017
statist promotion and protection of sin, 273, 283–284, 286
and abortion, 48, 100, 284, 546–551, 548–550, 597, 617, 642, 1001–1002 (*see also* abortion, and the state)
homosexuality, 48, 433
pornography, 433
evolution of morality, 272, 276, 612, 860, 927
false gospels (*see* false gospels)
impossible to maintain, 100–1101, 415, 455, 639, 710, 859, 918, 1171, 1212, 1334
and intellectualism, 38, 314, 1131
inversion of values
abortion, 217, 669 (*see also* abortion)
glorification of the lawless, 541–542, 829
hostility towards women, 269, 270, 334
immorality on principle
in art, 801
false freedom, 415, 1131, 1150
and guilt, 279
and modern economics, 679, 688
new moral elite, 282
"new" morality, 710
redefinition of freedom, 973, 1052
result of accident, 276
result of humanism, 669
immorality prerogative of power, 889
"judge not," 1334–1335
law separated from justice, 1009–1012
morality as immoral, 1007, 1009
primitivism *vs.* progress
and aesthetics, 527
in art, 795
desire for simplicity, 1098–1099
existentialism, 44–45
false idea of sin, 338–340
new world order, 326–327
"noble savage," 431
and pollution, 772, 778
pre-statist order, 1081
sexuality over love, 391, 1007
living beyond good and evil, 307, 313–317, 391, 801, 1009–1012, 1020–1021, 1096–1097, 1099, 1203–1204
moral anarchy, 184, 420, 539, 747, 893
moralism
and anarchy, 22
failure of liberal moralism, 552–556
failure of statism, 324
and humanistic atonement, 323–325
Marxism and socialism, 324, 364–365
morality without theology, 1171
and reduction of Christianity, 22, 104, 177, 194, 294, 324, 1121–1122
and revolution, 324, 528
shift to humanism in the U.S., 262
and sin, 323, 589, 1250
whited sepulchers, 1134
separated from theology, 794, 859, 867
universal ethics, 1356
"moral majority," 1138–1139
More, John, 91, 92
More, Thomas, 362, 363, 378, 571
Morecraft, Joseph, 937
Morison, John, 1393
Morley, John, 1379
Mormonism, 12, 152, 390
mortis, Greek, 1200
Moscow, 402, 819, 1003, 1102
Moses, 133, 166, 629, 673, 714, 1008, 1113, 1141, 1166–1167, 1291, 1310
mosques. *see under* Islam and Muslims (Mohammedans)
motherland, etymology and usage, 1087
mothers and motherhood. *see also* children
abortion, 548, 1365
blamed by children, 811
defense of children, 886
depravity in, 884
honor of, 900, 909–910, 1320–1321
and immorality, 764
indulgent of children's behavior, 786
influence of, 1433
leaving mother for Christ's sake, 919
myth of consent, 405

mothers and motherhood *(cont'd.)*
neglect of children, 313
play with children, 908
prayers of, 1310, 1312, 1313
rebellion of children, 829–830
referring to homeland, 1087
running wild, 364
separation of sons from, 419
spiritual matriarchy, 795–796
used to threaten, 673
Mother's Day, 909
Mount of Olives, 1425
movements and activism. *see* specific movements
movies. *see* films
movie theaters. *see* cinema, the
Moynihan, Daniel, 767
muckraker, the, 803, 1327
Muggeridge, Malcolm, 1277
Muller, Friedrich Max, 534
Muller, J.J., 1318
multigenerational faithfulness, 991, 1379–1380
"multiversity," 1217
murder
6th commandment (*see under* Law of God, Ten Commandments)
assassinations, 549
and envy, 856
human sacrifice (*see* human sacrifice)
and restitution, 653–654
result of antinomianism (*see* antinomianism, results in the culture, murder)
salvation by murder, 293–295, 296–298, 302–303, 435, 964
sanctity of life (*see also* sanctity of life)
abortion as murder, 9, 217, 546–551, 642
euthanasia (*see* euthanasia)
"mercy-killings," 1001
of a sexually abused child, 902
and the state
and gun control, 1016
mass murders of 20th century, 9–10, 293–295, 326, 399, 500, 510–511, 747, 841, 984, 1002, 1032, 1033, 1075
murder by state, 974–975, 1001–1002
murder made "legal," 1001–1002
power to murder, 1001–1002
suicide (*see* suicide)
vengeance, 673
Murgenstrumm, Lois, 391
Murphy, Franklin, 926–927
museums, 142–143
music
Christianity a singing religion, 1392
of Christmas, 1392–1393, 1409, 1413, 1415, 1417, 1422, 1424
humanistic, 20, 185, 321
man-centeredness in the church, 74–75, 120–121
Muslims. *see* Islam and Muslims (Mohammedans)
Mussolini, Benito, 596, 603, 1039–1040
myrrh, 1405, 1406, 1415
mysticism, 572, 827, 1176, 1209. *see also* pietism
myth of neutrality, 463–465, 710, 1432

N

Naboth, 916, 993, 1258
Nahum, 1273
name, etymology, 6
name, meaning, 1166
names, 5–6, 1166–1167
Napoleon, 737–739, 961, 1058, 1070
narcotics. *see* drug and alcohol abuse
Nathan, 642
National Council of Humanism in America, 464
National Games Reserve, 313
nationalism, 293, 1010, 1078. *see also* patriotism
National Labor Relations Board, 584
National Merit Scholars, 192
National Socialist Germany. *see* Nazi Germany
National Voice of the American Conscience, 32
Native American Indians, 24, 33, 321, 339, 491, 671, 886–888, 1255, 1279
nativity. *see* Christmas
natural disasters, 25, 230, 684
naturalism, 285, 488, 1211
natural law
church usage of term, 635–636
and classical humanism, 635–637
and Darwinism, 800
and the economy, 693–695
and the Enlightenment, 636, 979–980
and the French Revolution, 635, 636
vs. God's Law, 1007
and rationalism, 635, 1211–1212
and Roman Catholicism, 635
and statism, 42, 635–637, 710
nature. *see also* ecology

belongs to the Creator, 1408, 1410
Enlightenment doctrine, 979–980
matter, 248
Nature as predestinating force, 457, 693, 979–980
order as basic to universe, 749–751
rejoicing in creation, 1198–2000
as ultimate, 1211–1212
worship of, 1053
Nazi Germany
despotism of, 624
efforts to unite people, 738
Hitler (*see* Hitler, Adolf)
Holocaust statistics, 510
indirect attack by manipulation, 583
and justice, 618, 641, 1009
preceding legal revolution, 1048
and racism, 1129
and scientific faith, 408
and U.S. interventionism, 1025
Nazism, 399
Nebraska, 602–603, 642, 1287
necromancy, 176
Negroes. *see* Black issues
Nehemiah, 444, 515, 1274
Nelson, Alvar, 503
"neo-fascists," 650
Neoplatonism, 132, 247–249, 338, 372, 943–944, 947, 1176, 1208–1209
Nero, 117, 738, 1137
Netherlands, 562–563, 565, 570, 624, 1053
neutral, meaning and etymology, 463
Nevada, 955, 1060
Nevins, Allan, 758
New Adam, the
Christ as, 130, 285, 644–645, 1179–1180, 1247, 1271, 1384, 1389, 1391, 1397, 1400–1403, 1422, 1424–1425, 1449
humanistic version, 328, 645, 773
New Age thought, 176
new creation, 68, 131, 344, 486–487, 509, 522–523, 837, 966, 1179, 1199
New Deal, the, 160, 1079
New England, 265, 506, 946, 947, 1258, 1439
New English Bible, 1219
New Harmony, Indiana, 1036, 1037
New Jerusalem, 530, 744, 751, 849, 1044, 1391
New Left. *see under* liberalism
Newspeak, 1066
Newton, Isaac, 270, 568, 617
Newton, John, 1305, 1375
New York, 160, 214, 253, 497, 508, 770, 771
New York City, 198, 202, 209, 460, 667, 747, 770, 771, 884, 1124
New Yorker, 145
New York *Post,* 209
New York's Roxy Theatre, 144–145
New Zealand, 1338
Nicholas V, 105
Nicodemus, 1189
Nida, Eugene A., 471
Niebuhr, Reinhold, 168, 768
Nietzsche, Friedrich
affirmation of power, 969
anarchistic man, 366
attack on the family, 269
call for new language, 391
on Christians, 1131
denial of God and His Law, 413–415, 540, 1439–1440
existentialism, 834
false freedom, 420, 1066
false thinking, 461
"God is dead," 280
the "hero," 442–443
influenced by Emerson, 59
influenced by Hegel, 58
influence on Francis Parker Yockey, 814
influence on Willem de Kooning, 537
love of lies, 61
need of superman, 190, 485
philosophy of death, 173
utopianism of, 363
Nigeria, 231
nihilism. *see* meaninglessness and nihilism
Nikolais, Alvin, 788–789
Nile River, 1143
nineteenth century. *see* the History Index
Ninth Amendment. *see under* Constitution of the United States
ninth century. *see* the History Index
Nixon, Richard, 31, 212, 310, 348, 613, 981, 1073, 1078
Noah, 872, 1349–1350
Nobel Laureates, 1288
noble savage myth, 33, 45, 339, 431–432, 527, 773, 834–835, 1170
Nochlin, Linda, 800
Nock, Albert Jay, 718, 871
noetic effects of the fall. *see* mind as fallen
nomos, Greek, 1008, 1011
Norman Conquest, 24, 865
Norman kings, 43
North, Gary, 341, 563, 576, 672, 680, 702, 708
North Africa, 225, 499. *see also* Africa
North Carolina, 584
North Ireland, 864
North Korea, 1028

Norway, 1306
Notre Dame, 187
nuclear warfare, 755
nudism, 262
nursing homes, 899, 1375
Nyasa, Africa, 1237
Nye, captain of the *Southern Cross,* 663–664

O

Oakland Tribune, 754, 760, 761
Obadiah, 1141
obstetrics and gynecology, 547
occultism. *see* magic and the occult
O'Connell, William P., 547
Oedipus, 783, 932
offenses, handling, 1366–1369
Ohio, 595, 600, 607, 608, 831
Ohio Department of Public Welfare, 595
Ohio Supreme Court, 608
Ohio v. Whisner, 584, 606–608, 831
Ohio Welfare Department, 600
Oholiab, 427
oil companies, 297, 1062–1063
Old and New Testaments
  continuity of the church, 54, 68, 88–89, 792, 1443
  discontinuity and antinomianism, 633, 1209
  discontinuity and heresy, 633–634
  era of the New Testament
    baptism, 1184–1185, 1186–1188
    gift of the Holy Spirit, 1184–1185
    life of the city in, 745
  era of the Old Testament
    atonement for Old Covenant believers, 1182
    circumcision, 408, 905, 1186
    importance of Old Testament revelation, 1161
    looking forward to Christ, 1182
    sacrifices, 1161, 1176
    shaking of the nations, 8
    tabernacle, 1161
  rejection of the Old Testament, 1209
  systematic teaching of both, 163
  Temple of God, 793–794
  unity of the Old and New Testaments, 633–634
oligarchy, 160, 879, 968
Oliver, Revilo P., 813–814
Olsen, Jack, 1284, 1285
Olympics, 805
one world order. *see under* international relationships
OPC. *see* Orthodox Presbyterian Church (OPC)
opera, 144, 791, 1095
Operation Rescue, 1140–1141, 1212–1213
opium, 460. *see also* drug and alcohol abuse
"opium" of religion, 417, 528
oppression
  authority portrayed as oppressive, 405
  in the family, 36, 269, 270
  God as "oppressive," 36, 208
  power to oppress, 414–415, 775, 985, 995–996, 1001–1002, 1079, 1264
  by the state (*see* citizenry, abuse of)
order
  as basic to nature of the universe, 749–751
  as fundamental urge of man, 17, 1064
  as human invention, 749–751
order, translated, 1008
Order of Orthros, 1387
Order of St. John of Jerusalem. *see* Knights of Malta
Oregon, 1060, 1131
Oresme, Nicole, 693
orgies, 118, 436, 875
Orient, the, 534, 535, 740, 888, 1088. *see also* specific places
Origen, 134, 944
original sin and depravity. *see also* sin
  and Adam, 199, 470, 1402 (*see also* Adam, and common depravity)
  as autonomous and antinomian, 269, 338, 627, 1006–1007
    vs. Christian liberty, 1052–1053, 1066
    and humanism, 15, 18–19, 252, 270, 375–377, 378, 606, 1010, 1136
    right to autonomy, 9, 15, 37, 199, 1052–1053, 1066 (*see also* autonomy)
  basic problem of man, 762, 844, 1052, 1190
  basic to modernism, 135
  common depravity
    Calvinism on, 1368
    David on, 307
    denied by "silent majority," 844–845
    and Dominion Mandate, 294–295
    explanation of, 291–292
    foil of total justice, 485
    and God's sovereignty, 211
    and modern statism, 219
    and need of salvation, 1449
    redefinition of sin, 333
    social salvation, 306

"subsidy for evil," 762
common judgment, 550
and conflict between men, 191, 270, 329
denial of,
and anarchism, 318
by the church, 1128
and demand for perfection, 491–492
and historical revisionism, 460
and hope in political action, 465, 742
and *tabula rasa,* 394, 683
as too "negative," 176–177
and existentialism, 252
and the fallacy of simplicity, 1100–1102
false versions of, 305–306
as heresy, 1136
history as a development of original sin, 1018, 1168, 1184, 1186
instant gratification, 358–359
and interdependence, 269
man as central priority, 136
and Mark Twain, 33–34
mind as fallen, 462, 762, 1247
applying sin to all of life, 135
basic delusion of sinners, 1270–1271
basic irrationalism, 201, 375–376, 1084–1085, 1163
natural man transformed by the Gospel, 285
and pragmatism, 252
righteous distrust of man, 768
self-salvation, 1018
and the state, 359 (*see also* statism, claim to sovereignty)
humanistic law, 358–359
and injustice, 1006–1007, 1053
man legislates his sin, 668–669
and Marxism, 187–188, 252, 264, 631
and tyranny, 1100–1102
will to be god, 338 (*see also* sovereignty of man)
Origin of Species (Darwin), 517, 1027
Origins of the Medieval World, The (Bark), 683, 1098
Orphan Aid, 103
orphans. *see* widows and orphans
Orthodox Church. *see* Eastern churches
Orthodox Presbyterian Church (OPC), 562, 565
Orton, Aylott, 1071
Orwell, George, 192, 222, 363, 366, 443, 767, 768, 818, 978, 1057, 1066, 1089
Osterhaven, M. Eugene, 1189–1190
Otto, Bishop of Freising, 746
Otto III (Holy Roman emperor), 90, 129–130
Ottoman Turkey. *see under* Turkey
overpopulation, 551, 803
Owen, John, 571
Owen, Robert, 1036, 1037
Oxford University, 776
Ozment, Steven, 921

P

pacifism, 497, 1207, 1212
Packer, J. I., 391
Padicap War, 494
paganism. *see also* magic and the occult
and antinomianism, 382
atonement in, 287–288
and authority (*see* authority, humanistic; paganism, and statism)
belief in evil fate, 834
child sacrifice, 287–288
and Christianity
and Christmas, 1408, 1410, 1412, 1414
church as operatively pagan, 1223
incarnation doctrines, 129–130
mimicking Christianity, 1411
mixture in the West, 52, 183–184, 274
overcome by Christianity, 94, 1448
classical paganism (*see* classical philosophy and culture)
and the conflict of interests, 620
and dancing, 795–797
and emotionalism, 784
and the family, 913, 920
god as evil, 633, 783
human sacrifice (*see* human sacrifice)
in intellectualism, 382
man-centeredness, 72–73
modern return to, 548 (*see also* magic and the occult, as new authority)
"necessity knows no law," 638–639
pantheism, 217, 390
polytheism, 389–390, 440–441, 1216, 1439
and relativism, 389
revelations in, 152
and statism
and birthday celebrations, 1412
divine right of rulers, 1083, 1087
divinization of political orders, 1087, 1109, 1136, 1448
hope of the world, 1388–1389, 1415
incarnation doctrines, 129–130
state as savior, 588–589, 979, 1049, 1388–1389, 1415
view of reality, 465
and virginity, 288

paganism, defined, 1223
Paine, Thomas, 197, 198, 1293
Palmerston, 254, 330, 331
Panama Canal, 965
pantheism, 217, 390
Pan-Turanism, 1303
Paoli Massacre, 503
"paper tigers," 982
Parables of Christ
dishonest steward, 720
Good Samaritan, 1325, 1358, 1368
on judgment, 820, 1368, 1446
Lazarus and the rich man, 725
Seed and the Sower, 955
Talents, 169
Virgins and the Lamps, 103, 169, 174
"We are unprofitable servants," 298, 1244–1245
Wheat and the Tares, 368, 540
parachurch ministries, 685, 1109, 1127, 1147–1148. *see also* specific organizations
Paradise Lost (Milton), 798, 1199
Paris, 398, 800, 1102, 1123
parish, etymology, 87
Parker, Joseph, 1425
Parker, Theodore, 261
Parliament
in budgetary process, 728
claim to sovereignty, 48, 55, 91
and national debt, 727
and the War for American Independence, 502, 508, 1240, 1258
Parliament of Paris, 644
parochial, etymology, 87
parochial, usage, 87
Pas, A. ten, 1215
Passion of St. Perpetua, The, 1117–1118
Passover, 178, 256, 459, 913, 1410
Patapoff, Gaye, 815–816
patience, 888, 1125, 1295–1296, 1341, 1346, 1364
Patrick, St., 746, 1143
patriotism, 961, 967, 991, 996, 1010, 1356–1360, 1438
Patroclus, 805
Paulinus of Nola, 139
Paul the Apostle
absolute truthfulness of, 524
arrested by Roman captain, 602
arrest of, 1140
dislike of, 524
education of, 1117
example of common faith, 914–915
on Mars Hill, 897
"more than conquerors," 1196
opposed by false teachers, 117
on prayer, 1306
suffering of, 1291
and Timothy, 70
Payne, Robert, 767
peace
1919 peace conference, 43
as an ultimate goal, 349–350, 1150, 1222, 1351–1352
and Christianity
and the atonement, 1386
"blessed are the peacemakers," 1369
byproduct of relationship with God, 867, 1296, 1354–1355, 1386
of Christian individuals, 10, 1222, 1290, 1296, 1299, 1386
failure by peaceful assent to statism, 1014–1015, 1028, 1137, 1207
and God's covenant, 1030–1031
and God's grace, 1030–1031, 1369
Jesus as the Prince of Peace, 8, 1030, 1384
Jesus came to bring a sword, 1030, 1425
and the Law of God, 1386
peaceful conquest of the church, 76–77
peace in marriage, 195–196
postmillennialism and peace, 503–504
theonomy and peace, 10
common desire of man, 326, 361
hatred of, 435
humanistic ideals, 58, 148, 187, 348–352
by abolishing Christianity, 328
by abolishing stress, 1290–1292
by destruction, 435
false peace, 148, 154, 350, 866, 1385
by force, 196, 361
as a fundamental right, 195–196
and Marxism, 201–202
peace treaties, 494, 499, 866
persecution in the name of peace, 503–504
by politics, 206, 866, 1023, 1032, 1033
as right rather than duty, 195–196
syncretism, 200
from war, 191, 448, 473–475, 480, 507, 1168
war preferred to peace, 1022–1023, 1028–1031, 1032
with the world, 1304, 1351–1352

world peace, 376, 379, 1017
and repentance, 1025
in society
impossible with worldview war, 259, 1030–1031, 1034–1035
and peace with God, 1030–1031, 1355, 1386
result of regeneration, 361, 1030–1031
result of service to Christ, 10, 20, 255, 866–867, 1386
during trials, 1290–1291
Peale, Norman Vincent, 176
Pearce, Joseph Chilton, 1401
pedophilia, 673, 762, 901–902. *see also* abuse, child abuse
peer pressure, 16
Peking, 1102
Pelagianism, 207–210, 1007
Pendergast, Tom, 1263
penitentiary, etymology and usage, 1014
Penn, William, 1013
Pennsylvania House of Representatives, 86
Pentecost, 938, 1175
Pentecostalism. *see* charismatic movement
Penthouse Magazine, 598
Pepys, Samuel, 323–325
Perang, 663–664
perfect (telios), meaning, 358
perfectionism *vs.* holiness, 80–81, 1199–1200. *see also* legalism
perjury, 164, 463, 659
Peron, Eva, 552
Peron, Juan Domingo, 552
Perowne, Stewart, 1151
Perpetua, Vibia, 1118
persecution of the church
but not impotency, 1143–1144
cultural influence of martyrs, 570–571
deacons targeted, 109
for denying human totalitarianism, 1110
for denying the common faith, 850
failure of the church
ignored by the church, 483–484, 814
and pacifism, 1207, 1212
persecution by the church, 651
by family members, 1318–1319
fueled by guilt of evil men, 842, 1417
of Jesus Christ, 902, 1318
martyrdom courted, 1212–1213
martyrs dishonored, 299
modern, 52, 286, 1417
charitable trust doctrine, 597
church and school trials, 280, 460, 584–586, 596, 598, 603, 606–607, 629, 642–643, 733, 976, 993–994, 995, 1019, 1062, 1199, 1207, 1287
greater than ever before, 1132
hostility from family and friends, 1318
and humanist morality, 380, 488–489, 993–994, 1019
ignored by press, 280
Islamic, 1303
Marxist, 184, 249, 438–439, 483
in the name of peace, 503–504
against stance for Christian liberty, 650, 1019
strategic and disguised, 583–587, 595–600, 761–763, 976
and the Psalms, 1299
a reality for Christians, 1153, 1180
in specific places
in Africa, 499, 814, 1132
of the Armenian people, 1379, 1419, 1429, 1431, 1434, 1436, 1446
in China, 342
in Europe, 499–500
in Marxist countries, 184, 249, 438–439, 483
in Muslim countries, 1303
in Rome (*see* Rome, clash with Christianity)
in the Soviet Union, 483, 1132
in War for American Independence, 502–503
and stress, 1292
through indoctrination, 18
personhood
defined by courts, 48
of a fetus, 546–547
and wealth, 248–249
in the West *vs.* in the East, 1088
personhood of the fetus, 546–551, 1001–1002. *see also* abortion
perversion. *see* sexual crimes and perversions
Peter, 657, 938, 1140, 1228, 1373
Peter, Laurence J., 320–321
Peter principle, the, 320–321
Peterson, Peter, 1073
Petigru, James Louis, 266
Petronius Gaius Arbiter, 738
pettiness, 1340–1341, 1342–1343. *see also* hypersensitivity
Pettit, Charles, 485
Pew family, 891
Pharaoh Thutmosis III, 1388, 1415
Pharisees and Phariseeism
attacking faithful ministries, 103, 994
of Christ's day

Pharisees and Phariseeism *(cont'd.)*
case of the adulterous woman, 158
Christ's attack of, 1336
"except your righteousness shall exceed," 1336
Jesus questioned on taxation, 670
and communism, 342–343
gospel of crusade, 475, 477–478, 479–481
of humanism, 488–489, 491–492
as hypocrites, 1337–1338
legalism and antinomianism, 282, 323–325, 342–343, 591–592, 1336–1239 (*see also* legalism)
living by disgust, 1327–1328, 1337
modern "easy believism," 1215 (*see also* "easy believism")
the Phariseeism of evil, 281–282
in prayer, 1314
pride of, 1337–1338
replacing God's Law, 1220, 1336, 1347
result of liberal beliefs, 624
and selective depravity, 290, 293–295, 297, 1347
and selective obedience, 299–301
shifting focus, 1271
strength of, 1347
and tithing, 1260
and tradition, 1336, 1347
and utopianism, 364
whited sepulchers, 1134
Philip, 109, 1443
Philip II, 104
Phillips, Howard, 684, 965
Philo, 132, 393
philosophy, Christian. *see also* specific topics
God's revelation as starting point, 1163 (*see also* presuppositionalism)
mind as fallen (*see under* original sin and depravity)
precision of, 172–173
and reason, 402, 462, 1164, 1247
theology (*see* theology)
view of man (*see* man in Christian view)
philosophy, humanistic. *see also* specific subjects
lack of precision, 172–173
original sin as basic to, 135 (*see also* original sin and depravity, mind as fallen)
philosophers (*see* specific philosophers)
sacred *vs.* secular, 111–112
view of god (*see* God in humanistic view)
view of man (*see* man in Christian view)
view of reality (*see* reality, humanistic view of)
Phinehas, 673
physics, 984, 1211
Piao, Lin, 877
Pierce, Charles S., 205
Pierce, Franklin, 1022
Piers Plowman (Langland), 28, 367, 368
pietism
anti-intellectual, 166, 173, 186, 1209, 1230, 1277
and antinomianism, 119, 120, 162, 186, 657, 1093, 1209 (*see also* antinomianism)
compromise with humanism, 15, 119–123
and dispensationalism, 1176 (*see also* dispensationalism)
dualism
escaping the flesh, 944, 1110, 1121–1122, 1199
exclusive focus on the soul, 162, 464, 1044, 1169
heart *vs.* head knowledge, 462, 1251
man's soul as central, 447, 466, 944, 950, 1121–1122
mysticism, 944
sacred *vs.* secular, 111–112, 1199, 1208–1210
and emotionalism, 119, 125, 173, 186 (*see also* emotionalism)
and the Enlightenment, 1121–1122
and false definition of the church, 68, 104–105
form of modernism, 120, 127
of hippies, 120, 353
and impotency, 104–105, 119–123, 173, 289, 447, 464, 586, 598, 664–665, 827, 830, 953, 1015, 1121–1122, 1151
and abstractionism, 464, 634 (*see also* abstractionism)
attacking active Christians, 598
church's surrender of authority, 163, 1121–1122, 1207, 1209
false limits on the Bible, 161–162, 166, 943, 1121–1122, 1209–1210
pacifism and surrender, 1207
recession of Christian background, 657
self-absorbed, 119–120, 162, 165–167, 186, 466
lawless grace, 1093, 1209, 1220
medieval shift to pietism, 104–105, 1121–1122
monasticism, 68, 953–954

perfectionism *vs.* holiness, 80–81, 1199–1200 (*see also* legalism)
of the Pharisees, 1337–1338
redefining sin, 1209
and revolution of youth, 310
piety, usage and meaning, 920
piggul, Hebrew, 521
Pighius, 571
Pike, James, 391
Pilate, 9, 330, 825, 951
pilgrimages, 94–95, 398–400, 820
pimps, 1073
Pinnock, Clark H., 763
Pinson, Edmund, 945
Pin-Up, The (Gabor), 782
pioneers, 1279
Piper, Otto, 1115
pirates, 663–664
pity
for evildoers, 228
self-pity, 783, 824–825, 861, 888, 932, 1004
plagues, 754–757
Plato
on abortion, 546
as an idealist, 960, 961
Arianism, 393
and the family, 226
and law, 458, 635–636
philosopher-kings, 417
in the Renaissance, 440
on social planning, 39, 749, 1211
Platonism, 132–133, 247
Plato's *Republic,* 344, 363, 635, 963
Playboy, 282, 354, 598
pleasure principle, 1281, 1284
Pledge of Allegiance, 1360
Pliny the Younger, 1117
Plutarch, 1073
Plymouth Brethren, 1176
pneumonic plague, 754
poetry, 410, 1242
Pogo (comic strip), 1126
Poland and Polish, 619, 671
Polestar, 664–665
police
anti-police propaganda, 35–36, 294, 309
assault on, 664, 748, 884
authority of, 35–36, 750
and character, 761–762, 782
disallowed to use weapons, 761
failure of the state, 991, 995, 1029–1030
harassment of, 281, 884
as law enforcement, 28, 38, 263, 267–268, 281, 312, 750, 884, 991, 1029
as part of "the Establishment," 308
as political agents, 35, 967, 995
Rodney King, 198
without community support, 1072
political correctness, 488
politicians
and character, 161, 488, 752, 878, 960, 1136
Christian facade, 1136
distrust of, 818, 1080–1081
favor for non-working candidates, 1284–1286
judging candidates, 720–721
scapegoats of society, 437, 764
voice of the crowd, 878
politics. *see also* civil government
and Christian duty, 961
bringing state under authority of God's Law, 589, 1011, 1014–1015, 1023–1024, 1207
failure of churchmen, 105–106, 159–162, 388, 591, 674, 966
to hold magistrates accountable, 388
humanist attack on Christian involvement, 379, 597–598
to implement God's Law, 1129
"moral majority," 1138–1139
need for theology of politics, 1217
parties preferred to God's Law, 109
politics cannot reestablish Christian culture, 22, 251, 689, 733, 871–872
pro-life action, 1139 (*see also* abortion, anti-abortion activism)
regarding statism (*see* statism, and Christian duty)
retreat of the church, 651, 674, 950
to train people in character, 161
weakness of the church, 380
conservatism (*see* conservatism)
and drugs (*see* drug and alcohol abuse, and statism)
follows public opinion, 878, 893, 965, 1051
humanistic
as anti-Christian, 326–329, 759–763, 1007–1008
as art of compromise, 204, 213–214, 612
art of controlling other people, 591, 614, 877, 974, 1057–1058, 1275
bribe and payoff, 499–500, 526, 976
campaigns as new camp meetings, 91
conflict of interests as essential, 579, 1027–1031

politics
humanistic *(cont'd.)*
corruption, 185, 245, 291, 499, 822, 1035
crowd-pleasing, 467, 742, 759–762, 878–879, 977
embracing evil, 161, 523–524, 761–763
and envy, 1005
guerilla politics, 761
guilt-manipulation, 1072
hypocrisy and acting, 742, 1338
impotency and failure, 698–699, 1058–1059
instant gratification, 449–450, 759, 840, 846, 878, 1199–1200
lies, 391, 500, 977, 1008, 1035, 1080–1081
modern fascism, 1039
"omnipotence of criticism," 1331–1333
Phariseeism, 1338–1339
power blocs, 16–17, 39–40, 499, 961, 990–992, 1010, 1030, 1035, 1078–1080
pragmatism, 1008
as something to win, 869–870, 878–879, 964–966, 967, 977
statistics and manipulation, 231, 967, 969
and war, 1034–1035 (*see also* war)
liberalism (*see* liberalism)
local politics, 966
minority rule, 573, 965–966, 1262
parties, 983 (*see also* Democrats; Republicans)
most as fascist, 1040
and preaching, 161
salvation in, 355, 473–475, 480, 970, 1044–1045, 1082–1086, 1128–1130, 1338
Politics (Aristotle), 1049, 1168
Politics of Guilt and Pity (Rushdoony), 1096
Polk Doctrine, 613
Pollock, Jackson, 801
Polycarp, 804
polygamy, 376, 473, 1212
Polynesians, 873, 874–875
polytheism
and antinomianism, 1439
in "Christianity," 394–395, 464, 633, 1160, 1439
in classical paganism, 935, 1216
and covenants, 623
in pagan religions, 389–390, 440–441, 1216, 1439
and relativism, 376–377
and sovereignty, 3
Pompadour, Jeanne Antoinette Poisson de, 766
pontifex maximus, 90
poor class. *see under* classes
Popper, Karl, 494
population control, 226–227, 755, 803, 917
population explosion, 225–226, 1239
populism, 435
pornography, 228, 328, 415, 760–761, 768, 879, 1073
positive thinking, 176–177, 1085, 1328–1329
positivism in law, 462. *see also* law, humanistic
postmillennialism
blueprint for future in Scripture, 362, 590, 848, 1129, 1238
overcoming evil on earth, 9–10, 256, 1129–1130, 1181, 1196, 1207, 1234
overcoming sin of individuals, 293
triumph of evangelism, 1239
and Calvin, 570
and creation science, 62–63
deliverance of judgment, 235–236, 245, 253, 271, 954–955
and the Dominion Mandate, 1239 (*see also* dominion, and the future)
duty of the church, 174–175, 189, 954, 1196, 1201, 1206, 1207
of early Americans, 871, 946, 1237–1241
and the American War for Independence, 1239
of the early church, 804
vs. evolution, 62–63
and exuberant joy, 806, 1129, 1203–1204, 1218
and the faults of the church, 6, 134
and freedom, 1239
as heresy, 62, 110, 120, 174–175, 1225
dismissed as evolutionistic social gospel, 62
the millennium, 1238–1241
modern turning point in history, 351–352, 448, 955, 992, 1154
and death of the old order, 188–189, 351–352, 1286
"first the blade," 1425
"more than conquerors," 1196
and peace, 10, 438–439
and the Pilgrims, 946

in the prophesies of Christ, 7–10
of the Puritans, 949, 1237–1241
and the sovereignty of God, 982, 1154, 1196, 1203–1204
and Van Til, 570, 578
potentate, translated, 174
Potiphar's wife, 1317
Potter, Charline L., 696
Pound, Ezra, 798
poverty
Biblical solutions to, 1274–1276 (*see also* welfare)
and Christian duty, 247, 248, 1274, 1444, 1446–1447 (*see also* giving and charity)
and debt, 1274
and evil rulers, 935
and future-orientation, 845–848
as holy, 247–249, 342–343
and humanistic pietism, 187
and joy, 360–361
Neoplatonism and holy poverty, 247–249
poor as despised, 247
poor as victims, 248
poor class (*see under* classes)
and self-control, 888
as society's main problem, 341–343
Powell, Philip, 491
Powell, Ralph, 754–755
power. *see also* authority
Christian power, 17, 412, 481, 1004, 1143–1144
Christian aura of power, 1143
division of powers, 16–17
dominion *vs.* humanistic power, 471–472, 1124–1125
God as ultimate power, 1195–1196
God's Word as powerful, 146–147, 168, 1227
of missionary hymns, 1392
salvation as powerful, 1224–1225, 1226–1227
against sin, 1369
as "sons of God," 830–831
and tithing, 1124–1125, 1261, 1268
the "governing class," 891–894
humanistic,
of "charisma," 883
derived by blood and rank, 296
and doctrine of immanence, 984
evil ambition, 16–17, 161, 824, 1030, 1093, 1264
as impersonal, 471–472
impotent, 238
ineffective reform, 16–17, 475
and judgment, 708
vs. justice, 471–472, 614, 646, 731, 991, 995–996, 1001–1002, 1078–1080, 1264
"knowledge is power," 36
as license, 863, 889
to control others, 995–996, 1001–1002, 1090–1091, 1100, 1119, 1275, 1447
to murder, 1001–1002
to oppress, 414–415, 775, 985, 995–996, 1001–1002, 1079, 1264
and magic, 471–472, 527
political power blocs, 16–17, 39–40, 499, 961, 990–992, 1010, 1030, 1035, 1078–1080
replacing Holy Spirit with man's power, 80–81, 121, 481, 969, 1226, 1369
and science, 471–472, 983
"the omnipotence of criticism," 1331–1333
through social financing, 1125
as inherently evil, 338, 765–766
man's urge to power, 16–17, 363–365
and property control, 778
pragmatism
in the church, 1146
defined, 204–206
and equality, 21
and Hegel, 391
and Hitler's rise to power, 213
law and social order, 423, 451, 452, 457, 493–494, 612, 638–640
and Machiavelli, 378
and Marxist advancement, 254–255
and original sin, 252
philosophy in science, 493, 568
in productivity, 685
replacing principles, 553, 624, 748, 824, 862, 1203–1204
in Roman law, 330
utilitarianism, 452
view of reality, 402
prayer
vs. anxiety, 1298, 1306 (*see also* anxiety)
and Christian action, 662, 664–665, 1140
for civil magistrates, 1137, 1370
for evil authorities, 1137, 1370
examples from church history, 1307, 1387
and faith, 1306
for God's judgment, 1137
God's limits upon, 1313
for the imperfect church, 1345, 1368

prayer *(cont'd.)*
for impotent Christians, 1224
improper
for "family togetherness," 987
humanistic, 72, 222
and judgment, 1313
limiting God, 1307
long-winded, 1314–1315, 1337
mistakes in, 1309
"my will be done," 1313
prayerlessness, 1309
self-centeredness, 1308
sentimentalism, 1308, 1312
substitute for obedience, 662, 1127, 1255, 1269, 1310, 1312
"vain repetition," 1233, 1315
Lord's Prayer, 1314
and Mary, 1394–1398
as ministry of the elderly, 1378
in the name of Christ, 5, 1307–1308
and patience, 1296
prayer chains, 1315
prayer meetings, 1314
table graces, 1307
for wayward Christians, 1368
prayer, defined, 1306–1309
Praz, Mario, 398, 431, 838
preaching
Biblical doctrine slighted, 396–397
designed for mentally lazy, 1277
doom and gloom, 162 (*see also* eschatology, pessimistic)
and emotionalism, 173, 880
failure in changing culture, 168–169, 880, 1010
as faithful, 163–164, 170–171, 1349
boldness, 154, 155–156
opposition of congregation, 73, 74, 154, 156, 168, 569, 1342–1343
and Reconstruction, 1349
against sin, 156, 569
the jeremiad, 947
lack of vital preaching, 155–156, 168–169
long-winded, 1315
as man-centered, 470
neglected subjects, 3, 161–162
and politics, 161, 168
popular preaching, 73, 154, 155–156, 163–164, 168–169, 467, 524, 568, 880, 1010, 1219–1220, 1277
rationalism in, 426
revival and revivalism, 186, 426
submission to men, 154, 158, 169
systematic preaching, 574, 657
TV preachers, 62, 598
Preamble of the U.S. Constitution. *see under* Constitution of the United States
predestination, 978–982. *see also* providence of God
by chance, 978–979
by evil gods, 783
by God (*see also* Calvinism)
denied by Satan and followers, 590
and the economy, 693–695
election (*see* election of saints)
as evil, 1088
and evil authorities, 1362
and hope (*see also* hope, of Christians)
history flows from the future, 774, 1197, 1372, 1430
and the victory of Christ, 1154
and the modern church, 135–136, 695
and politics, 978, 1128–1129
and salvation (*see* salvation, and God's sovereignty)
by man (*see also* free will of man)
favored over God's government, 379
focus on events, 457
and myth. of "Nature," 979
in soul saving movement, 950
by the state, 694, 978, 985, 1020–1021, 1050–1051 (*see also* statism)
total planning, 230
by Nature, 457, 693, 979–980
negates equality, 325
and science, 275
Presbyterian Church USA, 1240
Presbyterian Medical Center, 547
Presbyterians, 120, 1160
presbyters. *see* church government
present-orientation
church as corrupted with, 1304
class and social warfare, 863–867
and decadence, 853–856, 868–869, 1126–1127, 1143, 1197
and economics, 677–679, 846–848, 876
and emotionalism, 879
and envy, 863–867
and existentialism, 874–876, 1234–1241
vs. future (*see* future)
and mental health, 1236
redefinition of freedom, 889
and relativism, 868
and statism, 877, 1032
and statist welfare, 878–879
press, the

attack on Christians in politics, 597–598, 613
blind faith in, 850
as deceitful, 862
federal subsidies, 733
ignoring persecution, 280
presuppositionalism
apologetics, 1432 (*see also* apologetics)
in art, 798–801
attacked by "fighting fundamentalists," 137
chance *vs.* predestination, 567–568
and the defeat of humanism, 540
and knowledge, 1168
and "laws of logic," 577, 1158–1159
and politics, 612
and reality, 153
and the "Received Text," 151–153
replaced by rationalism in church, 13
of Rushdoony, 559
in science, 1007
theonomy *vs.* autonomy, 567, 572, 578–579, 626–627, 1025, 1114
vital to Reconstruction, 1107–1108, 1432
pride
of academia and intellectuals, 779, 870
and architecture, 775–776
blessing expected despite sin, 167, 1255–1256, 1271
in the church (*see* church as corrupted, with pride)
contributing to salvation, 1247
"deserving" of grace, 1316
in elitism (*see* elitism, pride and arrogance)
evil ambition, 16–17, 161, 824, 1030, 1093, 1264
having credit with God, 1244
impatience, 1295–1296, 1999–1200
of the Jews, 236
and legalism, 81, 1337–1338 (*see also* Pharisees and Phariseeism)
"right" to privacy in sin, 283–284
and selective depravity (*see* selective depravity, and pride)
Prideaux, Tom, 447–448, 766
priesthood of every believer, 105. *see also under* responsibility of Christians
Prince de Ligne, 301
Princeton, 565, 566, 578, 1009, 1115
Princeton Seminary, 566, 1115
Princeton University, 578
priorities, 136, 1132, 1147, 1357, 1439, 1446. *see also* Reconstruction, Christian
Priscilla, 247, 1117
prison systems
absent in God's Law, 653
as corrective facilities, 84, 1013–1014
cultivate crime, 96
and environmentalism, 1013–1014
medical model, 335
as the new monastery, 1017
society of, 361, 1017
as source of heroes, 442
privacy
and master files, 21, 223, 229, 230, 355, 819, 1067–1068
and the "right" to sin, 283–284
as symptom of prudery, 761
private property. *see also* wealth
and class structure, 859
control by family (*see* family, and private property)
defense of as "selfish," 1325
and freedom, 1257–1259, 1260
and God's Law (*see* Law of God, Ten Commandments, 8th commandment)
and power, 778
and principle, 859
statist theft or control, 997–998 (*see also* taxation)
abolishment and revolution, 435
abolishment and utopianism, 363, 1019–1020, 1036
fascism as façade of private ownership (*see* fascism, defined)
to gain power, 778
through eminent domain, 1258–1259
through inflation, 1100
through property taxes, 1257–1259
as ultimate priority, 682–684
women disallowed from management, 419
process theology, 1172
Procrustes, 960–961
profane, definition, 1210
profanity, 185, 521, 771, 1134, 1208
profit *vs.* non-profit, 685
progress
and the development of sin, 1190
in the economy, 687–690, 1099
of the Gospel (*see* postmillennialism)
and the harmony of interests, 1029
and morality, 864–866, 918
and networking, 851
and "positive thinking," 1329
vs. revolution, 730–733

progress *(cont'd.)*
and self-government, 881
through conflict, 1028–1031
utopian (*see* utopian humanism)
Prohibition, 243, 658, 875, 887, 1016, 1042, 1274
proletariat, dictatorship of the. *see under* Marxism
promiscuity. *see under* sexual crimes and perversions
promises of God, 678, 1203–1204, 1233, 1297, 1401, 1445
propaganda
guilt manipulation, 249
and modern education, 881
prophecy. *see also* eschatology
as all fulfilled in Israel, 1175
Old testament limited to, 634
pagan, 1255
Prophecy and the Church (Allis), 1176
prophesies of Christ
in the garden of Eden, 7
gathering of the peoples, 8
Lion of Judah, 7–8
in the Passover, 256, 1410
of the Second Coming, 1402 (*see also* Second Coming of Christ)
as Shiloh, 7–10
prophet, the office of, 444, 1109
Proposition 13, 1039
propositional truth, 461–462
prosperity. *see* wealth
prostitution, 270, 747, 808, 984, 1073
Protestantism
and amillennialism, 570
condemnation of Rome, 1449
decline into pietism, 163
decline into rationalism, 1164
doctrine of, 564
doctrine of indulgences, 1215
false definition of church, 130, 140
priorities in 17th century, 1121
rationalism in, 132
scholastic view of, 566
state regulation of, 584
Protestant Reformation
Counter-Reformation, 140
denied by modern church, 1367
doctrine of justification, 113, 1178
and the family, 921–922
idea of the *fatherland,* 1087
marked by charity, 113–114
opposition to humanism, 183–184, 446, 746–747
people moved by oracles of God, 91
vs. rationalistic modernism, 138, 153
return to early church orthodoxy, 163, 183–184, 588
in Scotland, 913
traditions denounced, 94
Protestant work ethic. *see* Puritan or Protestant work ethic
protests, 27, 37, 198, 208, 369–370, 371
Proudhon, Pierre-Joseph, 329, 363
providence of God
and the atonement, 1391
and economics, 703, 729
in false religion, 455
and freedom, 237, 238
and meaning, 454–456, 457–458
and security of Christians, 238, 256, 360, 806, 1196
Psalms, the Book of, 1299–1300
psychiatry and psychology. *see also* mental disorders
and abortion, 548
and Christianity
anti-Christian movements in, 202, 384
"Christian" psychologists, 489
psychological heresies, 336–337
replacing faith and action, 514
church's reliance on, 143
church's stress of, 166
depression, 1236
in dystopian novels, 364
as a false gospel, 176–177, 346, 1014
Freud (*see* Freud)
gratitude and healing, 1345
guilt, 21, 384, 761, 1119
"happiness is a chemical," 782
imprisonment by the past, 1119, 1283, 1320
inability to cope, 889
medical model for sin, 335–337, 336, 1014
normality as absurd, 208–209
"positive thinking," 1328–1329
pressures of modern ideas, 449
privacy, 21, 761
psychoanalysis, 780
redefining sin, 344
repression, 21
and statism, 409, 596, 1014
stress, 449, 1290–1292 (*see also* trials and God's blessing)
therapies, 98, 493, 632, 1014, 1375
and time, 1235–1236
public schools. *see under* education in humanism

punishments and rewards, 696–697
purge, meaning, 648–649
Puritan or Protestant work ethic, 688, 691, 776, 856, 918, 1282, 1284
Puritans
  battle cry of, 605, 1143
  and Calvinism, 571, 1238–1239
  and Christmas, 1408
  and the City of God, 747
  doctrine of reformation, 1091–1092
  in early America
    capitalization and work ethic, 688, 691, 776, 856, 918, 1282, 1284 (*see also* capitalization)
    decline in America, 688, 949
    election day sermons, 162
    faith rejected, 349
    generational influence, 758
    healthy distrust of the state, 1087
    and joyful dominion, 945–946
    missionary zeal, 946
    postmillennialism of, 949, 1237–1241
    use of God's Law, 1113
  and the family, 1251
  as pilgrims, 398
  in the pulpit, 162, 168
  Puritan Commonwealth in England, 988
  and self-government, 791
  and sexuality, 944–945
  social financing, 1124
  strength of, 1143
  view of the Reformation, 1091–1092
purpose. *see* meaning
Pusey, Nathan M., 237
pygmies, 491–492, 671

Q

qahal, Hebrew, 67
Quadratus, Statius, 804
Quakers, 84, 148, 1013
Quantrill, William Clarke, 479–480, 509
"quarrelsome" Christian heroes, 1319, 1344
Quayle, Dan, 86

R

Raab, Selwyn, 555
rabbis, 5, 188, 390, 1336
racism
  Chalcedon Foundation accused of, 1153
  and class warfare, 1004, 1029 (*see also* class and social warfare)
  and envy, 1003–1004
  vs. God's harmony of interests, 41 (*see also* harmony of interests)
  institutionalized, 354
  intermarriage, 865, 1079
  justice and equality, 198, 258, 1004
  and liberalism, 45
  minority rights, 198, 1094–1095
  a modern fact, 1129
  and poverty, 248, 1004
  product of evolutionary thinking, 1129
  race as source of culture, 740–741, 749, 813–814, 870
  racial cleansing, 870
  racial reparations, 759–761
  racial violence, 20, 1004, 1029
  racial warfare, 850
  salvation by race, 1153
    "Anglo-Saxon superiority," 813–814, 1129
    Western man as more congenial to the Gospel, 813–814
  segregation and desegregation, 27, 121, 865–866, 965–966, 1079
  and selective depravity, 290–292, 293–294, 296, 303, 333–334, 632, 1004
  self-pity, 1004
  and "sensitivity training," 176, 1004
  and statism, 601, 865, 1029, 1094–1095, 1129
  in the U.S., 817, 1029
  victim mentality and, 834
  and welfarism, 1004
  "white" culture, 740–741
Rader, Dotson, 383
radio, 351, 1327
radio preaching, 186, 598
Rahab, 1141
Ramsay, William M., 889, 1049–1050, 1090
ranching, 873–874
Rand, Ayn, 701, 818
Rand, H.B., 1257
rape, 210, 272, 334, 433, 647, 764, 801, 995, 1334. *see also* abuse, sexual abuse
Rapture, 110, 174, 221, 489, 643, 1175–1177, 1212, 1219, 1232, 1234, 1237, 1241, 1304. *see also* eschatology
rationalism. *see also* philosophy, humanistic
  abstractionism, 577, 793–794
  anti-Christian, 305, 1163
  in the church, 13, 137–138, 153
    in early America, 1238–1239
    early church, 132–133
    Holy Spirit replaced with reason, 1164–1165

rationalism
in the church *(cont'd.)*
in judging God and His Word, 137–138, 593, 1158–1159, 1171
law of contradiction, 1158–1159
"proving" the existence of God, 1163 (*see also* apologetics)
in Reformed Christianity, 565–566
in classical humanism, 635–637
in conservatism, 426
in education, 917–918
and the Enlightenment (*see* Enlightenment, doctrine of reason)
God as comprehensible, 1167, 1304
irrationalism (*see* irrationalism)
limiting concept, 270, 577
philosophers (*see* specific names)
and reality
basic irrationalism of the fallen mind, 201, 375–376, 1084–1085, 1163
as a denial of sin, 1165
fallacy of simplicity, 1100, 1101–1102
fallibility of man, 152
and impotency, 410–412
inability to cope with evil, 263, 267–268
inability to cope with reality, 263, 355–356, 1163, 1399
rational is real, 320, 507, 1036–1037, 1075–1076, 1101–1102
redefining reality, 425, 917
reason as savior, 197, 355–356, 417, 1179
in Arminianism, 1179
faith in reason, 636, 917
salvation by rational politics, 197, 355–356 (*see also* politics, humanistic, salvation in)
as source of liberty, 197
reason as sovereign
and anarchism, 319
challenge of the incarnation, 1399–1403
defining reality, 402, 917
and elitist rule, 401–403, 407, 416–418, 635–636, 1164
empiricism, 789
as infallible, 44, 55, 263, 305, 1247
judge of all things, 1164–1165, 1167
in judging God and His Word, 137–138, 593, 1158–1159, 1171 (*see under* rationalism, in the church)
and law, 457, 507, 647–648, 1008
and natural law, 635, 1211–1212
vs. presuppositionalism (*see* presuppositionalism)
vs. propositional thinking, 462
reason as god, 426
replacing theology, 183, 425, 426
selective rationalism, 408–409, 1099
and social planning, 416–417 (*see also* social planning)
vs. sovereignty of Christ, 13, 917
and statism, 458, 494
and women's roles, 416–418
Rauschenberg, Robert, 800, 801
Ravenna, 746
Read, Leonard, 1100
Reagan, Ronald, 356, 547–548, 601
election of 1980, 598
reality
Christian view of,
God's reality as ultimate, 410–412, 1168–1169, 1195–1196
and presuppositionalism, 153
and stability, 439
and stress, 1290–1291
humanistic view of,
in academia (*see* academia, and reality)
and anarchism, 300–301, 1101
evil as ultimate reality, 834–835, 843, 1372
and existentialism (*see* existentialism, concept of reality)
governed by man, 135–136, 984, 1084–1085, 1440
"accepting" the universe, 405
as the invention of man, 789, 798–801, 807, 1440
rational is real (*see* rationalism, and reality)
hatred of reality, 436, 788–790, 801
attempts to avoid, 1375–1376
and doubt, 153
escapism (*see* escapism)
imagination in place of reality, 350, 1132, 1174–1177
Marxist inability to cope with reality, 263
meaninglessness *vs.* truth, 537–538
rejected in relativism, 1085
replaced by appearances, 111, 112, 115, 147
replaced by "positive thinking," 177, 1085
of Hegel, 320, 425
of Kant, 425, 507, 1163–1164
materialism, 984

and paganism, 465
and pragmatism, 402
in the Renaissance, 115
replaced by emotionalism, 124
universe as ultimate, 984
and utilitarianism, 452
Reaper newsletter, 710
reason as sovereign. *see* rationalism
reason in Christianity, 402, 1164, 1247
Received Text. *see* Textus Receptus
reconciliation without restitution, 93, 118. *see also* restitution
Reconstruction, Christian
according to God's law-word, 480–481
after God's judgment, 260
and atonement, 289, 295, 376, 383, 579
begins locally, 1116, 1359
begins in the home, 889, 898, 907–908, 921–922, 1359
begins with regeneration, 136, 271, 286, 329, 356, 366, 373, 486–487, 501, 579, 672, 768, 814, 861–862, 991, 1030–1031, 1035, 1124, 1226–1227, 1362–1363, 1366
begins with repentance, 1024
begins with self-government, 22, 38, 60, 123, 215–216, 223, 255, 295, 312, 444–445, 475, 579, 674, 763, 862, 889, 902, 966, 1073, 1091–1092, 1201–1202, 1439
education as vital (*see* education in Christianity, vital to Reconstruction)
providing real solutions, 1111, 1124–1125, 1130, 1134–1135, 1257, 1441
recapitalizing spiritual and material capital, 1081, 1134–1135
reordering priorities, 136, 1132, 1147, 1439, 1446
responsibility of every Christian, 189, 592, 814, 872, 885, 1081, 1145–1146, 1227
begins with man, 857
of civil arena, 28–29, 32, 211, 317, 497, 733, 966, 1124–1125, 1137, 1138–1139, 1257, 1265 (*see also* politics, and Christian duty)
vs. controlling others, 1153, 1447
the creative Word of God, 1329–1330
as "dominion theology," 346–347, 1113–1114 (*see also* dominion)
and evangelism, 579
faith for all of life, 1151
reconstructing agriculture, 356
reconstructing medicine, 848
reconstructing science, 356
free economy and, 1069
and good theology, 391–392, 1202, 1441–1442
overcoming evil doctrine, 249, 298, 366, 501, 544–545, 894
presuppositionalism, 1107–1108, 1432 (*see also* apologetics)
hard work and action
centrality of tithing and giving, 249, 720, 732–733, 1124–1126, 1201–1202, 1257–1262, 1265, 1446–1447
and church's inaction, 174–175
vs. demonstrations, 1213
vs. documenting evils, 193–194, 991, 1126–1127, 1134–1135, 1204, 1329, 1349
vs. military wars, 1025–1026, 1137, 1153
need for faith and obedience, 245, 438–439, 619, 674, 763, 862, 1124–1125, 1146, 1226
need of active Christianity, 574
vs. revolution, 302–303, 1137, 1140–1141, 1153
work is power, 371
importance of faith to, 235
modern necessity of, 1122
and money, 707–708
of Pelagianism state, 211
priority of God's Law, 136, 221, 273, 295, 334, 361, 373, 385, 497, 579, 636–637, 639–640, 862, 1108, 1356–1360, 1363–1364
implementing God's Law, 383, 674, 747–748, 751, 991, 1030–1031, 1034–1035, 1040, 1124, 1143, 1329–1330
responsibility of the Church, 131, 189
and Biblical literacy, 60, 255, 1300
and Christian foundations, 1109–1112
and danger of seminaries, 1173
diaconal ministry, 1149–1150, 1441–1443, 1447
importance of the laity, 1116
preaching, 1349
theonomy (*see* theonomy)
victory in the culture war, 286, 356, 529–530, 848, 954, 1137, 1144, 1146, 1154, 1181, 1201–1202, 1207, 1363–1364

Reconstruction, Christian
victory in the culture war *(cont'd.)*
hope for the future, 804, 848, 851–852, 872, 1040, 1124–1125, 1143–1144
modern turning point in history, 317, 501, 646, 828, 992, 1040, 1069, 1103, 1116, 1119, 1132–1133, 1139, 1154, 1288
permanence and change in history, 372–374
small beginnings, 439, 449–450, 467, 514–515, 885, 954, 1116, 1124–1125, 1132–1133, 1137, 1143–1144, 1154, 1199–1200, 1201–1202, 1349–1350, 1359, 1425, 1439
and sovereignty of God, 22, 28–29, 106, 312, 329, 360, 1107–1108, 1151
viewed as evil, 1151, 1153, 1442
and youth, 418, 815, 1120–1121
Reconstruction of the South, 266, 1079, 1258
Red China. *see under* China and Chinese
redeemer, meaning, 1390
"*redeeming the time,*" meaning
Red Reign of Terror in Hungary, 262–263
reformation
by accredited seminaries, 930
City of God *vs.* City of Man, 746–747
of criminals, 1013–1014
vs. documentation, 1134–1135
false cleansing, 1134
by human power, 16–17, 473–475, 479
by law, 1013–1015
"polishing brass on a sinking ship," 1237
Puritan view, 1091–1092
by rationalistic humanism, 401–403
Reformation, Protestant. *see* Protestant Reformation
reformatory, etymology and usage, 1014
Reformed circles
amillennialism in, 1237
antinomianism in, 126
rationalism in, 153
Reformed theology
as covenantal, 12
doctrine of justification, 1179–1183
as foundational to American culture, 1145–1146
priority of God, 1301, 1429–1430
a remedy for social ills, 952, 954
reform school, etymology and usage, 1014
Reichek, Jesse, 969
Reid, Whitelaw, 1174
Reign of Terror. *see under* French Revolution
relationships as mediated by God, 843
relativism
and antinomianism, 535, 618, 621, 748, 969, 1020–1021, 1089
in the church, 1170–1171
in conservatism, 962, 1044
and the culture of death, 173, 452
in education, 915
existentialism (*see* existentialism)
and historical revisionism, 510–511
and impotency, 311
and intellectualism, 767, 927, 1170
and libertarianism, 31
and meaning, 372–373, 457
meaninglessness and atheism, 531, 538–539, 694, 1203
and morality, 172–173, 380, 552, 554, 927, 1020, 1089
and the nature of man, 172–173, 467–468
no absolutes, 1170–1171
origins in Eastern thought, 534
and paganism, 389
and polytheism, 376–377
and pragmatism (*see* pragmatism)
and present-orientation, 868
rejection of reality, 1085
and "sensitivity," 962, 1044
and social order
and anarchy, 321, 533, 748, 868, 962
bypassing truth, 1096–1097
civic religion, 496–498
compromise, 614
"disposable man," 451–453
"dumping-ground future," 381–383
and the lower-class mind, 869
man as his own god, 454
pragmatism, 624
redefinition of freedom, 198
social justice, 618
statism, 927
welfare, 467 (*see also* welfare, statist)
"relevant" Christianity, 1214
religion. *see also* faith
basis of social order, 737, 745, 750–751
must dominate education to thrive, 936–937
"mystery of the social order," 737–739
painful death of, 512
vs. "the secular," 1208–1210
religion and state
antinomianism and statism, 328,

413–415, 529, 591, 624, 631, 643, 648, 993–994, 1037–1038, 1045, 1066, 1113 (*see also* statism)
Christian foundations of freedom (*see* freedom in Christianity)
Christian magistrates
rebuking of, 1370
when wickedness betrays professions, 1370
church-state issues
First Amendment as historical not legal, 422
liberal churches, 89
separation of church and state, 51–52, 387–388, 739, 1072, 1093, 1096
in Bible, 54
new meaning, 597
state control of church, 86–87, 583–585, 595–600, 603–604
church serving the state, 975, 1371
licensure, 53, 583–584, 931
as "necessary," 639
state replacement of church, 645
struggle of priority, 1093
taxation (*see* taxation, churches and taxes)
and citizenship, 745
civil religion, 88–89, 496–497, 652
defeating statism (*see* politics, and Christian duty)
exploitation of religion by state, 496, 528
to control the masses, 981
the Inquisition, 1047–1048
as the "mystery of the social order," 737–739
religion as department of state, 1109
religion as social cement, 610, 1048, 1120
revolution and redefining Christianity, 390–391
state churches, 503
freedom of religion, 602–603, 650–651, 1008 (*see also* freedom in Christianity)
myth of religious neutrality, 32, 51–52, 255, 325, 370, 639–640
organized atheism of the state, 370, 413–415, 641–642, 694–695, 816, 985
sins promoted by state (*see* statism, destruction of society, promotion of sin)
state punishing rival religions, 464, 1045
atheism promoted, 363
banning of religion, 433
banning of the Magnificat, 1415
replacement for religion, 384–385, 738–739, 1044–1045, 1087
toleration of religion, 9, 220, 483, 583–586 (*see also* persecution of the church)
religions, false. *see* false gospels; specific religions
Renaissance
academia captured by humanism, 183, 1121
and aesthetics, 527
and anarchism, 318, 639
and art, 143, 441, 1201
concept of freedom, 58
concept of reality, 115
corruption of the church, 105, 446, 1083
Frances Bacon on, 617
and imitation of nonworking rich, 775
love of death, 399
and rationalism, 425
reformation in, 588
rise of humanism in West, 183, 752
self-interest, 330
and the state
arrogance of Renaissance kings, 934
concept of the state, 208
and elitism, 441
state as savior, 1050
and utopianism, 362
"Renaissance Man," 926–927
repentance
beginning of Christian Reconstruction, 1024
faith and obedience, 1228–1229
false repentance, 84–85
and peace, 1025
refused by critical students, 553, 831, 893, 1091, 1119
refused by self-pitying citizens, 824–825
and social healing, 259, 301, 814–815
and social progress, 223
true repentance, 937
Repression of Heresy in Medieval Germany (Kieckhefer), 1047
Republic (Plato), 344, 363, 635, 749, 963, 1049, 1137
republic, defined, 389
republican government, 389, 592, 603, 985, 1003. *see also* constitutionalism
Republicans, 130, 532, 588, 699, 1007

Republic of the Southern Cross, the (Brussof), 364–365, 663–664
Requiem for Democracy? An Inquiry in the Limits of Behavior Control (Karlins and Andrews), 1080
respectable "Christianity," 1318
"Respondez!" (Whitman), 528
responsibility in humanism
  autonomy and absolute self-government, 318–319, 449
  evading responsibility (*see also* environmentalism; escapism)
    and abuse, 158, 228
    and anarchy, 1112
    and antinomianism, 14, 210, 807–808, 879
    avoiding reading Scripture, 1161
    blessings expected despite sin, 167, 1255–1256, 1271
    boredom, 836–837
    cowardice, 6
    dependence
      slavery (*see* slavery, and sin)
      welfarism, 122, 668–669, 878–879
    depression, 555, 836–837
    entitlement mentality, 834, 861, 1084, 1112, 1281, 1446
    environmentalism (*see* environmentalism)
    hatred of God's reality, 436, 788–790, 801
    and human rights movements, 270
    immaturity (*see* immaturity)
    murder
      abortion, 840–841 (*see also* abortion)
      euthanasia (*see* euthanasia)
    psychology
      labeling sin "disease," 336
      medical model, 336
      pressures of modern ideas, 449
    reconciliation without restitution, 93, 118
    Romanticism, 429
    and self-esteem, 1248–1249
    self-expression and spontaneity, 838–839
    self-righteous protest of the criminal, 38
    victim mentality (*see* environmentalism)
    violence as solution, 874, 1022–1023
    while demanding responsibility of others, 713
responsibility of Christians
  accountability, 336
  to be active for Christ, 78–79
  care for widows and orphans, 1447 (*see also* welfare, and Christian duty)
  chastisement, 336
  comprehensive application of Scripture, 743, 1146
    under covenantal requirements, 1162, 1244
    duties in education, 925 (*see also* education in Christianity)
    and the office of prophet, 444
    reading Scripture, 1161–1162
    and Reconstruction (*see* Reconstruction, Christian)
    to spiritual and material, 1176
  and dominion (*see* dominion, and Christian responsibility)
  duties increase with responsibilities, 737–739, 810–811
  evasion of,
    in conspiracy theories, 1196
    in politics, 159
    and "relevant" Christianity, 1214
  interdependence, 321
  priesthood of all believers, 105
    holiness (*see* holiness, Christian)
    total dedication to Christ, 444, 1214–1215
  regeneration, 336, 471–472
  self-government, 215
    acknowledging personal sin, 814–815
    as basic government, 968, 970, 1100, 1202
    confession of sin, 833
    delayed gratification, 840, 853
    disciplined thinking, 1084
    in face of temptation, 813, 1043
    financial, 689
    freedom (*see* freedom in Christianity, as responsibility)
    government by the Holy Spirit, 1165
    humility, 833, 1271
    to mature and grow, 38, 169, 223, 358–359, 851–852, 1277–1278, 1292
    opposed by statists, 219
    radical responsibility of the believer, 1091–1092
    reasonableness, 791
    repentance and social healing, 259, 268, 301, 814–815
    restitution, 294, 336
    tithing (*see* tithing)

trust in God, 1289 (*see also* faith)
anxiety, 1287–1288, 1291, 1297–1298, 1306, 1377
confidence of victory, 1196, 1203–1204
laughing with God, 1196
living in hope and victory, 837, 1081, 1154, 1196
vs. in man, 147
obeying and leaving results to God, 1154, 1203–1204
rejoicing, 188–189, 1409
"though He slay me," 1301–1302
in trials and stress, 1251–1252, 1290–1291, 1317, 1320 (*see also* trials and God's blessing)
waiting on God, 1297–1298
rest, 360–361, 1279, 1384. *see also* Sabbath
restitution
and atonement, 653–655, 1013
basic to Christian law, 632, 1013, 1021, 1025
and Christian justice, 653–655, 659–660
false versions of, 323–324
and foreign policy, 653
and God's judgment, 654–655
instead of man's vengeance, 93–94
reconciliation without restitution, 93, 118
and self-government, 294, 336
solution for crime, 653–655, 1014
resurrection
of the body, 1198, 1200
of Christ and His victory, 1218
general resurrection, 793–794
obsession with, 1437
proving with rationalism, 152
Resurrection Day. *see* Easter
retirement community, 899
revival and revivalism
birth of, 120
and Christian education, 950
focus on individual experience, 136, 1222
followed by decline, 165–166
and irrelevance of evangelicals, 119
origins of revivalism in America, 949–950
and preaching, 186, 426
results in modernism, 951
and retreat from the world, 950
true revival, 167, 797
vagueness of, 186
revolution. *see also* war; specific revolutions
and anarchy, 184
and atheism, 435, 1203
and Christianity
as "Christian duty," 389, 390, 759
Christian framework, 222–223, 670, 824, 1137, 1399
contribution of revolution to secularization, 562–563
disguised as evangelism, 187–188, 341
hard work and action *vs.* revolution, 302–303, 1137, 1140–1141, 1153
preceded by religious revolution, 28, 208, 257, 262–263, 265, 368, 425, 433–434, 436, 1054–1055
promoted by church, 186–187, 244, 759–760, 1137
redefining Christianity, 390–391
rejection of Biblical thinking, 40–41, 883, 1137, 1203–1204, 1362
revolutionary clergy, 390–391
vs. Sabbath rest, 360–361
and unconditional love, 959–962, 1323–1324
"civil-rights" revolution, 241, 243–244, 270–271, 353–354, 1079–1080
condemns new revolutions, 24
counterrevolution, 778
and critical analysis, 411
denial of sin
environmentalist view of man, 318 (*see also* environmentalism)
mis-location of evil, 312, 361, 368
and natural goodness of man, 208–209
noble savage doctrine, 339
revolution *vs.* regeneration, 672, 730–733, 1108, 1140–1141, 1362–1363, 1366–1369, 1400
and selective depravity, 298, 647–648 (*see also* selective depravity)
and equalitarianism, 192
examples in history
American "Revolution," 509 (*see also* War for American Independence)
French Revolution (*see* French Revolution)
Russian Revolution (*see* Russian Revolution)
and failure
due to failure of old order, 645, 828, 1094
due to failure of the people's god, 26, 192, 212, 255, 259, 263, 879
and the establishment (*see* Establishment, the, and revolution)
exploiting the people, 354, 761
failure of revolution, 544, 730, 915, 1070–1071

revolution *(cont'd.)*
and the judgment of God, 236
and modern statism, 731, 828, 1124
20th century changes, 1039–1040
and ecology, 437
exploited by socialists, 354, 761–762
and fiat law, 636
and human rights, 195–196, 270
as subsidized, 22, 209, 354, 761–762, 763
and taxation, 731, 1020, 1039–1040, 1071
voting for revolution, 268
and moralism, 324, 528
and nihilism, 435, 436
perpetual revolution
as answer to societal ills, 672, 730–733, 763, 1449
faith in change, 373, 730, 760–762, 851–852
faith in revolution, 486, 759, 768, 964
hope of student movement, 730, 760–762
of humanism, 40–41, 193, 268, 328–329, 443, 507, 672, 730, 763, 1124, 1449
instant gratification, 361, 841, 879, 888, 1199–1200
and pessimistic eschatology, 303
rebirth of society, 407, 436, 449–450, 672, 773, 879
religious fervor of revolutionaries, 647, 730, 1124
taught in schools, 36
as way to freedom, 40–41, 59–60, 1124, 1137
and Romanticism, 429
sexual revolution (*see* sexual revolution)
shock value, 803
and total autonomy, 40–41, 366, 435, 761–762
and the universities, 36, 192–193, 267, 760–761
and utopianism, 390, 449–450
war's revolutionary nature, 1032 (*see also* war)
of youth, 310, 339, 730, 760–762 (*see also* youth, student movement)
Revolutionary War. *see* War for American Independence
"Revolution or Regeneration" (Rushdoony), 1140
rewards and punishments, 696–697
Rey, Gabriel, 1036
Rhodes funds, 892
Rice, Charles, 1002
Richard II, 94, 368
Richardson, Joanna, 766
Richardson, W.L. "Bill," 720–721
rich class. *see under* classes
rich young ruler, the, 1251
Rickey, Branch, 965–966
Rieff, Philip, 1089
Riesman, David, 319, 847
Riessen, Van, 362–363, 366
righteous, translated, 652, 1006, 1011, 1113, 1289
righteousness
abdication and evil, 823
distrust of man, 768
"except your righteousness shall exceed," 1336
"hunger and thirst after," 1278
"judge righteous judgment," 1334–1335
and justice, 1006–1008, 1011, 1113–1114, 1289
rights of man. *see also* freedom in Christianity; freedom in humanism
and anarchy, 199, 738
and capital punishment, 26
children's rights movement (*see* children's rights movement)
civil-rights revolution, 241, 243–244, 270–271, 353–354, 1079–1080
of criminals, 280, 747, 962, 1006, 1065
denied in humanism, 413
vs. duty, 195–196, 199, 738–739, 1244–1245
to have "the good life," 1270–1271
in humanistic economics, 21, 1270
protected by God's Law, 1323
before God and man, 629
parental rights, 280
property rights, 682–684
and relativism, 618–619
self-defense, 234
and shoes in Scripture, 629
to sin, 272–273
homosexuality rights movement, 86, 270, 281, 603, 1136
and the Marquis de Sade, 962
to murder, 1001–1002
privacy and sin, 283–284
and the state
as basis of law, 26, 1001–1002
Declaration of the Rights (French Revolution), 636, 644

defined by the state, 197–199, 243, 1001–1002
and growth of bureaucracy, 222–224
guaranteed by the state, 199
and statist welfare, 21, 199, 209, 211
voluntary surrender of, 629
women's rights movement (*see under* feminism)
Rilke, Rainer Maria, 135–136
rioting, 665, 760–762, 786
Ripon, California, 560
risk, 604
Robbe-Grillet, Alain, 869, 874
Robespierre, Maximilien, 414, 443, 647–648
Robinson, Jackie, 966
Robinson, John A.T., 391
Robinson Crusoe (Defoe), 319
robots, 981
Rockefeller, John D., 1286
Rockefellers, 694, 891
Rockwell, Lew, 684
Roepke, Hans Sennholz, 706–707
Roepke, Wilhelm, 706–707, 982
Roe v. Wade, 1072, 1136
Roloff, Lester, 831, 976
Roman Catholicism
and the Counter-Reformation, 1361
doctrine of the church, 130, 1449
lay-led study groups, 1116
and natural law, 635
priorities in 17th century, 1121
problems in, 975
bureaucratic rule, 69–70
fiscalism, 105
indulgences (*see* indulgences)
the Inquisition, 1047–1048
irrelevance, 105
"nepotism," 105
papal infallibility, 42
Roman imperialism, 588
selective faithfulness of, 301
and the Protestant Reformation, 184, 1367–1368
and Protests, 1160
state regulation of, 584
tax-exempt status, 597
Vatican, 70
Romania, 103, 1444
Romanticism
birth of feminism, 419–420
and the bizarre, 398
and Christianity
in the church, 784, 1251
as non-Christian culture, 796
contribution to secularism, 563
emotionalism, 419–420, 426, 783
and evasion of responsibility, 429
everyday Romanticism, 428–430
false gospel of, 429
and the family, 420
fundamental goodness of man, 430
myth of the noble savage, 33, 45, 431–432, 773, 834–835
reforming man, 1013–1014
and Mary Queen of Scots, 300
obscuring role of the city, 849
and the occult, 428–429
the pilgrimage, 398
priority on human experience, 136
redefining love, 428–429
and revolution, 429
and spontaneity, 838
and work, 428, 429
and youth, 429
Rome. *see also* classical philosophy and culture
abortion in (*see* abortion, in classical paganism)
clash with Christianity
attack on Christ's life, 9
defeated by Christ, 189, 349, 351, 733, 1120
immorality of Commodus, 1212
"more than conquerors," 1196
over sovereignty of Christ *vs.* Caesar, 47, 54, 207, 445, 585, 588–589, 599, 610, 745, 931, 938, 981, 1109–1110
resulting legal immunity of Christianity, 610
slander of Christians, 1117
superior government of Christianity, 610–611, 1441
superior intellect of Christianity, 1120–1121
superior society of Christianity, 1110, 1151, 1330
classes in,
citizenship, 745, 1117
powerful as beyond the law, 738
rights of creditors, 683
serfdom and slavery, 369, 889, 1054, 1117
treatment of poor, 247
debt in, 683, 1273
decay of, 991
disease in, 756
early years, 588
fall of, 995–996

Rome *(cont'd.)*
Fall of Rome, 588
and corruption, 982, 995–996
"dark ages" following, 752
and end of land tax, 683
fallacy of simplicity, 1098
and hopelessness, 303, 996, 1083
and impotency of critics, 991
interest in occultism, 448, 1081, 1118
loss of faith in saving power of Rome, 1083, 1118, 1120
and nihilism, 455, 825, 996
past-bound focus, 514–515, 996, 1120
security preferred to freedom, 349, 351
triumph of Christ, 189, 349, 351, 733, 1120
and welfarism, 745–746
as governing body
antiestablishment action, 1003
citizenship in, 745, 1117
as *de facto* order, 671
divinity of rulers, 746, 1083
"Eternal Rome," 440
law defined by man, 497
as "light of the world," 981
pagan statism, 90, 440, 981, 1109
religion exploited for statist ends, 610, 1109
statist salvation, 641, 1083, 1152, 1212, 1389
the Twelve Tables of law, 683
welfare state, 109, 330, 745, 1084, 1090
influence on West
church government concepts, 69–70
pilgrimages to, 398
state government concepts, 90
philosophy of
concept of success in, 330
concept of virtue, 338
"necessity knows no law," 638–639
roots of Innocentine philosophy, 474
value of wise men in, 1404
religion
as exploited for statist ends, 610, 1190
human sacrifice, 805
and license, 107, 610
mystery religions in, 743
"sons of God," 830
"the genius of Rome," 440, 445
Rome, modern, 1102
Romer v. Evans, 1136
Rooker, Tom, 1174
Roosevelt, Franklin Delano, 448, 698–699, 963, 1286
Roosevelt, Theodore, 563, 803, 878, 963, 967
rootlessness and barbarism. *see* barbarism and rootlessness
Rosenstock-Huessy, Eugen, 90, 657, 773–774
Roszak, Theodore, 1123
Rothbard, Murray, 684
Rousseau, Jean-Jacques
artist as prophet, 425, 787
doctrine of freedom, 1052–1053
doctrine of humanism, 644, 961
elitism, 407
and environmentalism, 318
fashioned modern world, 768
general will as infallible, 91, 1164
genius in the modern world, 443
"gospel" of equality, 780
"Gospel of the Child," 477
and instant gratification, 841
myth of consent, 405–406
nature as source of freedom, 197
noble savage doctrine, 339, 431, 432, 527, 773–774
and socialism, 339
Rubens, Peter Paul, 789
Rubin, Jerry, 309
Ruef, Abe, 961
Ruffian, Edmund, 509
Rushdoony, Dorothy, 656, 1006, 1213, 1303, 1439
Rushdoony, Edward, 1432
Rushdoony, Haig, 1292
Rushdoony, Isaac, 1379
Rushdoony, Mark, 1379
Rushdoony, Rebecca, 1434
Rushdoony, R. J.
"friendly" warnings about, 585
leader of Christian Reconstructionists, 1442
as a missionary, 840
parents of, 1433–1434
in Scotland, 1303
on Van Til, 559–574
Rushdoony, Rousas George, 1434
Rusk, Dean, 755
Russell, Bertrand, 1163
Russia. *see also* Soviet Russia; Soviet Union
old Russia, 192, 401, 1003, 1022, 1094
humanistic westernization, 104
kulaks, 1003
millionaires in, 1264
Russian Revolution (*see* Russian Revolution)

Russian Revolution, 364, 485, 900, 1054, 1094. *see also* Soviet Russia
based on natural law, 635
Bolsheviks, 354, 445, 900
hatred of Christianity, 502
impact of, 1071
and nihilism, 436
unhindered humanism, 184
Rustin, Bayard, 187
Rutherford, Samuel, 529–530
Rutledge, John, 531

S

Sabbath
command to rest, 360–361, 1279
command to work, 1285
and debt laws, 709–711
heaven as an eternal Sabbath, 1377
land laws, 654
and legalism, 360
resting in the Lord, 360–361, 1377, 1387
vs. revolution, 360–361
sacerdotalism, 1187
sacraments, 109, 438
baptism (*see* baptism)
communion (*see* communion)
Sade, the Marquis de
abolition of law, 414, 1334
champion of equal rights, 962
conclusion of relativism, 172
demoralism of, 376
existentialism, 315
false freedom, 1052–1053, 1211–1212
living totally beyond good and evil, 1334
meaninglessness, 800–801
naturalism, 488, 1211–1212
proposal of humanism, 544
"supernatural law is evil," 272
war on the family, 921
Sadecky, Petr, 438
sadism, 277, 376, 399, 801
sadomasochism, 288, 799, 1108. *see also* masochism
Saint-Gaudens, Augustus, 799
saints. *see* specific names
Saint-Simon, Henri de, 228
"salt of the earth," 1149
salvation
as deification, 1449
and doctrine of creation, 634
false gospels (*see* false gospels)
and God's sovereignty, 905–906, 1050, 1178–1183
and baptism, 905–906
by choosing Christ, 1187, 1196, 1215
and evangelism (*see* evangelism, in terms of God's sovereignty)
and grace, 906
and justification by faith, 1178–1183
make salvation possible, 1050
man's contribution to his, 1179–1183, 1247
predestination (*see* predestination)
Reformation doctrine, 113
and incarnation, 1419
narrow view of,
as being rescued from our problems, 1177
as central, 466, 1147, 1271
limiting Christian work to, 1149
limiting the Bible to, 161, 458, 1160
limiting to the soul, 1169
as powerful, 1224–1225, 1226–1227
as comprehensive, 1055, 1058
doctrine and society, 1128–1129
and freedom (*see* freedom in Christianity, in the salvation of Christ)
rebirth, 258, 417, 517, 1189–1191, 1424
sin and salvation as framework for history, 490–492, 1190, 1384, 1400
of the whole world, 1169, 1198–2000, 1384
purpose of, 1195, 1214–1215, 1222–1223, 1351–1352, 1442
goal as the Kingdom, 1280
not so God could serve us, 1196, 1222, 1318–1319, 1442
through Christ alone, 964, 970, 1128–1129, 1227, 1450
doctrine of justification, 1178–1183, 1179–1183
through Old Testament sacrifices, 1176
Salvian the Presbyterian, 1083
Samuel, 1258, 1261
Samuelson, Paul, 1073
Sanborn, Franklin Benjamin, 261
sanctification, 295, 668, 1312
sanctity of life, 548–549, 1001–1002
abortion as murder, 9, 217, 546–551, 642
euthanasia (*see* euthanasia)
"mercy-killings," 1001
personhood of the fetus, 546–551, 1001–1002
Sand, George, 327

Sanders, Harland, 699
Sandlin, Andrew, 559–574, 1433
San Francisco, 144, 391, 460, 477, 832, 861
San Francisco Fox Theatre, 144
Sanhedrin, 9, 464, 1189
Sanine (Artzibashev), 435–436
San Jose Christian School, 815
Santa Ana Register, 755, 761
Santa Claus, 1432
Sarnoff, David, 237
Sartre, Jean-Paul
  autonomy, 1164
  "bastard intellectual," 443, 883
  definition of love, 883
  examination of criminals, 276
  existentialism, 120, 191, 319, 383, 834
  and freedom, 40, 58, 61
  hostility to marriage and women, 269
  humanism, 315
  influenced by Hegel, 391
  nihilism, 366
Satan
  and death, 34, 191
  demonic culture, 797
  failure of, 63
  false authority of, 34, 162, 312
    "as victorious," 824, 1129, 1196
    autonomy, 15, 37, 252, 621
    as the first academician, 410
    messenger of light, 116–118, 523–524, 591
    plan for salvation, 1108
    and "ultimate power," 1275
  God *vs*. Satan, 541
  humanist battle strategy, 590–591
  irreconcilable with God, 200
    battling against Satan, 1108
    denies God's sovereignty, 590–591, 1275
    evil (*see* evil)
    temptation of Christ, 1108, 1310
    temptation to doubt God, 718
    wages war against true Christians, 1253
  John Milton's, 1199
  and the lower-class mentality, 879
  studying depths of, 1349, 1372
  as totally spiritual, 1199
Satanic Mass, 179–180
Satanism. *see also* magic and the occult
  in art, 800
  Black Mass, 179–180
  and conspiracy theories, 312, 1372
  influence on Christianity, 391
  and instant gratification, 966
  modern revival of, 399–400, 415
Satyricon, 738
Saudi Arabia, 1063, 1303
Saul, John Ralston, 1032
Saunders, John, 561
Saurin, Jacques (James or Jacob), 91, 568, 1209, 1355
Savanarola, Girolamo, 91
save, translated, 1206
Savinkov, Boris, 435
Savio, Mario, 390
Savoy Declaration, 570
Scalia, Antonin, 1136
Schaar, John H., 1089
Schaeffer, Franky, 1288
Scherman, Katherine, 394
Schilder, K., 1378
Schiller, Friedrich, 219–220
schizophrenia, 554, 1014, 1236
Schlissel, Steve, 287, 937
Schmemann, Alexander, 572
Schneider, Ernst, 50
scholarship, Christian, 137–138, 1230
scholarship, humanistic, 748, 776. *see also* academia
Scholasticism, 153, 563, 1163
Schopenhauer, Arthur, 269
Schriver, Adam, 566–567
Schultze, Charles, 50
Schwartz, Andrea, 168
Schwartz, Ford, 805
science
  and the agricultural revolution, 853–855
  atomic energy, 237
  ecology (*see* ecology)
  educational discipline, 36
  natural disasters (*see* natural disasters)
  space exploration, 591
  technology (*see* technology)
science, Creationist
  abortion and science, 547–549, 551
  accidents and predestination, 275
  church rejection of creationism, 634, 1101
    importance of six-day, 1172–1173
    old earth creationism, 1101
  implications of, 379
  matter, 248
  "no scientist could believe the Bible," 1118, 1119
  only valid starting place for science, 538, 637, 1007, 1168–1169, 1216
  physical laws, 250, 330, 635
  and postmillennialism, 62–63
  rationalistic apologetics, 1432

and Reconstruction, 356
reforming sciences, 1217
as scientifically superior, 1168–1169
stewardship and conservation (*see* ecology, Christian stewardship)
theology (*see* theology, as queen of sciences)
view of man, 288
view of society, 41, 235
view of the economy, 694
science, humanistic and evolutionary
chaos as source of order
causation, 270, 275, 396, 1118
chance as ultimate, 447, 851, 979, 1007, 1118, 1163
criminal as pioneer, 44–45, 272, 276, 279–280, 282, 442
destroy to advance, 193
disorder as ultimate, 751, 1107
vs. "information" as anti-chance, 928
scientific planning, 402, 694
and Christianity
and antinomian dispensationalism, 14
borrows from Christianity, 1007
creation as evolution, 396–397, 1101
critique of the Bible, 151–152
eliminates the "God-concept," 471–472
vs. postmillennialism, 62–63
process theology (*see* process theology)
ecology (*see* ecology)
evolution
belief of classical paganism, 1172
Darwinism (*see* Darwin and Darwinism)
god as evolving, 126–128, 397, 1172
existentialism and reality, 493
and faith
blind faith in evolution, 517, 559
evolution as hope of man, 1168–1169
faith in miraculous origins, 275–276, 568, 577, 1107, 1163
faith in reason, 636, 917
infallibility of science, 42
and magic, 179, 471–472
a new authority, 33, 40, 191, 1203–1204
the new monk, 802
predestination, 275
presuppositionalism, 1007
time and process as god, 127
as gnostic, 396
and history, 459–460, 493–495
inevitable progress, 192–193, 211, 237, 306, 376, 920
society as evolving, 272, 749, 920
utopianism, 192, 237, 363, 408, 919–922
materialism, 984
and modernism, 137
Newtonian science, 270
pragmatism, 493, 568
problems in,
arrogance of, 636
destruction of science, 748, 1118–1119
experimentalism as source of truth, 120
lack of higher ethical standards, 127, 636
and meaninglessness, 447–449, 1197
meaninglessness and nihilism, 321, 447–449, 538–539, 1197
suspicion of, 1081
and society
destroys moral fabric of society, 1401–1402
conflict of interests as essential, 509, 821, 1027–1031
morality, 272, 926, 1171, 1203–1204
and racism, 1129
ruthless individualism, 694 (*see also* individualism)
and the Enlightenment, 258, 305
social planning (*see* social planning, scientific)
social sciences, 493–495
and statism, 408, 694
anti-freedom, 273, 1099–1100
and Hegelianism, 92, 979–980
humanistic power, 471–472, 983
and law, 667, 748
Marxism, 363 1027, 1080
Nazi Germany, 408
omniscience, 223
state as providential, 62–63, 694, 1062–1063
total control necessary, 1204
view of God (*see* God in humanistic view, and "science")
view of man
abortion and science, 547–549, 551
behaviorism, 1099, 1123–1124
creation of superman, 190, 237, 485
denial of sin, 471
depersonalization, 447, 782, 1123 (*see also* depersonalization)
expendable, 190, 310, 451–453

science, humanistic and evolutionary view of man *(cont'd.)*
experimental animal, 253, 310, 748, 811, 1123, 1203–1204
extinction of mankind, 218
frailty of reason, 447
and guilt, 336, 384, 1121
man creates meaning, 612 (*see also* meaning, man as source)
psychology (*see* psychiatry and psychology)
Science magazine, 754
Scofield and Scofieldism, 1175–1176
Scofield Reference Bible, 1175
Scotland, 293, 299, 367, 508, 913, 1170, 1303
Scott, Mel, 229
Scott, Otto J., 414, 502, 508, 647–648, 932, 988, 1022, 1288, 1303, 1350
Scott, Paul, 755–756, 761
Scott, Walter, 700
"Scottish-Irish-Presbyterian rebellion," 1243
Scripture. *see* Bible
secession, 265–266, 508–509
Second Adam. *see* New Adam, the
second century. *see* the History Index
Second Coming of Christ, 178, 791, 1177. *see also* eschatology
Second Treatise on Civil Government (Locke), 404, 682
secular, defined, 14–15, 1208–1210
"secular humanism," 1208–1210. *see also* humanism
security
for Christians
and the Lordship of Christ, 256, 268
personal security replacing service to Christ, 1115
in Providence of God, 238, 256, 806, 1196
in the community, 744, 1072
and dystopianism, 363
lost in humanism, 1072
and property, 1071, 1257
and self-interest, 331, 1143
and slavery, 697, 889, 1050, 1055, 1057–1058, 1406
trusting in the state, 25–26, 197, 222–224, 877–880
cradle-to-grave economic security, 877
and the Fall of Rome, 349, 351
security preferred to freedom (*see under* freedom in humanism)
Social Security (*see* Social Security)
statist abdication of duty, 1029–1030
and work, 248, 1071–1073, 1270, 1282
Sedgwick, Henry Dwight, 802
Seidenberg, Roderick, 774
Seiss, Joseph A., 880
selective depravity
and antinomianism, 414–415
class and social warfare, 122, 290, 293–294, 296, 333–334, 342, 368–369, 414–416, 632, 764, 777
and racism, 290–292, 293–294, 296, 303, 333–334, 632, 1004
and the student movement, 298
and conspiracies, 257–258, 264, 297, 892–894, 907, 1372
and environmentalism, 1442
and evolution, 298, 647–648
and guilt, 632
and impotency, 1143
and the medieval church, 764–769
presuppositions of, 306–307
and pride, 305, 307, 369, 413–415
and denial of sin, 365–366, 764–769, 803, 844
forgetting personal sin, 1372, 1442
living by disgust, 1327–1329
and Phariseeism, 290, 293–295, 297, 1347
and the state
and communism, 767–768
and Establishment faults, 303, 764–769
and the law, 291, 296–298
and Marxism, 291, 293–294, 296, 324, 408
and selective leadership, 305, 409, 413–415
and socialism, 767–768
and state as savior, 296, 476–478, 648
and state definition of morality, 291, 294, 296–298, 306–307
and war, 866
and 20th century mass murder, 293–295
good/bad guy syndrome, 1347–1348
and murder, 303, 480
self-centeredness
in the church, 1126–1127, 1146, 1150, 1197, 1206, 1301, 1308, 1446
of criminals, 807–808
decadence and self-indulgence, 1143, 1190, 1197, 1308, 1352–1353, 1378, 1442, 1446
as sin, 1301
self-defense, 234, 1001

self-esteem, 1248–1249
self-expression, 285, 286, 299–301, 838–839
self-government, 696, 902–903, 917, 1100
  absolute self-government, 318–319, 449 (*see also* autonomy)
  as basic, 902–903, 1055–1056, 1442
  and Christian Reconstruction (*see* Reconstruction, Christian, begins locally)
  man's failure in, 966
  of the masses, 881
  and progress, 881
  the Puritans, 791
  the responsibility of the Christian, 215 (*see also* responsibility of Christians, self-government)
self-interest, 330–332, 840–841, 960, 1301, 1352–1353
self-justification, 1328, 1352–1353
self-love, 1346
self-realization, 282, 286, 359, 523–524, 555, 607
self-righteousness, 38, 300, 782, 1250–1251
seminaries, 138, 262, 341, 390, 393, 394, 396, 410, 426, 740–741, 930, 955, 1132, 1172–1173
Senate, U.S., 531, 667, 808, 818
Seneca Indians, 886–887, 889
Sennholz, Hans, 772, 812–813, 815
sentimentalism
  and antinomianism, 124–125, 167, 659, 794, 960, 1008, 1313, 1323
  in the church (*see* church as corrupted, with sentimentalism)
  and escapism, 1174–1175
  vs. love, 1323–1324
  love of evil, 662
  vs. reality of Christ's words, 155
  sacrifice of justice, 1312–1313
separation of church and state. *see under* religion and state, church-state issues
Septuagint, 12
Serbians, 510
serfdom, 369, 401–402, 417, 889, 1022–1023, 1050, 1054, 1090, 1117. *see also* slavery
Sermon on the Mount, 742, 955, 1149, 1324
serpent, as translated, 116
Servetus, Michael, 113
Seton-Watson, Hugh, 647
settlers, 837, 886, 1053, 1258
seventeenth century. *see* the History Index
seventh century. *see* the History Index
sex education, 21, 285, 650, 760, 1165
sexism, 834
sexual abuse. *see under* abuse
Sexual Chaos (Vertefeuille), 1197
sexual crimes and perversions
  adultery (*see* adultery)
  bestiality, 272, 314, 488, 626
  exploitation
    depersonalization and animalization, 328, 1230
    exploitation, 1405
      incest, 40, 272, 282, 380, 875
      "intergenerational sex," 673, 901–902
      pornography, 228, 328, 415, 760–761, 768, 879, 1073
      prostitution, 270, 747, 808, 984, 1073
      rape, 210, 272, 334, 433, 647, 764, 801, 995, 1334
    incest (*see* incest)
  fornication, 314
  glorified and respected, 1073, 1131
    as natural, 1007
    and "primitive" culture, 858
    and "right to privacy," 283–284
    sympathy for the Establishment outlaw, 829
  homosexuality (*see* homosexuality)
  man-machine relationships, 981
  masturbation, 314, 420
  nudism, 262
  and the occult, 179
  orgies, 118, 436, 875
  preaching against, 156, 569
  promiscuity, 270
    discipline for, 1310
    and existentialism, 45, 363, 782, 879
    as freedom, 420, 782
    lack of self-denial, 887–888
    vs. love, 183, 391, 1007, 1326, 1405
    man-centered expression, 801
  sexual communes, 901
  sexual revolution, 303, 328, 477, 921, 1131
  statism and deviance, 363, 737, 762, 879, 1020
  on television, 1134
  total lack of standards, 1007, 1020, 1212, 1285
    and antinomianism, 15, 172, 801, 875
    death of God, 30
    and relativism, 172, 1020
  and war, 1032
sexuality
  castration, 801, 905, 944, 1186
  erroneous celibacy of Christians, 944–945

sexuality *(cont'd.)*
God's glorious purpose, 914
vs. love, 183, 391, 1007, 1326, 1405
nudity, 262
and the Puritans, 944–945
regulations and high culture, 858
sex in marriage (*see* marriage, and sex)
virginity and chastity (*see* virginity and chastity)
and youth (*see* abuse; sex education)
sexually transmitted diseases, 336, 799, 918, 1249, 1255
sexual revolution, 303, 328, 477, 921, 1131
Sforza, Ludovico, 399
Shahryar, 1372
Shakespeare, William, 127, 410, 457, 1163, 1275
shameless, usage, 1248
Shammon's theory of information, 928
Shanghai, 210, 705, 707
Sharon, Georgia, 993
Shaw, Charles Gray, 796
Shaw, George Bernard, 517
shehkets, Hebrew, 521
Shelley, Percy B., 243, 428, 430, 790, 792, 838
Shepard, Thomas R., Jr., 803
Sherman, William T., 480, 509
Shiloh, 7–10
Shiloh, defined, 7
Shintoism, 389
shoes, putting off, 629
Siberia, 230, 452, 483
Sider, Ronald J., 342–343
Siegel, Jules, 1023
Silberfarb, Edward, 747
"silent majority," 266–267, 844–848
Sileven, Everett, 602–603, 642, 976, 1287
Simenon, Georges, 188
simple living, 338–340
simplicity, fallacy of, 1098–1102
sin. *see also* original sin and depravity
Christian solutions to,
blessed trials make sin unsatisfactory, 1293–1294
Christian power, 1369
confession of, 93–96, 833, 844, 1442
correct response to sin, 1366–1369
freedom from sin, 20, 492, 631, 970, 1042, 1055–1056, 1066, 1222, 1224, 1389, 1424
grace as the only answer, 768, 1124, 1369
postmillennial victory, 293
repentance (*see* repentance)
sins of the godly, 1246
in the culture (*see also* antinomianism, results in the culture)
church failure to deal with sin, 156, 157–158, 1026
confrontation of sin and conversion, 1222
environmentalism (*see* environmentalism)
existentialism, 415
instant gratification *vs.* work, 358–359, 429, 840, 861 (*see also* instant gratification *vs.* growth)
and "progress," 1190
promoted by the media (*see* media, promoting sin and humanism)
results in war, 1027–1031
and rise of Hitler, 213–214
society's greatest problem, 341–343, 768, 1389
statist promotion of sin, 668–669, 1001–1002
denial of, 213, 215, 219–220, 268, 362, 364, 365–366, 430
and democracy, 1040 (*see also* democracy, the people as inherently virtuous)
depersonalization of sin, 166
and environmentalism, 813–815
and false hope, 465, 742, 1129
and finances, 728
and hope, 465, 742, 1129
and impotence, 1128
and meaninglessness, 469–470
no longer recognized by the church, 1026, 1128
personal sin forgotten, 1372, 1442
and rationalism, 1165
by "science," 471 (*see also* science, humanistic and evolutionary, view of man)
selective depravity, 365–366, 764–769, 803, 844
and the Lordship of Christ
abominations, 521–522, 1248–1249
antinomianism as sin, 15, 177, 621, 1052, 1187, 1246–1247
defining sin, 306
dividing over sin, 202
iniquity, 1246
judgment of sin, 157–158, 523, 681, 714, 1063, 1195, 1436
wages of sin is death, 523, 681, 714, 1063, 1195, 1436 (*see*

also under judgment of God)
original sin (*see* original sin and depravity)
sin as always ultimately against God, 307, 324
sin as freedom from God, 1222
man's basic problem
from the beginning (*see* original sin and depravity)
common need for atonement, 288, 295, 379, 409, 480, 1058–1059, 1124, 1165, 1189–1190, 1449–1450
as delusionary, 1247
due to environment, 812–813
false freedom in sin, 1293
false religion as heart of all sin, 461–462
fear as a grievous sin, 1144, 1275, 1287
ignoring God's law-word, 1198
overcome through Christ, 1389
results in conflict, 1031
as self-centeredness, 1301
seriousness of, 1195–1196, 1246–1247
universal slavery to, 631, 768, 1050, 1052–1053, 1065, 1383
prevention and statism, 628–629, 1016–1017, 1042–1043
freedom to sin, 1042–1043, 1184, 1199
without a solution to sin, 1016–1018, 1023–1024, 1044, 1058–1059, 1124, 1129, 1389
pride of man
blessing expected despite sin, 167, 1255–1256, 1271
contributing to salvation, 1247
credit with God, 1244
as "deserving" of grace, 1316
evil ambition, 16–17, 161, 824, 1030, 1093, 1264
impatience, 1295–1296, 1199–1200
"right" to privacy in sin, 283–284
redefined by humanism
defined socially, 306, 363, 1044–1045
depersonalization of sin, 166
as dualism, 741
by the Enlightenment, 305, 307, 433
by feminism, 333–334
as ignorance, 327, 621
intentions, 620
as lack of consent, 405
as luxury, 338–340
minimized in modernity, 98, 154, 155–156
pain replacing sin as greatest evil, 1206
by pietism, 1209
as poverty, 342
as primarily against man, 306, 323–325, 334
by psychology, 344
in relation to self, 491–492
resistance to elitist rule, 648, 985, 1017, 1042, 1045, 1048, 1066
selective obedience, 294–295, 301, 304
in terms of pietism, 1209
transgression as "human," 288
as a virtue, 1248
sin, defined, 1209, 1246
Sinai, 133–134
Sinclair, Upton, 261
Singapore, 277
Singer, Gregg, 572
singing, 1392–1393, 1425
Sirach, Ben, 1274
Sistine Chapel, 801
Sixteenth Amendment, 596. *see under* Constitution of the United States
sixteenth century. *see* the History Index
sixth century. *see* the History Index
Skinner, B. F., 402, 442, 818, 980, 1080, 1099, 1102
slavery
abolition of, 1022–1023
of children, 1338
and debt, 683–684, 709, 1273, 1274
emancipation by the state, 401–402, 1060
and environmentalism, 215
vs. free labor, 1022
history and examples of, 490–491
and the Civil War, 505–506
contentment of slaves, 1057–1058
in modern Africa, 490–491
in the South, 265, 1022, 1057
and kidnapping, 889
prostitution (*see* prostitution)
seduction and exploitation, 764
serfdom in Rome, 369, 889, 1054, 1117
and sin
result of antinomianism, 50, 1260–1261
result of freedom from God, 59, 1261
result of inner slavery, 1050–1051, 1057–1058, 1261
salvation by slavery, 889

slavery
and sin *(cont'd.)*
and security, 697, 889, 1057–1058 (*see also* freedom, security preferred to freedom)
slavery as freedom, 223, 443, 603, 703, 1054–1056, 1090
slavery as judgment, 1260–1261
slavery to sin, 631, 768, 1050, 1052–1053, 1065, 1383
slave labor camps, 9, 184, 248–249, 452, 1002, 1007, 1020, 1037, 1066
and U.S. foreign relations, 1370
war captives, 889
work as "slavery," 1284
slavery, defined, 1060
slavery of the masses
and accreditation, 930–931
and education, 532, 927, 930–931
religious and moral decay, 161, 529
result of autonomy, 625, 1114
result of sin, 768
to the state
brainwashing to make voluntary, 643, 1022
in classical philosophy, 1049–1050
control of work, 369–370, 696, 1016, 1036–1037, 1060–1061, 1090–1091
and fear of freedom, 1049–1050
and man's autonomy, 625, 1114
and man's "solutions," 631, 1022–1024
pragmatism, 452
and security, 889, 1050, 1055, 1406
socialism, 603, 889, 1023
and state education, 532, 927, 930–931
and taxes, 401, 486, 761, 973, 1060–1061, 1071
voluntary, 1057–1058
and warfare mentality, 1029–1030
sleepless nights, 1251
Smith, Adam, 16, 237, 331
Smith, Gerrit, 261
Smith, Henry, 945
Smith, J. V. C., 204
Smith, Nora, 477
Smith, Ronald Gregor, 449, 1295
Smith, William, 1443
Smoot, Dan, 891
Smyrna, 500, 804
Snapp, Byron, 1345
social collapse
and anarchy, 20–22, 40, 45, 184, 188, 302, 313–317, 364–365, 714, 851, 1120, 1363
and antinomianism, 38, 161, 162, 259, 313–317, 454–456, 498, 525–530, 623, 748, 750–751, 954, 1355
and autonomy, 313–317, 318–322, 331, 434, 618, 1010
and rejection of Christ's atonement, 289, 334
social contract theory, 614, 617, 682, 1121
social gospel, 62–63, 136, 325, 652, 951, 1038, 1129
social graces, 320
socialism
in America, 1262
and Christianity
"Christian" socialism, 251, 467, 611, 1007, 1325
"ethical" socialism, 814–815
grows with Christian decline, 1260–1261
prayers of, 1309
redefining good and evil, 631
socialism in the church, 149, 611, 694–695
class warfare in, 423
in conservativism, 26
criticism of, 482
and the economy, 682, 1067–1069
beginning of socialism, 229, 331, 691–692, 694
centralization of wealth, 732, 1019–1020
confiscation, 233–234, 656–657, 701–703
control of money (*see* money, statist control of)
decapitalization, 687, 691, 701, 715, 1030, 1264
denial of economic laws, 228, 251, 701, 703, 707, 861, 1069, 1195
and envy, 656–657, 715
food shortages, 225–228, 234, 1068–1069
parasitic, 231, 234, 701–703, 706–707, 871, 1264–1265
poverty, 21, 117, 234, 248, 687, 703
social cannibalism, 1264
and evolution, 1027–1029
failure of
coercion replaces moral order, 32, 184, 268, 525–526, 694, 761, 1020, 1102
fallacy of simplicity, 1098–1102

and intellectuals, 1036–1037
results in meaningless life, 756
and fascism, 596, 603, 1039
form of moralism, 324, 364–365
imperialism and aggression, 231, 871, 1264
and myth of consent, 408–409
philosophy of (*see also* Marxism)
concept of freedom, 40, 1007
Eastern origins, 534–536
"equality," 21
infallibility, 43
and Rousseau, 339
and selective depravity, 767–768
and utopianism, 363, 1007, 1075–1076
on the working man, 1285
and plagues, 756–757
resisting, 244
and science, 324, 364–365 (*see also* science, humanistic and evolutionary)
slavery of the masses, 603, 889, 1023
success of, 436
contentment of citizens, 1057–1058
exploiting revolution, 354, 761–762
preceded by religious decay, 1262, 1324, 1325
provides "solutions," 1129–1130
total control, 229–230, 244
socialization
and education, 914, 1019
through coercion (*see* statism, socialization through coercion)
through education (*see* education in humanism, and social order)
social justice, 603, 617–619, 647–649, 667–668, 731–733, 1057, 1093–1097
social planning. *see also* elitism
and the Enlightenment, 258, 305 (*see also* Enlightenment, doctrine of government)
Franklin D. Roosevelt's speech, 159–160
idealistic politics, 960–961
existentialist, 423
failure of, 235, 245, 253, 748, 756
failure of the people, 869–870
Marxist, 40, 230, 423
the master plan, 229–232
order and peace, 749
Soviet Union, 230, 364
and welfare, 57
work replaced with social planning, 228, 1036–1037, 1053, 1073–1074
and world salvation, 344–345, 985
and money, 229–232, 346, 718–719
scientific (*see also* science, humanistic and evolutionary)
and behaviorism, 384, 402, 1099
death of the free market, 694–695
determinism, 978
and economic "science," 679, 1062–1063
elitism, 818
and environmentalism, 1099
genetic engineering, 695, 811
"great instrument of reason," 417
necessary to social order, 40
programming men, 442, 980–981
scientific socialism, 1037, 1080
security preferred to freedom, 273, 1099–1100
social Darwinism, 237–238, 694, 1027–1030, 1264
and sin
abortion, 548–550
and abortion (*see* abortion, and the state)
and antinomianism (*see* antinomianism, results in the culture, statism)
euthanasia (*see* euthanasia)
homosexuality, 48, 433 (*see also* homosexuality)
and sovereignty
general will embodied by elite, 405–406, 407, 443–444, 1164
and intellectualism (*see* intellectualism, and elitist rule)
justice, 159, 485–487
and omniscience, 223
people's trust in, 227, 748
philosopher-kings, 39, 1211 (*see also under* elitism)
planners beyond the law, 252
planning replacing law, 458, 612, 647–648
predestination by the state, 423, 548, 980, 985
and rationalism, 416–417
welfare (*see* welfare, statist)
"social relevance," 120–121
Social Security, 296, 818, 1285
social security numbers, 818–819
society
based on a higher law, 38, 56, 250, 496–498, 1066
community (*see* community)
as expression of people's character, 161, 316, 591–592

society *(cont'd.)*
and morality (*see* morality and society)
permanence and change, 372–374, 851
and women's roles, 416–418, 419–420
society, etymology, 865
Society and History (Thrupp), 749
society when Christian
changed by Christ's Lordship, 1151
"Christendom" (*see* "Christendom")
"City of God," 744, 746–748
and creationism, 41, 235
decentralization, 915, 1019, 1045, 1099–1102
and doctrine of salvation, 1128–1129 (*see also* atonement by Christ, and society)
dominion (*see* dominion, and society)
results of pessimistic eschatology, 949
social stability
competition and cooperation, 696
good character, 161, 316, 591–592
harmony of interests (*see* harmony of interests)
peace (*see* peace, in society)
and war, 1025–1026
society when humanistic, 187
city life, 744, 749, 800–801 (*see also* cities)
culture (*see* antinomianism, results in the culture)
decadence (*see* decadence and self-indulgence)
and education (*see* education in humanism, and social order)
and evolution, 272, 749, 920 (*see also* science, humanistic and evolutionary, and society)
loneliness and isolationism, 800–801, 803–804 (*see also* individualism)
meaninglessness (*see* meaninglessness and nihilism, and society)
order and peace, 348–352
based on cosmological order, 749
consent, 39–41, 404–406, 407–409
and crime (*see* crime, and society)
"Great Community/Society," 205, 241, 243, 259, 362, 747, 1019, 1094
impossible with worldview war, 259, 1030–1031, 1034–1035
socialization through coercion (*see under* statism)
and social planning, 749 (*see also* social planning)
and statism (*see* statism, destruction of society)
toleration of religion (*see under* religion and state)
and redefinition of the family, 737–739, 901–903
social instability (*see also* social collapse)
the authority crisis, 184, 206, 266–267, 328–329, 437–438, 538–540, 927, 969
barbarism and rootlessness (*see* barbarism and rootlessness)
class and social warfare (*see* class and social warfare)
coercion cannot replace faith, 1121
crisis and changing standards, 100, 161, 184, 188, 747, 750, 1032
decapitalization by theft, 864
dissolution into survival, 315–316
elitist war on culture, 441–445, 443, 779, 780
envy as central, 668 (*see also* envy)
flight from responsibility, 420 (*see also* responsibility in humanism, evading responsibility)
hopelessness and disillusionment, 436, 448, 512–516
moral anarchy, 184, 420, 539, 747, 893 (*see also* social collapse, and anarchy)
radical division between peoples, 648–649
revolution and anarchy, 184 (*see also* anarchy and anarchism; revolution)
sin as society's greatest problem, 341–343, 768, 1389
social collapse and suicide, 313–317, 435–439, 448 (*see also* social collapse)
and statist economics (*see* economics, statist involvement)
sociology, 112, 190, 238, 291, 311, 451, 458, 1146
Sodom, 763, 801, 1081, 1330
Sokolow, Anna, 788
solipsism, 432
Solomon, Carl, 477
Solomon, Robert C., 737
Solzhenitsyn, Alexander, 10, 452, 482–483, 1075
Son of God. *see* Jesus Christ
Sophocles, 783, 932
soteriology. *see* salvation
South Africa, 831, 965, 1255. *see also* Africa

South America, 257, 687, 715, 858, 1069, 1270
South Carolina, 265–266, 506, 1022
Southern states, 265–266, 506, 1022, 1057, 1079, 1258
South Sea islands, 350
sovereignty
and Alexander Hamilton, 49
and constitutionalism, 50, 194
and the U.S. Constitution, 47–48, 49, 55, 325, 599
sovereign(ty), meaning, 49, 55
sovereignty of God
and covenantalism, 623–625, 905–906
exclusive to God, 202, 203, 325, 984, 1168
as Creator, 3, 373, 457, 634, 1107, 1171, 1216–1217
God as truth, 11
His fiat Word, 1100–1101
infallibility, 11–13, 43
omnipotence, 223, 486, 1050, 1100–1102, 1331
omniscience, 223, 486, 791, 1100–1102
ownership over all things, 54
unchangeable, 197, 372–374
fundamental to Christianity, 135–136, 970, 1050
as *God,* 3
hatred of, 1036–1038
denied by Satan and followers, 590–591, 1275
emotionalism in the church, 426
rejected by the West, 47, 391, 1009–1012
and His total Lordship, 741, 953, 970, 1171 (*see also* Lordship of Christ)
absolute authority (*see* authority, Biblical, God's authority as absolute)
and His Law, 1168–1169 (*see also* Law of God)
vs. Neoplatonism, 943–944
over evil (*see* evil, and God's sovereignty)
over history, 494–495, 939
over the future, 1286, 1414 (*see also* postmillennialism, and the sovereignty of God)
vs. statism, 9, 394–395 (*see also* statism, claim to sovereignty)
and tithing, 1268
and meaning, 135–136, 322, 457–458, 978
in predestination (*see* predestination, by God)
providence (*see* providence of God)
and Reconstruction (*see* Reconstruction, Christian)
in salvation (*see* salvation, and God's sovereignty)
and security, 1196
and society
economics, 50, 251, 330, 1070
freedom (*see* freedom in Christianity, in God's sovereignty)
and the harmony of interests, 620–621, 866–867
justice, 131, 648, 652, 920–921, 1006–1008, 1011 (*see also* justice, in Christianity)
and law, 130, 131, 423, 592, 621, 629, 636, 647, 1009, 1021 (*see also* law, Christian view)
and political theory, 194
and theonomy, 3–4
sovereignty of man. *see also* man in humanistic view; original sin and depravity
atomistic man, 188
basic to humanism, 135–136, 1114
"being human" as governing principle, 747–748
and consent, 39
creating himself, 799–801
defining good and evil, 172–173, 467
man as ultimate, 1074
as savior, 1226 (*see also* false gospels)
as source of meaning, 135, 457–458, 612, 800–801, 979–981
and class and social warfare, 41, 423, 458
and conspiracy theories, 1195–1196
and culture of death, 1001–1002
futility of, 383
in morality (*see* morality in humanism)
in predestination (*see* predestination, by man)
and statism (*see also* statism)
and elitist rule, 1037, 1447
and humanistic law (*see* law, humanistic, autonomy)
incarnation of the general will (*see* democracy, state incarnation of general will)
and loss of freedom, 1001–1002
and loss of justice, 409, 748, 1001–1002, 1074
as superman, 1064
Soviet Russia, 226, 437. *see also* Soviet Union
distrust of own military, 1121

Soviet Russia *(cont'd.)*
efforts to unite people, 738
humanist social order, 668
lust for power, 365
persecution in, 1132
Red Army, 1121
slave labor camps, 1066
utilized authoritarian culture, 21
utilized lawlessness, 354
and utopianism, 361
Soviet Union, 389, 405, 438, 603
Bolsheviks (*see* Russian Revolution)
and Christianity, 387, 436, 925
citizens of, 1057
class warfare in, 732, 864, 1264
constitution of, 583
the economy, 1285
failures of, 1075–1076
anarchy in, 680
collapse of, 1195
contempt of work, 1281–1282
economic failure, 1068–1069, 1195
famine in, 226, 1068–1069, 1101
fear of, 1195
Gorbachev, Mikhail (*see* Gorbachev, Mikhail)
interventionism, 191, 346
leader in humanism, 583
Lenin, Vladimir (*see* Lenin, Vladimir)
nihilism in, 45
part of the United Nations, 209
public schools in, 1072
Stalin, Joseph (*see* Stalin, Joseph)
as totalitarian state, 596
centralization in, 1079, 1090
false republic, 603
persecutions in, 483
and power, 17, 365
private charity as serious offense, 1090
as slave state, 603, 1037
social planning, 230, 364
and total terror, 1040
utilized authoritarian culture, 21
utilized lawlessness, 354
will to be god, 328
and utopianism, 361, 1075–1076
space exploration, 591
Spain and Spanish, 104, 789, 820, 870–871, 1047, 1303
Spanish-American War, 309
Spanish Inquisition, 1047
Sparta, 905
Spectator (English magazine), 739
Spencer, Stanley, 800
Spengler, Oswald, 442, 814
spirituality, 586, 952, 1198–1199, 1200, 1209, 1291. *see also* pietism
Spock, Dr. Benjamin, 526
spontaneity, 838–839
sports, 805–806, 965
Stafford, Jean, 208
Stafford, Peter, 767
Stalin, Joseph
break with Hitler, 500
critics of, 1332
and false freedom, 1008, 1055
as false hero, 442, 467
guilt of, 338
humanistic order of, 1075
influence on Marxism, 121–122
moral bankruptcy of, 525
"new barbarian," 883
totalitarianism of, 1040
tyranny of, 408
Stampfer, Judah, 617, 619
Stanford, Peter, 1242
Stang, Alan, 1023
stars (celebrities), 145
state
citizenry (*see* citizenry)
civil government (*see* civil government)
elections and voting (*see* voting and elections)
politics (*see* politics)
as a religious fact, 598–599
statism (*see* statism)
state taxes. *see under* taxation
statism. *see also* elitism; social planning
and Christian duty (*see also* politics, and Christian duty)
to an apostate state, 1011, 1048, 1358
bringing state under authority of God's Law, 589, 1010–1011, 1014–1015, 1023–1024, 1207
extricating ourselves from Satan's kingdom, 592
failure by peaceful assent, 1014–1015, 1028, 1137, 1207
"For God and country," 1359–1360
forsaking statist idolatry, 1023–1024, 1048, 1137
necessity of the tithe, 1124–1125, 1266
principled rejection of tyranny, 222–223, 497, 642–643, 1011, 1014–1015, 1047, 1060–1061, 1137
putting Christians in office, 1127
to recapitalize ourselves, 1081

Reconstruction, 317, 1124–1125, 1257, 1265
restoring liberty with God's Law, 57, 220, 591–592, 639–640
and Christian failure
Christians embracing revolution, 1137
Christians embracing socialism, 149, 611, 694–695
church corrupted with statism (*see* church as corrupted, with statism)
disestablishing Christianity, 1072–1073, 1096–1097, 1150
hope in statist salvation, 105, 390–392
result of antinomianism, 328, 413–415, 529, 591, 624, 631, 643, 648, 993–994, 1037–1038, 1045, 1066, 1113–1114
claim to sovereignty
and architecture, 142–143, 144, 752, 792
"blasphemy" in statism, 513, 1045
concept of treason, 43
control over religion, 598
in the courts, 604, 1047
god walking on earth, 55, 207, 359, 391, 1136
grace of state, 17
human sacrifice, 905, 1264 (*see also* twentieth century mass murders)
incarnation, 131, 644, 648, 1448
infallibility of the state, 42–43, 55, 363, 451, 608, 641, 1045, 1088, 1367
ownership of man, 1168 (*see also* man in humanistic view, in statist view)
punishing rival religions, 464, 1045 (*see also* religion and state)
vs. sovereignty of Christ, 9, 394–395
state as naturally the highest good, 207–208, 219, 370, 636, 641, 645, 973, 1016–1017
unhindered power, 250–251, 378–379, 434, 497, 531, 621, 639, 641, 1010, 1028, 1089–1091
coercion and cultivating fear
brute force, 1122
Christian independence from, 1102
conspiracy theories, 1195
Dracula's example, 400
false dominion, 1114
fear of state reprisals, 1287
hatred of all things it cannot control, 483–484, 1023
and the Inquisition, 1047–1048
salvation by destruction, 1119
self-incrimination, 658–659
and self-security, 1143
worship of evil, 1276
destruction of society
twenty-first century collapse, 589 (*see also* social collapse)
abandonment of justice, 1010, 1032
abdication of true authority, 645, 765, 827, 991, 995–996, 997, 1001–1002, 1010, 1029–1030
abuse of citizenry (*see* citizenry, abuse of)
and anarchy (*see* anarchy, and statism)
barbarism, 1091 (*see also* barbarism and rootlessness)
and death, 999–1000
drugs and statism, 219, 918, 1042–1043
and environmentalist doctrine, 355
monopoly of power, 991, 1001–1002
policies harming children, 1338
present-orientation, 877, 1032
prison system (*see* prisons)
promotion of sin, 48–49, 273, 283–284, 286, 433, 668–669, 1001–1002 (*see also* abortion, and the state)
state as larger criminal syndicate, 605, 970
undercutting all authority, 438, 750 (*see also* authority, the authority crisis)
destruction of the economy, 698, 705–706, 765–768, 1067–1069, 1084–1085 (*see also* economics, statist involvement)
agriculture, 219, 225–228, 230, 233–234, 244, 330, 855, 1068–1069, 1101–1102
and business, 122, 604, 995, 997, 1090
decapitalization, 1081
and money, 346, 718–719
theft or control of private property, 711, 995, 1060–1061
through general greed, 408, 467, 995, 1070–1074
through taxation (*see* taxation, destruction of society)
undercutting work discipline, 1084, 1282, 1285
welfare (*see* welfare, statist, failure of)
and education (*see* education in humanism)

statism *(cont'd.)*
and exploitation
exploitation of death, 999–1000, 1001–1002
exploitation of emergency, 1023, 1032–1033, 1067
exploitation of religion (*see under* religion and state)
exploitation of war, 1028, 1032–1033
failures of, 738, 991, 996, 1010, 1029–1030, 1080, 1082–1086, 1094, 1119
disillusionment of people and revolt, 26, 28–29, 436–439, 512–516, 526, 556
to provide salvation, 230–231, 317, 991, 1016, 1082–1086, 1119, 1389
statist moralism, 324
history and examples (*see also* specific subjects)
in Africa, 326, 341, 405, 814, 977, 1069, 1230, 1270, 1338
in classical humanism (*see* classical philosophy and culture, and statism)
communism (*see* communism)
in Greece (*see* Greece, and statism)
hope of ancient history, 1082–1083, 1388 (*see also* paganism, and statism)
hostility to history, 493
"King's Touch," 25
Marxism (*see* Marxism)
medieval political theology, 90 (*see also* medieval era, political ideas)
modern hope, 62–63, 91, 1010, 1017–1018, 1044–1045, 1055–1056, 1082–1086, 1129–1130, 1309
socialism (*see* socialism)
Towers of Babel, 50, 592, 915, 1063, 1440
Western rejection of God's sovereignty, 47, 391, 1009–1012
and intellectualism, 267–268, 351, 1036–1037, 1132, 1404 (*see also* elitism, philosopher-kings)
and natural law, 42, 635–637, 710
people's faith in, 25–26, 28–29, 219, 877–880, 1201
disillusionment and revolt, 26, 28–29, 436–439, 512–516, 526, 556
people desiring good relationship with, 17
resulting in their conquest, 219
for security, 25–26, 197, 222–224, 877–880
state-worship, 598, 643, 904, 1055, 1123, 1136
and subsidized media, 1201
salvation by the state, 344 (*see also* politics, salvation in)
actualization of freedom, 391, 1055–1056
in ancient paganism, 588–589, 979, 1049–1050, 1388–1389, 1415
and atheism, 641–642
civil religion, 88
communism, 342–343
embraced by churchmen, 105, 390–392
and environmentalism, 187–188, 245
false statistics, 230–231
hope in elections, 159, 355–356
and infallibility, 43
and Marxism, 187–188
meeting needs, 213–215, 645–646, 1264 (*see also* welfare, statist)
messianic education (*see under* education in humanism)
overcoming death, 25
preventing sin (*see* sin, prevention and statism)
prisons as reformatories, 84, 1013–1014
and property taxes, 1258–1259
rejection of God's Laws, 250
remaking man, 409, 417–418, 486, 528
and selective depravity, 296, 476–478, 648
sin defined socially, 306, 363, 1044–1045
social gospel, 62–63, 325 (*see also* social planning)
through legislation, 334, 1016–1018, 1129
utopian humanism (*see* utopian humanism, and statism)
without solution to sin, 1016–1018, 1023–1024, 1044, 1058–1059, 1124, 1129, 1389
and science (*see* science, humanistic and evolutionary)
socialization through coercion, 184, 438, 525, 750, 865, 1118, 1121 (*see also* violence and coercion)
centralization, 590, 1020, 1083
and education (*see* education in

humanism, state ownership of children)
equality, fraternity, and brotherhood, 591–592, 603, 747
"Great Community/Society," 205, 241, 243, 259, 362, 747, 1019, 1094
identity of interests, 865
international relationships (*see* international relationships)
racial integration, 202
replacement for religion, 384–385, 738–739, 1044–1045, 1087
through terror, 976
tolerance over true love, 1322–1324
and unity, 187, 202, 376, 935, 1019, 1102, 1129
social planning (*see* social planning)
total dictatorship necessary
antinomianism, 591, 628, 642, 974
attack on the church, 586, 639, 878
brainwashing of the people, 596
and the courts, 661
and economics, 703, 707, 1062–1063, 1099–1102
false elimination of sin, 903
false salvation, 1050–1051, 1388
forcible integration, 865
humanistic dream of justice, 485–487
master plan, 230
in modern day, 983
new society, 442
and security, 1090–1091
taxation, 731, 1020
through law, 1016–1018
warfare, 1028
Stauffer, Ethelbert, 1389, 1415
St. Denis, Ruth, 795
STDs. *see* sexually transmitted diseases
Stearns, George Luther, 261
Steffens, Lincoln, 803
Stent, Gunther, 888, 939
Stephen, 109, 1443
Stephens, Alexander H., 509
sterilization, 243
Stevens, "Josh," 663–664
Stevens, L. Clark, 883
Stevens, Wallace, 46
Stevenson, Adlai, 237
Stevenson, W. Taylor, 461
stewardship
church as Christ's steward, 131
covenant wealth defined, 723
of creation (*see* ecology, Christian stewardship)
dominion and finances, 723, 1124–1125, 1265, 1446
giving (*see* giving and charity)
and modern economics, 684
Parable of the dishonest steward, 720
and "the good life," 721
of wealth, 1110–1112, 1265–1266 (*see also* finances)
work and capitalization, 679, 687, 691, 846, 861, 918, 1004, 1005, 1053
Stilicho, 514–515
Stirner, Max, 40, 58, 300, 423–424, 1011
Stoddard, Henry Luther, 1174
Stoicism, 806, 1211–1213
Stonehouse, Ned, 569
Storrs, Emory, 543
Story, Joseph, 970
Strachan, William R., 479–480
strangers (foreigners). *see* immigration
Stravinsky, Igor, 441, 795
stress, 1290–1292, 1293
stress, meaning and usage, 1290, 1291
Strong, Edwin A., 559–560
Stuart rulers, 711
student movement. *see under* youth
style. *see* fashion
sublapsarianism, 81
submission, doctrine of, 1361–1365, 1366–1369, 1396
subsidies
for abortion, 548–549
for the economy, 16–17, 331, 701
for education, 16–17, 240–241, 267, 328, 513, 610–611
for humanism, 1201
for intellectuals, 1036–1037, 1132, 1404
for media, 234, 1201
and pollution, 772
and power blocs, 16
for revolutionaries, 22, 209, 354, 761–762, 763
and state control, 610–611
subsidizing evil, 22, 209, 228, 354, 677–679, 701, 762–763, 1262
tax exemption as a subsidy, 602
substance, etymology, 274–275
success
in Christianity, 350
and envy, 1073–1074
as evil, 248, 1073–1074
as more important than truth, 204–206
resented by failed men, 843
Sudan, 313
suffering. *see also* masochism
vs. fighting evil as "holiness," 1212

suffering *(cont'd.)*
and God's sovereignty (*see* trials and God's blessing)
of Paul, 1291
wrongfully, 1167
sufficiency of Scripture. *see under* Bible
Suffolk Bar Association, 667
Suggs, Robert C., 875
suicide
cultural suicide, 188–189, 217–218, 313–317, 337, 338, 435–439, 448, 452 (*see also* social collapse)
and evasion of responsibility, 189, 191, 211
and false religion, 340
and drug and alcohol abuse, 250, 550
end of humanism, 217–218, 382, 385–386, 448, 527, 803, 1205
escape from stress, 1290
and existentialism, 978
and fear, 1236
and instant gratification, 359, 888
and love of death, 180, 550
mass suicide among youth, 385–386
meaningless and nihilism, 435, 978, 1071
result of antinomianism, 382, 385–386, 435, 527
and self-pity, 888
and social despair, 180, 303
of young children, 978
suicidism, 448, 836. *see also* death, culture of
Sumer and Sumerians, 774, 875–876, 1049
summum bonum, Latin, 578
Sunday schools, 595
supralapsarianism, 81
Supreme Court of the United States
abortion rulings, 1072, 1136 (*see also* abortion, and the state)
as anti-Christian
arm of humanist religion, 463–464, 583–584
dismantling of Biblical nature of law, 488, 632, 1073
outlaw of Christian influence, 752
autonomy, 434
and the Constitution, 241, 266, 283, 284, 348, 464
environmentalism, 209
family legislation, 243
lack of justice, 668, 1009
law and morality, 252
protection of criminals, 535
protection of the state, 1048
replacing legislature, 27
restriction of freedom, 926–927
and sovereignty, 48, 242
Sutton, Antony C., 976
Sweden and Swedish
attack on Christianity, 583, 605
humanistic education in, 976
socialist "freedom" in, 1054
social order of, 668
state church in, 753
totalitarianism in, 503, 596, 604, 986, 1040
utopian dream in, 364
Sweeney, James Johnson, 915
"sweetheart suits," 604
Swift, Jonathan, 836
Switzerland, 115, 1431
synagogues, 603
syncretism, 200–203, 593, 815, 821, 1118, 1145–1146
syncretism, defined, 200
synods. *see* specific Councils
Syria and Syrians, 5, 1035
systematic theology, 121, 163, 170, 540, 571, 574, 657, 1146, 1216–1218, 1433

T

taab, Hebrew, 521
Tacitus, 339
Taft, Charles P., 237
Taggart, Patrick, 391
Talmud, 390
Tammany Hall, 747
Taoism, 372, 389
Tarr, Joel A., 770
Tarsus, 602
Tarzan stories, 431. *see also* noble savage myth
Tatar, 493
Tawney, R.H., 689
taxation
audits and self-incrimination, 660
and Christian duty, 592, 732, 1266, 1363
Biblical taxation, 1257–1262
and the Lordship of Christ, 670–672, 1107
tithing as God's tax (*see* tithing)
churches and taxes
anti-abortion activism and taxes, 597, 1140
exemption, 596, 602, 1112
profit *vs.* non-profit organizations, 685

reclassification of the church, 596–597
in Rome, 53, 610
tax on individual church members, 86–87
destruction of society, 991
capitalization destroyed, 22, 677, 688, 715, 731, 916, 993, 997, 1071, 1084
and debt, 677–681
depersonalization of man, 249
and inflation, 31, 702
as judgment of God, 710
limiting private spending, 707
and national debt, 679–680, 713, 727–728
and poverty, 688, 997–998
robbing meaning of work, 1071
robbing widows and orphans, 993, 997–998, 999–1000
theft through taxation, 1071
as tyranny, 1258
and education, 267, 464
and environmentalism, 355
in history *vs.* modernity, 765–766, 1259
inability to collect taxes, 1067, 1068
Internal Revenue Service (*see* Internal Revenue Service)
slavery to the state, 401, 486, 761, 973, 1060–1061, 1071
age of confiscation, 219–221, 226, 233–234, 238, 688, 702, 731, 973, 993, 997, 1019–1020, 1028, 1039, 1060–1061, 1082, 1100, 1258 (*see also* socialism, and the economy)
and atheism, 1258–1259
citizen opposition to, 670–672
and fascism, 1039 (*see also* fascism)
and illegitimate authority, 670–672
opposition while demanding socialist benefits, 26, 267, 611, 879, 1266
taxation as punishment, 355
and social financing, 1257
paying taxes as a humane duty, 731
and racial reparation, 759–761
redistribution of the wealth, 702, 732, 1020, 1071, 1072, 1073, 1084, 1285
and social justice, 731–732
state-directed revolution, 731, 1020, 1039–1040, 1071
subsidies (*see* subsidies)
subsidizing folly and evil, 677–679, 701, 763
subsidizing revolution, 22, 209, 354, 761–762, 763
taxation as salvation, 340
tax exemption as a "subsidy," 602
tax-revolt, 254, 670, 672, 1039, 1140, 1363
types of taxes
atonement or covering tax, 108
federal taxes, 999
income tax, 355, 596, 688, 731, 1020, 1060, 1071
inheritance and death taxes, 688, 731, 898, 916, 993, 997–998, 999–1000, 1020
property taxes, 683, 731, 897, 916, 1039, 1257, 1258, 1263
Social Security (*see* Social Security)
state taxes, 999
and the U.S. Constitution, 160, 670–671
taxis, Greek, 1008
technology
enabling further statism, 983
enabling further work, 450, 854, 1099
and enthusiasm, 1242
as freedom from work, 1053, 1090, 1282
"humanizing" of, 32
and pollution, 772
precision in, 172
rejection of as virtue, 338, 1098–1099, 1101
replacing meaning, 451, 824, 1091, 1097
replacing morality, 365, 802–803, 918
result of Christian heritage, 20
and specialization, 1098–1099
and utopianism, 375, 385, 386, 450, 1040
Tecumseh, 886
teleios, Greek, 358
television
culture of death, 289, 460
depictions of evil, 835, 1134–1135, 1279
and doctrine of freedom, 1052
exploitation of feeling, 782–783, 837
fostering humanism, 688, 1208
and health, 335–336, 780
hero worship, 873–874
imitation of by the church, 145–146
indulgence in, 124, 1423
and new dark age, 752
over-dramatization of life, 791–792
pale representation of the world, 106
promotion of false faith, 271
and sexual perversion, 782
and small-mindedness, 1341
war on the family, 375, 900
television preaching, 62, 598, 1327

Temple of God, 793–794. *see also* Levites; Old and New Testaments
Ten Commandments. *see under* Law of God
Tenin, Vlas, 819
Tennessee, 266
Tennyson, Alfred, 966
tenth century. *see* the History Index
terrorism, 302, 435, 477, 479, 658, 730–731, 861, 880
Tertullian, 439
Teutons, 774
Texas, 160, 755, 831, 995
Textus Receptus, 151–153, 569
thanksgiving. *see* gratitude
theater, 144, 791–792. *see also* films
theft. *see also* private property
  basically a denial of the Lordship of Christ, 994
  and class conflict, 764, 990
  and debt, 709–710, 717–719
  and decapitalization of society, 864
  and envy, 1005
  forbidden by God's Law (*see* Law of God, Ten Commandments, 8th commandment)
  justified in cases of "necessity," 638–639
  kleptomania, 1006
  and legal tender laws, 717–719
  made "legal," 990, 993, 999–1000, 1005, 1047, 1060–1061, 1067, 1071, 1072, 1082, 1100
  and monopoly, 990
  result of antinomianism, 272, 314, 993–994, 1334
  by the state
    control or confiscation of property
      in communist China, 657
      fascism (*see* fascism, defined)
      via taxation (*see* taxation, slavery to the state)
    "executive privilege," 988–989
    theft of freedom as the basic theft, 994
  by working men, 821
the History Index. *see* the History Index on 1577
themis, Greek, 521
theocracy, 68, 378, 718. *see also* civil religion; theonomy
Theodoric the Great, 515
theological ignorance, 162, 166, 173, 186, 1004, 1128, 1232, 1253, 1277
theology. *see also* God
  abandoned in the West, 368
  "dominion theology," 1113–1114
  need for theology of politics, 1217
  poor theology in the church (*see also* church as corrupted, with poor theology)
    ignorance of, 166–167
    as limited to church, 1216–1218
    made irrelevant by the church, 1015
  process theology, 1172
  as queen of sciences, 751, 1015, 1216–1218
  and Reconstruction (*see* Reconstruction, Christian, and good theology)
  Reformed theology (*see* Reformed theology)
  replaced by rationalism, 183, 425, 426
  systematic theology, 121, 163, 170, 540, 571, 574, 657, 1146, 1216–1218, 1433
theology, definition, 1216
theonomy. *see* Law of God; Reconstruction, Christian
  vs. autonomy, 434, 567, 572, 578–579, 623, 626–627, 1025, 1114
  Christ as Lawgiver, 3–4, 8 (*see also* Lordship of Christ, as comprehensive; sovereignty of God, and His total Lordship)
  development of, 568
  opposition to, 395, 462, 626–627, 969, 1131
  and peace, 10
theonomy, meaning, 626
Theophilus, 1117
theosis, 1449
Thiess, 835
third century. *see* the History Index
thirteenth century. *see* the History Index
Thirty Years' War, 104, 570
Thomas, Gordon, 491
Thomism, 395
Thompson, Francis, 801
Thomson, James, 836
Thoreau, Henry, 59, 261, 497
Thought Revolution, 481
thrift and planning, 687–688, 691, 853, 873–874, 879, 883, 918
Thrupp, Sylvia L., 749
Tilden, Freeman, 709–710, 713–714
time, 438, 773, 876, 879, 880, 1234–1241, 1282, 1321
Timothy, 953
tipping, 1268–1269
Tiptoft, John, 399, 527
tithing
  debt to God, 1258, 1266
  failure to tithe, 1268

and God's judgment, 1127, 1260, 1268
and impotency, 102, 1206
robbing God, 1268
"tipping" God, 1268–1269
false doctrine, 342, 368
vs. freewill offerings, 1258–1262
and God's sovereignty, 1268
and obedience, 294, 937, 1259, 1266, 1268–1269
and the Pharisees, 1260
purpose of, 1124–1125, 1258, 1265
answer to social ills, 22–23, 1110, 1124–1125, 1257, 1265
central to Reconstruction, 732, 1265
and Christian power, 1124–1125, 1261, 1268
education, 120–121
festival tithe, 1259
God's tax, 1258, 1266, 1268
and Levitical function, 54, 107–108, 925, 1259, 1265
overcoming statism, 592, 732, 1124–1125, 1257–1262, 1266
poor tithe, 898, 1110, 1259
recipients of the tithe, 1127
to God *vs.* church, 23, 1259, 1265
"tithe barn," 1263
tithing to an apostate church, 1259, 1265
tobacco, 1042
Tocqueville, Alexis de, 508, 767
Toffler, Alvin, 980
Tolstoy, Leo, 550, 794, 801
Tome of Leo, 129
Tormay, Cecile, 263
torture, 399, 659
total depravity. *see* original sin and depravity
totalitarian, defined, 983
totalitarianism. *see also* authority, humanistic; statism
and antinomianism, 413–415, 591, 1045
in the church (*see* church as corrupted, with totalitarianism and abuse)
coercion and cultivating fear (*see under* statism, destruction of society)
denial of interdependence, 269
totalitarianism, defined, 596
Toulouse, the gold of, 1091
towebah, Hebrew, 521
Tower of Babel, 189, 245, 590, 890
Towers of Babel, statist, 50, 592, 915, 1063, 1440
traditions
and the Pharisees, 1336–1339
and Reformed theology, 94, 1158
Transcendentalism, 506
travail of creation, 1235
treason, 43, 541, 612, 1047, 1217, 1414, 1422
treaties, 148, 160, 473, 494, 499–500, 623, 1219
Tree of Life, 1378, 1408, 1410, 1449
Trench, R.C., 1244
Trent, Council of, 94, 96
trials and God's blessing. *see also* responsibility of Christians, trust in God
bearing our own burdens, 1306
and Biblical view of heaven, 1377–1378
bitterness, 1351–1353
countering pettiness, 1340–1341
God and the "problem" of evil, 1167
God does not abandon, 1390–1391
gratitude and healing, 1345
hope for the future, 1320–1321
make sin unsatisfactory, 1293–1294
opportunity for growth and maturity, 1292, 1320–1321
preparation for service, 1377
priority of God, 1301–1302
problems and life, 890, 1373, 1396
and the Psalms, 1299
strength in God, 1320, 1434
stress, 1290, 1306
suffering instead of fighting evil, 1212
suffering wrongfully, 1167
testing by God, 1293–1294
trials in court. *see* courts
Trilling, Diana, 884
Trinity, doctrine of, 133, 165–167, 334, 1157. *see also* God, the Trinity
Tripoli, 490
Trotsky, Leon, 528, 883, 1075, 1121, 1138 1332
Trotskyites, 1138, 1332–1333
Troy, ancient, 287
trust in documents, 147–150, 448, 1036–1037
trust in God. *see under* responsibility of Christians
truth. *see also* reality
and authority, 26, 31
Biblical doctrine of, 11, 1097, 1157–1158
denial of (*see also* meaninglessness)
church's rejection of absolute truth, 277, 1096–1097
collapse of society, 825, 1085–1086, 1095–1097
fight against knowing self, 34
replaced with feeling, 173 (*see also* emotionalism)
replaced with "social justice," 1095–1097

truth
denial of *(cont'd.)*
sacrificed for false peace, 350
for sake of unity, 1096–1097
humanistic definition, 205, 208, 1096–1097
and infallibility, 42
vs. meaninglessness, 61, 184, 188, 276, 311, 1096–1097
vs. pragmatism, 204–206, 330, 1096–1097, 1146
presuppositionalism (*see* presuppositionalism)
tsdak, Hebrew, 1011
tsedeq, Hebrew, 1289
Tudors, 765
Tung Chi-Ping, 481, 1075
Tunney, John V., 617, 641–642
Turan, 1087–1088
Turkey and Turks, 499–500, 976, 1303, 1419, 1429, 1431
Turnbull, Colin M., 313–316, 1066
Turner, Frederick Jackson, 1242
Tuveson, Ernest Lee, 943, 946
Twain, Mark, 33–34
twelfth century. *see* the History Index
twentieth century. *see* the History Index
twentieth-century mass murders, 9–10, 293–295, 326, 399, 500, 510–511, 747, 841, 984, 1002, 1032, 1033, 1075
twenty-first century. *see* the History Index
Two Cities, The (Otto, Bishop of Freising), 746
Tyler, Wat, 368
tyranny or *tyrant,* Greek, 18, 57, 59, 359

U

Uganda, 313
Ukraine, 226, 234, 1079
Ullerstam, Lars, 762
Ulman, Neil, 760
Ulysses, 774
unconditional love, 959–962, 1219, 1323–1324. *see also* love
unconscious, the, 492
unemployment, 679, 698. *see also* business, labor
UNESCO, 548–549
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (U.S.S.R.). *see* Soviet Union
Unitarianism
and abolitionists, 505–507, 1022
and Eastern thought, 534
Emerson's influence on, 262
evolution from Presbyterianism, 393
influence on Holmes Jr.'s life, 1009
influence on the church, 969
of John Quincy Adams, 48
of Secret Six, 265
and statist sovereignty, 325
anti-immigration, 204
early public school movement, 54–55
and property tax, 1258
U.S. spread of, 1262
United Kingdom, 976
United Nations, 191, 209, 376, 523, 898, 1007, 1128
United Presbyterian, 1240
United Press International (UPI), 808
United States of America
as a "Christian nation," 1131–1133
civil government
city governments, 334
county governments, 334
court system, 26, 27, 48, 49–50, 285–286, 309–310, 334, 433, 1096 (*see also* courts)
Supreme Court (*see* Supreme Court)
executive branch, 891, 1058
federal government, 49, 159–160, 176, 233, 242–243, 283, 284, 334
legislative, 27, 31, 334
state governments, 160, 242, 243, 334
the White House, 18, 1303, 1370
Constitution (*see* Constitution of the United States)
Declaration (*see* Declaration of Independence)
founding of,
Biblical literacy, 1299
Christian education, 54, 913, 950, 1111
on Christianity, 632, 943, 946–948, 1131, 1145–1146
constitutionalism, 1113, 1145
election day sermons, 162, 597
Founding Fathers, 892
and God's Law, 244, 591–592, 1113
political theory
checks and balances, 243
express power doctrine, 243
law as "voice of equity," 367
prohibitions on civil government, 243, 251–252
separation of powers, 243

social planning, 230
sovereignty, 49, 55, 328
and stability, 214–215
by Puritans (*see* Puritans, in early America)
settlement of, 1053
social application of the faith, 1050
welfare in, 1263–1264
freedom in (*see* freedom in Christianity, in America)
history of (*see* the History Index; specific events)
influenced by philosophies
Enlightenment, 506–507, 963
eschatology, 871, 946, 1124–1125, 1234, 1237–1241
rationalism, 1238–1239
Native Americans (*see* Native American Indians)
the original American dream, 104, 613, 1142
as a "promised land," 1131, 1142 (*see also* immigration)
statism in,
communism, 240, 348, 542–544, 893
fascism, 602–604, 1039
federal ownership of land, 1060
Marxism, 563
socialism, 261–262, 265, 688, 1262
wealth in, 1431
unity. *see also* disunity in the church
agreeing with God, 1251
in Christ (*see* community, Christian)
equated with grace, 1096–1097
at the expense of faith, 187
at expense of truth, 1096–1097
false gospel of unity, 187, 865–866
false unity, 187, 202, 376, 1129
forced by the state, 187, 202, 376, 1129
harmony in service to God, 1343 (*see also* harmony of interests)
and humanistic socialization, 935, 1019, 1102
of life lost in humanism, 620
and moral disarmament, 542
as ultimate goal of "Christianity," 187, 543, 1096–1097
universality or catholicity. *see* catholicity or universality
universal salvation, 133, 534, 543
universities and colleges. *see also* specific institutions
academic freedom, 44, 760–761
architecture, 143
Christian origins of, 1216
depersonalization of students, 310
elitism in, 408
as federal universities, 513
foolishness of, 815
hatred of, 513
humanism in "Christian" colleges, 839
as messianic agents of humanism, 36, 44, 61, 328, 927, 1201
minority quotas, 1094–1095
need for truly Christian establishments, 1146
as part of "the Establishment," 308
and revolution, 36, 192–193, 267, 760–761 (*see also* youth, student movement)
seminaries (*see* seminaries)
statism in, 16–17, 408, 1112
student movement (*see under* youth)
support of Hitler, 408
University Church Council, 391
University Committee on Vietnam at UCLA, 760
University of California, 50, 390, 856, 926, 1112, 1217, 1461
University of California at Berkeley, 390, 856
University of California at Los Angeles, 760, 926
University of Colorado, 459
University of Edinburgh and New College, 1433
University of Michigan, 276
University of Santa Clara, 759–760
University of Washington, 311
unprofitable servants, 298, 1244–1245
Unwin, J.D., 858–862
Uperi, 875–876
Upgren, Arthur, 707
upper class. *see under* classes
Upton, John, 103, 574, 1441–1442, 1444
Ur, 1166
Uriah, 307
Uruguay, 196
USDA, 226
U.S. Justice Department, 604
Ussher, Bishop, 571
U.S. State Department, 553, 731
U.S. Statutes at Large, 654
U.S. Treasury, 237, 703
Utah, 1060
utilitarianism, 452. *see also* pragmatism
utopian humanism
anti-Christian hope
"Christian" versions, 523–524, 594
and Communism, 816
and God's judgment, 992

utopian humanism
anti-Christian hope *(cont'd.)*
liberal ideals, 539
overcoming death, 920, 985, 1044
plans for salvation, 344–345, 485–487, 579, 919, 1010, 1017–1018, 1044–1045, 1388, 1129–1130
predestination by the state, 978
primitivism, 326–329, 773
recreating man, 190, 880
view of god, 128
decadence, 777–778
failure and disillusionment
in education, 512–516
lawlessness, 747, 808
man as uncooperative, 980–981
and moral emptiness, 526, 556, 893
nihilism, 363, 436
political promises, 698, 879, 1080–1081, 1128
religion of humanism, 190–194
result of sin, 768
"social gospel," 1036–1038
the state as god, 362
turn to monasticism, 802
unknowability of the future, 36
and instant gratification, 355–356, 449–450, 758, 879, 1282, 1296
looking to other shores, 349–350
nihilism and meaninglessness, 414, 436
and one world order, 1414
one-world religion, 202
perfect order, 749, 1017–1018
and public education, 36, 512–513
retreat and monasticism, 744, 802
and revolution, 390, 449–450
and social justice, 668–669
and statism, 1017–1018, 1028, 1075–1076, 1128
victory of science, 192, 237, 363, 408, 919–922 (*see also* science, inevitable progress)
and war, 1028–1031
wilderness as paradise, 744

V

Vacca, Roberto, 802
vagrancy, 113
Valerian, 1151–1152
Valla, Lorenzo, 183
valley of Baca, 1321
Van, city of, 1431
vandalism, 513, 786, 808
Vanderbilt, Cornelius, 1264
Van Nuys, CA, 535
Van Til, Cornelius
on Aristotle, 1172
Cultural Mandate, 1162
development of civilization, 1145
on doctrine of scripture, 12
God's creation of facts, 469
importance to Reformed faith, 1429–1430
opposition of Gnosticism, 396
on postmillennialism, 578–579
power of, 633
presuppositionalism of, 137, 151, 1107
on rationalism, 1165
on redemption, 1058–1059
Rushdoony on, 559–574, 1432
theistic premises of science, 1007
theonomy *vs.* autonomy, 135, 626
Van Til, Henry, 795, 838–839, 911, 919–920, 1145
Van Zee, C. Harold, 1252
Vatican, 300, 464
Venerable Bede, 835
Venezuela, 687, 715
vengeance, 94. *see also* justice
Venus, 184
Verrill, A. Hyatt, 663–664
Versailles, 144, 963
Vertefeuille, John, 1197
Vesuvius, 1440
victim mentality. *see under* environmentalism
victims, treatment of, 842–843
victims of crime, 272, 280
Victoria, Queen of England, 500, 1219–1221, 1344
Victorian era, 124, 1220
victory. *see* postmillennialism
Vietnam
"Black Death" originating in, 755–756
leftist involvement in, 348
losses to Americans, 1028
paganism in, 834–835
Vietnam War, 27, 266, 554, 1083
villain, etymology, 369
Vinson, Fredrick Moore, 328, 434
violence and coercion. *see also* pacifism; war
in statism
contempt of God, 976
in New York City, 747
resulting in fear, 1121, 1276, 1287
result of antinomianism, 750
as result of bankruptcy, 119, 1118, 1122, 1195

self-incrimination, 658–661
in socialism, 32, 184, 268, 525–526, 694, 761, 1020, 1069, 1102
state as savior, 1017, 1114
through structures, 752
Viorst, Milton, 831
virgin birth, 127, 1384, 1394–1398, 1399–1403
Virginia, 479, 490, 1259
virginity and chastity
and Christian love, 277
and elevation of culture, 858
humanist shaming and hatred of, 285–286, 762, 1007
and pagan sacrifices, 288
vocation. *see* calling, vision, and vocation; work
Volker, William, 1087
Vollenhoven, Dirk Hendrik Theodoor, 565
Voltaire, 441, 749, 766
"voluntary family," 595–596, 901
voting and elections
and Christian duty, 102, 168–169, 967, 1127, 1138–1139, 1176 (*see also* politics, and Christian duty)
election day sermons, 162, 950
judging candidates, 720–721
democracy (*see* democracy)
election of Reagan, 598
as a façade for totalitarianism, 258, 603
and hopelessness, 303
and immigration, 967
impotency of, 245
lack of voting, 827, 965
manipulation, 967
"moral majority," 1138–1139
as most precious right, 258
for revolution, 268
salvation by, 159, 268, 355–356 (*see also* politics, salvation in)
in terms of one's pocketbook, 1138
voting blocs, 1079–1080
vouchers for education, 86, 610–611
vox populi, vox dei. *see under* democracy
vulgarity, 185

W

Wagner, Richard, 173, 442, 789
waiting on God, 361, 1297–1298
Wallace, Anthony F. C., 886–887
Walsingham, Thomas, 368
Walton, Frank J., 991
war. *see also* revolution; violence and coercion; specific wars
age of war, 1027–1031
20th century mass murders, 9–10, 293–295, 326, 399, 500, 510–511, 747, 841, 984, 1002, 1032, 1033, 1075
conservative hope in change by war, 866, 1025–1026, 1028
imperialism, 191, 1023, 1025–1026, 1032
jungle warfare, 1069
Marx on War, 1027–1028, 1030
nuclear warfare, 755
salvation by war (*see* false gospels, war as savior)
and utopian humanism, 1028–1031
war outlawed by Kellogg-Briand pact, 148, 1128
with allies, 1035
antiwar protest, 309, 348, 760 (*see also* international relationships, world peace)
captives of war, 889
and Christianity
Biblical warfare, 1001, 1025–1026, 1034–1035
"for God and country," 1356–1360
and the theonomic society, 1025–1026
against civilians, 1034–1035
state's war against citizens (*see* citizenry, abuse of)
targeting cities, 850–851
cost of war, 122, 1028, 1032–1033
dehumanization of man, 1032
and economics, 698, 1025–1026, 1027–1031
exploited by growing state, 1028, 1032–1033
revolutionary nature of, 1032
the culture war (*see under* culture)
defensive, 1025
and international relationships, 1027–1028, 1034–1035
offensive, 1025–1026
peace and humanism (*see* peace, humanistic ideals)
product of sin, 1027–1031
class and social warfare (*see* class and social warfare)
and humanistic politics, 1034–1035
and selective depravity, 866, 1027–1030, 1032
warfare state, 1027–1031

war
product of sin *(cont'd.)*
war preferred to peace, 1022–1023, 1028–1031, 1032
without principle, 613, 1032
chemical and biological warfare, 754–755
crimes in, 1034–1035
and Darwinism, 1027–1030
savagery in, 1034–1035
and sexual crimes, 1032
terrorism (*see* terrorism)
total war, 479–481, 1034–1035
War for American Independence, 47–48, 502–503, 949, 1239–1240, 1243
"war on drugs," 918. *see also* drug and alcohol abuse, and statism
Warren, Charles, 241
Warren, Earl, 237, 309, 880
Washbourne, Thomas, 1391
Washington, D.C., 31, 144, 251, 572, 997, 1000, 1060–1061, 1102, 1131, 1243
the White House (*see* White House)
Washington, George, 144, 859–860, 1033, 1259, 1263, 1360
Washington Star Service, 754
WASP culture. *see under* whites
Waterman, Bully, 1242
Watson, John Broadus, 1080, 1099
Watson-Watt, Sir Robert, 251
Watts, Isaac, 856, 1386, 1393, 1413, 1424
Watts "riots," 665
wealth
as a blessing, 725–726, 1005
capitalization, 687–690, 691–692 (*see also* capitalization)
Christian potential, 247, 255, 1110 (*see also* tithing)
Christian stewardship, 1110–1112, 1265–1266 (*see also* stewardship)
covenant wealth defined, 723
economics gaps narrowing, 648
history as wealth-building for God's Kingdom, 724, 1397
relative wealth of Americans, 1431
result of hard work, 1004–1005
spiritual capital, 861
decapitalization, 408, 657, 687–690, 691
as "evil," 338–340, 720–721, 725, 1004–1005, 1072–1073
and dualism, 247–248
investments, 677–678
money as a form of, 705, 723 (*see also* money)
fiat prosperity, 31
get-rich-quick schemes, 254
gold and silver as God-created wealth, 703, 718
saving money, 688, 691, 700, 705, 847
wealth defined exclusively as money and possessions, 723
and personhood, 248–249
private property (*see* private property)
and progress, 687–690, 1004
and statism (*see* economics, statist involvement)
thrift, 687–688, 691, 853
Weathermen, the, 525, 1081
Weaver, Richard, 283
Webb, Jack, 782
Webber, Carolyn, 728
Webster, Daniel, 717
Webster, Noah, 717–719, 1087, 1216, 1291
Webster's 1828 *Dictionary*, 1087, 1216
Wead, Douglas, 86
Weiss, Martin D., 679
welfare. *see also* poverty
and Christian duty, 721, 1110–1112, 1130
Calvin's Geneva, 113–114
early church, 71, 76, 108
gleaning principle, 1131–1132, 1263
the Levites, 107–108, 1443
medieval period, 1110–1111, 1124
in early America, 1263–1264
and the family, 898, 916–917, 1265–1266 (*see also* family, basic to social order)
private as most cost-effective, 869–870
widows and orphans (*see* widows and orphans)
and work, 248, 1071–1073, 1270, 1282
welfare, statist, 44, 200, 228, 1285
in ancient Rome, 109, 330, 745, 1084, 1090
and antinomianism, 314, 879
and birth rates, 585
contempt for, 437
and death of God, 251
demand of the people, 812
disguised as freedom, 122
failure of, 869–870, 1265
collapse of welfare state, 109, 351, 420–421, 759, 812, 1270
cultivating irresponsibility of recipients, 122, 668–669, 878–879
decapitalizing the productive, 689, 702, 706, 1004, 1030–1031
and envy, 668, 1004
inadequate, 1265, 1288
political instrument, 1263, 1270

present-orientation, 878–879
as totalitarian, 731
federal aid, 241, 759–762, 812, 870
as highest law, 330
and inflation, 812–815
as "loving your neighbor," 1325
modern statistics, 759
and relativism, 467
and rights, 21, 199, 209, 211
and salvation, 296, 314–315, 340
Satan's temptation of Christ, 117
and social justice, 668–669, 731
and social planning, 57
Social Security, 296, 818, 1285
Werfel, Franz, 529
Wesley, John, 1251
West, Rebecca, 636
Western history. *see also* the History Index
atonement and civilization, 99, 289
Biblical language of Christendom, 274
civil war between humanism and Christianity, 183–185
establishing Christian civilization, 775
mixture of paganism and Christianity, 52, 183–185, 274
rejection of Christianity, 446–450, 502–504, 1072
retreat of the church, 104–105
shift from God's Law to human rights, 195
shift in class conflict, 248
shift to humanism, 562–563, 641–643
Westminster Seminary, 562, 566
Westminster Standards, 570, 1157, 1429. *see also* catechisms
Westminster Confession, 438, 1158–1159
Westminster Larger Catechism, 1159, 1230
Westminster Shorter Catechism, 98, 220, 342, 444, 840, 913, 1230
Whale, John S., 543
Whately, William, 945
Wheaton College, 390
Wheeler, Richard S., 1119
"When Adam delved, and Eve span...," 25, 222
Whig Party, 204
Whisner, Levi W., 606–608, 831, 976
White, James, Bishop of Winchester, 394
White, John S., 927
White, R. J., 853–854
Whitehead, John W., 583, 584
White House, 18, 86, 1303, 1370
whites. *see also* racism
"Anglo-Saxon superiority," 813–814, 1129
as evil race (*see* selective depravity)
WASP culture, 740
white guilt, 333–334, 354–355
Whitman, Walt, 260, 326–328, 528
widows and orphans
creation of the diaconate, 69
and inheritance tax, 993, 997–998, 999–1000
remarriage of widows and widowers, 1250–1251
responsibility of the church, 1447
robbing of, 997–998, 999–1000
treatment of as key test of character, 1000
Wilberforce, William, 1209
Wildavsky, Aaron, 728
Wilde, Oscar, 279, 1091
wilderness as paradise, 744
William III, king of England, 711
Willow Run, Michigan, 234
Wilson, Pete, 86
Wilson, Woodrow, 91, 205, 266, 344, 448, 474, 831, 1080, 1128, 1131, 1338
Winkworth, Catherine, 1190
Winter-Berger, Robert N., 822
wisdom
and capitalization, 688, 691–692 (*see also* capitalization)
duty of every Christian, 1278, 1406
hatred of and love of death, 179–180, 1277
"wisdom of this world," 1338, 1404
the Wise Men, 1404
Wise Men (Magi), 1404, 1412, 1414, 1422
Witherspoon, John, 717, 952
Witonski, Peter, 776
Wittgenstein, Ludwig, 562, 1164
wives. *see* marriage
Wolf, John B., 868
Wolfe, Alan, 555
Wollstonecraft, Mary, 420
women
and abuse
adultery and counseling, 118, 1250
from controlling churches, 69–70
defined in terms of men, 416–417, 419
discriminated from property management, 419
harems, 473, 1212
humanist hostility towards, 269, 270, 334
response of Christian women, 118, 1212

women
and abuse *(cont'd.)*
unjust domination of women, 269, 270
victimization of romantic women, 429
of wives, 118, 147, 320, 1361
dress and modesty, 626
feminism (*see* feminism)
ministry to
unwed mothers, 1130
widows and orphans (*see* widows and orphans)
as mothers (*see* mothers and motherhood)
providing future orientation, 847
and rationalistic humanism, 416–418, 419–420
religion seen as women's emotionalism, 419
role in society, 416–418, 419–420
role in the church, 633
role in the home, 269, 270, 416–418
"women and children first," 810–811
and work, 142, 143
Woodhull, Victoria, 420
Worcester Foundation for Experimental Biology, 275
Word of God. *see* Bible
words
defined (*see* specific words or phrases)
as magic, 449–450
subversion of, 389–392
Wordsworth, William, 476, 783, 1070–1071
work
commanded in Sabbath Law, 1285
for economic security and welfare, 248, 1071–1073, 1270, 1282
vs. envy, 1005
and sabbath rest, 360–361, 1279
contempt for work, 775, 856, 860, 879, 1090, 1281, 1284
evasion of work and social collapse, 1285
favor for non-working candidates, 1284–1286
freedom as escape from work, 1053, 1090, 1282
inheritance and lack of work, 1284–1286
and meaning of a "gentleman," 868–869
non-working class, 1284–1286
and parasitic aristocracy, 776–778, 868–869, 871
and Romanticism, 428, 429
time-watching, 773, 1282
work as slavery, 1284
working to play, 777, 1281, 1284
estate and calling, 225, 256, 374, 807–809, 823–824, 990, 1143, 1144, 1284–1285 (*see also* calling, vision, and vocation)
business as a calling under God, 444, 689, 776, 1102, 1146 (*see also* business)
children taught to love work, 856, 887
Christian authority and liberty, 20, 174–175, 369–370
delight in, 776, 856
division of labor, 416
and dominion, 945–946, 1053, 1281–1283, 1286, 1329
in Eden, 358
and freedom to work and plan, 883
in heaven, 1377
meaning and purpose, 1071–1073, 1284–1286
as power, 369–371, 1004, 1286
Puritan work ethic (*see* Puritan or Protestant work ethic)
growth *vs.* instant gratification, 688, 691, 819, 845–848, 879, 880, 888, 1200
and capitalization, 679, 687, 688, 691, 776, 846, 856, 861, 918, 1004, 1005, 1053, 1282, 1284 (*see also* capitalization)
consumption *vs.* production orientation, 847, 861, 871–872, 1285
and patience, 888, 1125
planning and thrift, 873–874, 879, 883, 918
and Reconstruction, 174–175, 371 (*see also* Reconstruction, Christian, hard work and action)
sin and instant gratification, 358–359, 429, 840, 861
work in influencing culture, 174–175, 585–586, 1015, 1227
work of the early church (*see* early church, faith and work of)
in the local church, 170–171
profit *vs.* non-profit organizations, 685
as replaced
replaced with criticism, 1332
replaced with nihilistic terrorism, 435, 861, 880
replaced with "positive thinking," 177

replaced with social planning, 228, 1036–1037, 1053, 1073–1074
salvation by therapeutic work programs, 1014
and statism
controlled by the state, 369–370, 696, 1016, 1036–1037, 1060–1061, 1090–1091
forced by state compulsion, 1014, 1060, 1285
as fundamental right *vs.* duty, 195–196, 211
meaning of work robbed by taxation, 1071
philosophy of "the working man," 1285
public schools and labor (*see* education in humanism, and social order)
statist undercutting of work discipline, 1084, 1282, 1285
welfarism *vs.* work, 1004, 1285
and technology (*see* technology)
and women, 142, 143
workers. *see* business, labor
working class. *see under* classes
works-morality. *see under* false gospels
worldliness, usage and meaning, 950, 1209
world peace. *see under* international relationships
World War I, 494, 1028, 1034, 1079, 1142, 1436, 1446
depressions after, 701
World War II, 144, 494, 866, 1008, 1025, 1028, 1035, 1263
decrease of unemployment, 698
nature of U.S. law after, 632
post-era, 84, 137, 154, 624, 632
Worldwide Church of God, 596
worldwide injustice and antinomianism, 618, 637, 650, 992, 993–994, 1007–1008, 1031, 1205–1206
worship
confused with Christianity, 109
false worship (*see also* false gospels)
of ancestors, 440, 913, 1321
ancestor worship, 390, 440, 913
of Caesar, 651
of evil, 501
of false Jesus, 156
of feeling, 782–783
of genius, 443
of man, 18, 202, 252, 264, 329, 389, 618 (*see also* humanism)
of Molech, 521, 902, 904–906
of Moloch, 287
of money, 721 (*see also* money, worship of money)
of nature, 1053
new forms of, 120
of primitive, 45
of self, 1136
of the state, 598, 643, 904, 1028, 1055, 1123, 1136 (*see also* statism)
and fear, 1276
freedom to worship, 1065
by rulers, 395
of triune God, 6
Calvinistic, 114
charity in, 115
churches as places for, 568
commands to, 76
and confession of sin, 833
and faithfulness, 1358
family worship, 907, 913
liturgy of, 598
wrath of God. *see* judgment of God
Wuest, Kenneth S., 1183
Wurmbrand, Richard, 436, 542
Wyeth, Andrew, 799–800

X

Xhosa peoples, 1255
xenizo, Greek, 1228

Y

Yale, 192, 506, 1091, 1251
Yemen, 196
Yew, Lee Kuan, 277
Yiddish, 619
Yockey, Parker, 814
Yorty, Mayor Samuel, 348
Young, E.J., 566
youth
child abuse (*see under* abuse)
children (*see* children)
and Christianity
Christian reconstructionists, 418, 815, 1120–1121
and the church, 186–187, 342–343, 418, 815, 1120–1121
"even the youths shall faint," 1297
pietism and revolt of youth, 310
revolution in name of evangelism, 186–187, 342–343

youth
and Christianity *(cont'd.)*
young thinkers in church history, 1120–1121
Youth for Christ, 391
fallacy of simplicity, 1098, 1099
idealism of, 373
inheritance (*see* inheritance)
as lonely hero, 208
need for new faith, 382
and politics, 210, 816 (*see also* youth, student movement)
problem youth
and antinomianism, 310–311, 435
barbarism and rootlessness, 272–273, 320, 328, 786, 829–830
crime and gangs, 44, 664, 808
disillusionment, 192–193, 513
drop-outs and drop-ins, 353–357
and existentialism, 44
and humanistic education (*see* education in humanism, and social order)
meaninglessness and nihilism, 438, 1071, 1097
melodrama and emotionalism, 792
and moral decay, 267, 272–273, 714
and statism, 816
willful immaturity (*see* immaturity)
Romanticism of, 429
state ownership of, 596, 1072, 1083, 1123
student movement, 20, 353–354, 436–437, 476–478
anarchy of, 209, 267, 810, 981, 1052
anti-morality, 760, 1052
criticism without personal repentance, 553, 831, 893, 1091, 1119
development of prior humanism, 303, 311, 328, 893, 1091, 1119
failure of grandparents, 899
faith in revolution, 730, 760–762
hatred of the "normal" man, 208–209
as impotent, 28, 553, 831, 894, 1119
and instant-gratification, 1284
lack of principles, 831, 1052
leaders taking advantage of, 308–309
mass suicide, 385–386
revolt against failure of humanism, 192–193, 215, 259, 263, 308–312, 354, 893, 899, 981, 1072, 1081, 1083, 1119
and selective depravity, 298
violence of, 1085
Youth Crusade, 475, 477. *see also* Children's Crusade
Youth for Christ, 391
yule log, 1410

Z

zaam, Hebrew, 521
Zanzibar, 491
zeal
Zebedee, 1117
Zechariah, 915, 1137
Zion, 68, 73
Zola, Emile, 771
Zuver, Dudley, 1226

HISTORY INDEX

Ancient World (Creation–a.d. 300)

Garden of Eden, 7, 19, 394, 410, 1248
Noah, 1349–1350
Jacob, 7
Judah, 7–8
Moses, life of, 1166
Pharaoh, 18
King David, 307
Ancient Israel, 745
Assyrian Empire, 1273, 1388
Babylonian Empire, 1273, 1404
1479–1425: Thutmosis III, 1388
Greece
  Philosophy of
    Begins with the ultimacy of chance, 577
    Abstract ideas viewed as the ultimates, 577
    Belief in salvation by politics, 344
    Humanistic relativism in, 455
    Tragedies of demonstrated the belief that evil fate was supreme, 835
    Dramas justified criminals as innocent victims of fate, 932
    Saw the state as the highest good, 968
  Religion of
    Mortal gods, 398
    As part of the state's public works to ensure morale, 207
    Gods of were above the law, 934
Sparta, 905
Rome
  And abortion, 546
  Serfdom originated in, 369, 1406
  Foreigners lived outside the walls and were legal nonpersons, 588
  The Roman dream in the Catholic Church today, 588
  De facto government of, 671
  Destroyed its own standard of citizenship, 745
  And deadness to life, 836
  Inflation helped destroy urban life, 851
  And serfdom, slavery, 889
  Emperors deliberately violated morality, 934
  Citizenship was reserved for the elite, 1117
  Intellectuals left paganism and became Christians, 1118, 1120

Life increasingly reduced to one dimension, 1404
Religion of
Moral gods, 398
Belief in salvation by politics, 344
Idolized peace, 349, 351
Worship the "genius of Rome," 440
Allowed no unlicensed religion or god, 107
Gods of were above the law, 934
Imperial salvation, 1090
Statism of
Caesar is Lord vs. Christ is Lord, 47, 207, 610,1109
Persecution of Christians, 445, 1117–1118, 1120
Fall of, 746
Land tax vanished after, 683
Two stages of, 1083
c. 497/6–406/5: Sophocles, 783
384–322: Aristotle, 393, 577, 635, 636, 1405
63–63: Cicero, 981
c. 428–c. 347: Plato, 39, 363, 393, 960
175–164: Antiochus Epiphanes, 5
140–63: Hasmonean Dynasty, 5
37–4: Herod, 1405
c. 25–c. 50: Philo of Alexandria, 393, 132
27–14: Augustus Caesar, 1389

Early Church (1st–4th centuries)

A.D. 1: Incarnation of Christ, 9–10, 1389, 1394–1398, 1408, 1412, 1414, 1417,
Wise men, 1405
New Testament Church, 47, 108, 247
Apostle Paul, 76
27–66: Petronius Arbiter, 738
c. 50: Council of Jerusalem, 90
61–113: Pliny the Younger, 1117
c. 85–c. 160: Marcion
Heresy of, 633–634
130–202: Irenaeus, 133
161–180: Marcus Aurelius, 1211
161–192: Commodus, 1212
214 or 215–275: Aurelian, 746
225–258: St. Lawrence, 1441
c. 250–c. 325: Lactantius, 920
253–260: Valerian, 1152
257: persecution of Christians, 1151
256–336: Arius of Alexandria, 393
c. 296–373: Athanasius of Alexandria 449, 1164
Early Church, 139–140, 163, 1118
306–337: Constantine, 1120
c. 331–396: Gregory of Nyssa, 133–134, 794
354–430: Augustine, 132, 943–944, 1222
381: Council of Constantinople, 1164

Medieval Era (5th–15th centuries)

Medieval Era
Term "Dark Ages," 752, 963
Term "Medieval," 752, 963
Life expectancy of nobility's sons, 826
The role of the miller, 990
Made Jews into a target of popular anger, 1003
Tithing in, 1124
Aggression of women, 1361
Changed view of deathbeds, 1374
Philosophy
  Holds poverty as a virtue, 248
  Humanistic relativism in, 455
Church
  Pilgrimages in, 94
  Pardons in, 94–95
  Architecture of churches in, 139
  Began to stress man's aspirations, not Christ, 140
  Became irrelevant, 827
  Declared itself to be the kingdom of God, 984
  Modern historians lie that most of the wealth was in the church, 1110
401–404: Paulinus of Nola, of Aquitaine, built a church at Cimitile, 139–140
St. Patrick, 1143
451: Execution of Armenian leaders defending Christianity, 1379
451: Council of Chalcedon, 129, 1136
c. 468: Aristides the Just ostracized from Athens, 1073
590–604: Pope Gregory I (Gregory the Great), 247
800: Charlemagne put down human sacrifices in Northern Europe, 288
819: Council of Aix, 110
872–882: Pope John VIII, 90
996–1002: Otto III, Holy Roman Emperor, 90, 129–130
Inquisition, the, 1047–1048
1033–1109: Anselm, 283
1079–1142: Peter Abelard, 620–622
Tenth Century, 920
1100: Openness of Europe, 820
1073– 1085: Pope Gregory VII, 1093
1220–1250: Frederick II, Holy Roman Emperor, 42–43, 473
1198–1216: Pope Innocent III, 473–475, 1047
1199: The Fourth Crusade, 474
1199–1216: King John of England, 621
1202: Siege of Zara, 474
1204: Sack of Constantinople, 474
1208: Albigensian crusade, 474
1212: The Children's Crusade, 474, 475, 476–478
1220–1250: Frederick II (Frederick the Great), 208, 1047–1048
1225–1274: Thomas Aquinas, 138, 248, 925
1285–1347: William Occam, 425
1346–1353 (Peak of): Black Death, 367, 754
1377–1399: Richard II of England
  Era of, 368
1380–1479: Thomas à Kempis, 775
1399–1413: Henry IV, 1093
1400s: Institutions began to fail, 823

c.1407–1457: Lorenzo Valla, 183
1417–1431: Pope Martin V, 105
1428/1431–1476/77: Vlad Dracula, 105, 399–400
1475: had to date authorized the killing of 100,000 people, 399
1447–1455: Pope Nicholas V, 105
1466–1536: Desiderius Erasmus, 94, 378, 945
1469–1527: Niccolò Machiavelli, 378–379, 496, 824
1475–1504: King Ferdinand II of Aragon (Spain), 870
1478–1535: Sir Thomas More, 378, 571
1483–1546: Martin Luther, 91, 571, 925, 1399
1485–1509: Henry VII, 765
1498: Johann Geiler preached on the consequences of the loss of estate, 824–825

Reformation and Renaissance (16th–17th centuries)

Reformation
Postmillennialism as part of, 62
Began with the attempt to return to the legitimate practices of the early church, 163
Shatters the union between faith and humanism, 183–184
Shatters medieval belief in "holy poverty," 248
As a reaction against the humanists, 446
Briefly misunderstood the Roman dream, 588
Pushed back the pagan principle of necessity, 639
Recognizes the centrality of the family, 921
Stressed the fallibility of men and institutions, 1367
Renaissance, 330
And freedom redefined, 58
Collecting of the arts begins in, 143
As a celebration of the triumphant humanists, 183, 639
Faith in salvation by the state, 362, 1050
Set a precedent for the 20th century by its lust for torture and murder, 398
Worship of artists as the "genius of society," 441
As the result of the decline of Christianity in the "Middle" Ages, 446
As an attempt to reform the Greco-Roman dream and advance humanism, 588
Cultural goal of imitating the nonworking elite, 775
Kings disregarded the poor, saw themselves as superior, 934–935
As an era of showy art and brutal terror, 1201
1509–1547: Henry VIII (England), 765, 921
1509–1564: John Calvin
Viewed as an oracle of God, 91
And the reach of Christ's Kingship, 113–115
Did not resort to personal attacks, 571
Levitical role of, 925
Wrote his *Institutes* at a young age, 1121
Stressed the fallibility of men and institutions, 1367
1513–1572: John Knox, 91, 367
1542–1567: Mary, Queen of Scots, 299–301
Marriage to the Dauphin of France, 299
Executes Chastelard, 300
Taint of madness in, 765
1551–1606: Christopher Columbus, 491
1554–1558: Philip II (Spain), 104
1554–1600: Erastian Richard Hooker, 393–394
1561–1626: Francis Bacon, 617

1564 (baptized)–1616: William Shakespeare, 457
1564 (baptized)–1593: Christopher Marlowe, 457
1575: Order of St John of Jerusalem built a hospital in Malta, 1110
1584–1652: John Cotton, 56, 961
1588–1679: Thomas Hobbes, 617
1596–1650: René Descartes, 425

Puritan and Commonwealth era (17th century)

Puritans and Puritan Commonwealth Era
And tithing, 112
And capitalization, 691
Transformed culture from hyperemotion to moderation, 791
Views married sexuality as a blessing, reverses idea that abstinence is a virtue, 944–945
A people of the Bible, 946
View all Scripture as the Law of God, 947
Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish thinkers agreed on the necessity of godly rule, 1121
The crown rights of King Jesus, 1143
At maximum strength were 4% of England, 1143
Took seriously their responsibility to provide for widows, 1251
1618–1648: Thirty Years' War, 104, 570
1633–1703: Samuel Pepys, 323
1640–1642: Sir Orlando Bridgeman, 988
1642–1726/27: Isaac Newton, 617
1660
Virtue became an end to itself, 104
Structure of Western civilization began to shift from Christianity to humanism, 104
Role of the church became limited to piety and worship, 104–105
The modern state as man's hope of salvation began to develop, 974
After 1660
The calibre of preaching has declined and emphasis shifted, 467
The structure of Western civilization began to shift from a Christian to a humanistic basis, 466, 1209
c. 1660–1731: Daniel Defoe, 319
1685–1688: James II, 28, 988
1689–1702: William III, 711

United States of America

American Pilgrims, 398, 1258
American Puritans, 162, 747, 945–946, 1237–1238
1644–1718: William Penn, 1013

England

English Puritans, 571
Cambridge Platonists, 947
1603–1714: Stuart Period (England), 711
1603–1625: James I (England), 570
1616–1683: John Owen, 571
1625–1649: Charles I, 28, 43, 988

1628–1658: Oliver Cromwell, 393, 683, 947
1632–1704: John Locke, 36, 476, 682–684
Formulates the mythical doctrine of consent, 40, 404–406, 407
Held that property took priority over all else, 682
1660: Trial of men who executed Charles I for treason, 43
1660–1685: Charles II, 104, 754, 988

France

1694–1778: Voltaire, 433, 434

Awakening and Enlightenment (18th century)

Enlightenment Era, 330
Views criticism as the guide for discovering truth, 42
And freedom redefined, 58
Saw reason and the state as the authors of liberty, 197
Belief in the natural goodness of man, 305
Pilgrimage becomes a quest for humanistic experience, 398
Causes the legal and social downgrading of women, 419
And the divine right of civil authorities, 423
Artists turn against the nobility and royalty, 441
Humanism revived by, 446, 588
Decaying of will to live, 555
Rethought natural law, 636
Concept of the city as a product of economic order, 749
Cultural goal of imitating the nonworking elite, 775
War against the family, 899
Christian involvement in civil life becomes viewed as worldliness, 950
Movement towards state control of education, 950
Revivalists denounce Christian schools as ungodly, 950
Belief in predestination by Nature, not God, 979
Christian thinkers ceased to be elite men, 1121
Departure from literal creationism, 1172
Belief in the omnipotence of criticism, 1331
Rulers forbade the use of the Magnificat as treason, 1399, 1415
Eighteenth Century, 446, 447
1760–1820+: Industrial Revolution, 39, 854
1774: Treaty of Kuchuk Kainarji, 500
1785–1832: Romantic Period, 398, 419, 783, 838
Gives birth to feminism, 419–420
Divinized emotions, 426

United States of America

Bank architecture patterned after Greek temples until after WWII, 144
Founding of, 845–846, 878
Colonial Period, 1238
1703–1758: Jonathan Edwards, 1238
1703–1791— John Wesley
Feared his fiancées' beauty would destroy his holiness, broke off the engagement, 1251

1719–1790: Samuel Bellamy
Postmillennialism of, 1239
1721–1803: Samuel Hopkins
Postmillennialism of, 1239
1722–1803: Samuel Adams 161
1723–1794: John Witherspoon, 717, 952
1736–1799: Patrick Henry, 490, 717, 1360
1739–1800: John Rutledge, 531
1740: Practical Christianity makes a brief comeback, 104
1757–1804: Alexander Hamilton, 949–950
1763: Influence of postmillennialists, 1240
1774: First Continental Congress, 1258
1775–1783: American War of Independence
As a triumph for Puritan postmillennialism, 949
As a major factor in the decline of Puritan postmillennialism, 949
Magna Carta doctrine of debt obeyed briefly after, 683
As a counterrevolution against statism, 963
Replaced by the sexual revolution in modernity, 1131
Referred to as a Scottish-Irish-Presbyterian rebellion, 1243
1779: Battle of Vincennes, one of history's most decisive battles, 490
1779–1820: Stephen Decatur, 490
1780: America predominantly Scottish, 1243
1782–1850: James G. Calhoun, 506
1788–1850: Adoniram Judson, 1203
1789–1797: George Washington, 49, 1087, 1360
1781: Farewell Address, 859
1785: Disapproved repealing of mandatory tithe laws, 1259
1795–1849: James G. Carter, 54, 327–328
1796–1859: Horace Mann, 260, 1111
Visions of statist education, 54, 327–328, 1040
1797–1874: Gerrit Smith, member of the Secret Six, 260, 261

England

1760–1820: George III, 765, 853–854
1770–1850: William Wordsworth, 476, 783
1771–1858: Robert Owen, 1036–1037
1780: Parliamentary commission creates the budgetary process to justify national debt, 727–728
1788–1823: Lord Byron, 838
1792–1822: Percy Shelley, 430, 790, 838
1792–1875: Charles G. Finney, 426

France

1643–1715: King Louis XIV, "The Sun King" (France), 104, 142, 179
The nation . . . dwells entirely within the person of the king, 644
Reconstruction of France under, 765
Court marked by gambling, 775, 869
Stripped nobles of their power, 777, 868
Portrayed the state as God, 963
1680: Construction of Versailles, 144
1706: Battle of Ramillies, *God seems to have forgotten all I have done for him,* 496

1712–1778: Jean-Jacques Rousseau
Held to the general will as the infallible "new Holy Spirit," 91
Saw nature as the source of liberty, 197
Father of the founding fathers of socialism, 339
Influence of, 425
Tarzan as an embodiment of Rousseau's noble savage, 431
Whoever refuses to obey the general will shall be compelled to do so, 443
Root belief in the child and the power of the child's purity, 477
Return to primitivism, 773
Idealism of, 961
1740–1814: The Marquis de Sade
Held that the only evil is God and His law, 172, 272
As the logical alternative of Biblical living, 376
Argued that because there is no God, there is no law, 414, 1212
Proposes humanism as new religion of reason, 544
1749–1759: Mercier de la Riviere, 974
1761–1762: *Rameau's Nephew* written, 413
Viewed the whole world and life as meaningless and absurd, 413–415
Translated by Goethe, 413
Hailed by Mark and Hegel, 413
Argued that because there is no God, there is no law, 414
1774–1791: Marie Antoinette, 766
1789–1815: French Revolution
And freedom redefined, 58
The state became more openly humanistic in countries after, 105
Strength of humanism in, 184, 949
Undergirding worldview of, 414
Liberty, Fraternity, Equality — or Death, 414
Vox populi vox dei, 423
Preceded by a war against church and state, 441
Idolized their own genius, 441
Planned the reduction of population, 485
Based on the concept of natural law, 635, 636
Bitterness toward the middle class, 766
Cultural goal of imitating the nonworking elite, 775
Strengthens the belief that godless man would command the nations, 949
Introduced a new foray into barbarism, 1034
1789: Declaration of Rights of Man and the Citizen
Passed, 199
The nation is….the source of all sovereignty, 636, 644
1793–1794: Reign of Terror
Directed against political counterrevolutionaries, economic self-preservationists, and Christians, 544
1793–1794: Maximilien Robespierre, 443

Elsewhere

1711–1776: David Hume (Scotland), 789
1717–1831: Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (Germany)
And freedom redefined, 58–59
Influence of, 58,130, 391
Spiritual father of Marx, Kierkegaard, Dewey, and Sartre, 391
Grandfather of Marxism, pragmatism, Fabianism, and existentialism, 391
The march of God in the world, that is what the state is, 391

Hails *Rameau's Nephew,* 413
The rational is the real, 425
1723–1790: Adam Smith (Scotland), 16, 237
1724–1804: Immanuel Kant (Germany) 195, 425
1741–1790: Joseph II, Holy Roman Emperor (Habsburg), 975
c. 1760–184: James Saurin (Ireland), 568, 91
1770–1827: Ludwig von Beethoven (Germany), 787–788

Modernism (19th — 20th centuries)

Nineteenth century, 447
Twentieth Century, 964, 1168
Slavery in, 491
War against the family based on the Enlightenment, 899
Development of gangs, 914
1847–1857: The age of clipper ships, 1243
Changed view of death, deathbeds, 1374–1476
Dehumanization of women, 416
Futile fascination in the future, 556
Church, 953, 946
Social Revolution, 398, 401, 257
Philosophy
Belief in salvation by murder, 297–298
Many American writers break with the Puritan faith and exalt heathen countries as paradise, 349–350
Views man as a rational and political animal, 416
Turning to Eastern relativistic spirituality, 455–456
Sees man as god and lawmaker, 458
Statism
20th century as a triumph of humanism
As most bloody era of history, 9–10, 291, 517
Major area of struggle in the US is between statist, humanistic schools and the truly Christian schools, 411–412
Worst development of serfdom since the fall of Rome, 417

United States of America

Gleaning was familiar in some areas until WWII, 1263
1800–1860: American socialists attacked the tithe, 1262
Frontier country settlers largely God-fearing men, 1279
Retired men moved overseas due to American disapproval of nonworking men, 1284
Early 1800s
Every Southern state except SC favored the end of slavery, 1022
Tithing and charity in, 1124
Secret Six
Members of, 261
Conspire to bring about the Civil War and fund John Brown, 261
Members of had worked to bring about state control of education, 261
As the logical developments of American intellectual history, 262
Unitarians that hated Calvinism; statists, 265
Held that the answer to slavery was apocalyptic warfare, 1022
1800; 1802–1807: Noah Webster, 717–718
1801–1809: Thomas Jefferson, 144

1801–1835: Chief Justice John Marshall
1819: *McCulloch v. Maryland* Introduces the doctrine of sovereignty into the U.S. Supreme Court decisions, 49
1803–1882: Ralph Waldo Emerson
Influenced by Hegel, 58
Held to a semi-anarchistic position, congenial to socialism, 59
Influence upon Nietzsche, 59
As a forerunner of Marx, 260
Member of the second Secret Six, 265
Worked to bring about the Civil War and financed John Brown, 260, 261
Influence of, 262
1805–1879: William Lloyd Garrison, 59
1809–1817: James Madison, 717
1809–1867: George Luther Stearns
Member of the Secret Six, 260, 261
1810–1860: Theodore Parker
Member of the Secret Six, 260, 261
1810–1876: Samuel Gridley Howe
Member of the Secret Six, 260, 261
1810–1850: Margaret Fuller, 405
1811–1882: Henry James Sr., 472
1813–1898: John Murray Forbes
Member of the second Secret Six, 261
1814–1886: Amos A. Lawrence
Member of the second Secret Six, 261
1816–1901: Thaddeus Hyatt
Member of the second Secret Six, 261
1817–1862: Henry David Thoreau
Member of the second Secret Six, 261
1819–1891: Herman Melville
Hostile to the United States, idolizes foreign lands as paradise, 349–350
1819–1892: Walt Whitman
I think I could turn and live with animals . . . , 326–327
Visions of humanistic utopia, 327
1820s: 156, 963
1820–1903: Herbert Spencer, 58
1823–1911: Thomas Wentworth Higginson, 260, 261
1825–1829: John Quincy Adams
1839: Declares the War of Independence to have been a revolt against "the omnipotence of Parliament" to the "omnipotence of the God of battles," 47–48
1830s
American ships battle Malay pirates, 663–664
1831–1917: Franklin Benjamin Sanborn
Member of the Secret Six, 260, 261
1832: *America* written by S.F. Smith, 197
1833–1834: There was no system of state control of education in America until, 54
1835–1910: Mark Twain, 33–34
1837–1899: D. L. Moody, 1314
1839–1914: Charles S. Peirce, 205
1841–1843: Daniel Webster, 717
1848–1849: Horace Greeley, 1174
1850s, 204, 966, 1255
1853–1857: Franklin Pierce
1856: Fourth Annual Message, 1022
1856–1931: Frank Harris, 279–280

1857–1938: Clarence Darrow
1905: Issued a call that started the intercollegiate Socialist Society, 261
1859–1952: John Dewey
Influenced by Hegel, 58
Truth is an abstract noun, 205
Prophet of salvation by statist education, 344, 1040
Existentialism and pragmatism, 423
Philosophy of provided modern faith, 936
1860: Redefinition of freedom clearly dominant in the USA, 59, 1264
Mid-nineteenth century, a democratic spirit seeped into the churches, 156
1861–1865: American Civil War
As a rehearsal of total war, 479, 1034
Atrocities of, 479–480
As an evil war, 505
North involvement was less moral concern and more economic and sectional hatred, 505
Anti-Christian Unitarian beliefs of the Abolitionists, 505, 507
War followed the low ebb of theology in churches, 505
The South was staunchly Christian, its leaders were not, 505
Anti-slavery societies in the South, 506
Slavery and beliefs concerning in the South, 506
The Modern military strategy of total war began with, 509
Quantrill and General Sherman, 509
Property tax forced on the south after, 1258
1863: The Old Guard journal dedicated to the defense of secession
Cites writings of 1776 era as justification, 508
1864–1936: Abe Ruef, 961
Reconstruction Era, 266
1876–1916: Jack London
1905: Issued a call that started the intercollegiate Socialist Society, 261
1878–1968: Upton Sinclair
1905: Issued a call that started the intercollegiate Socialist Society, 261
1881–1965: Branch Rickey, 965–966
1882–1967: Edward Hopper, 799–800
1885–1889: Eugene Debs, 535
1886–1924: General John Pershing, 309
1886–1968: Karl Barth, 305
1892–1971: Reinhold Niebuhr, 305–306
1939: Delivered lectures on *The Nature and Destiny of Man*, 168
1898: Spanish-American War, 309
1898–1979: Herbert Marcuse, 58
1901–1909: Theodore Roosevelt
In some respect the Europeanization of America began with, 563
Unprincipled foreign policy of, 254
As the consummate politician, 878
Immigrants sworn into citizenship in order to vote for Roosevelt, 967
1902–1932: Associate Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr. (Supreme Court), 666–667
As the most influential on American law in the 20th century, 1009
1881: published *The Common Law*
The life of the law has been . . . experience, 666
1907
Pollution by horse population, 770
Welfare needs met by Christians, 1112, 1263
1909: *A History of the Future* written, *It will become clear that . . . morality itself is outdated . . . ,* 376–377

1909–1972: Saul Alinsky
Depends on the churches for his support, 390
1913–1921: Woodrow Wilson, 1338
As a political messiah, 91, 1128
Prophet of salvation by politics, 344
Work was prelude to greatest growth of imperialism, 344
Believed that he had a better way than Christ, 448
Influenced by Innocentine ideas of moral revival, 474
Subverted the Constitution, 831
Political lies of Wilson's era, 1080
Completed the US's shift from missions to military salvation, 1131
1919: Peace conference
The League of Nations is going to go one better than Christianity, 43
1917– 2009: Andrew Wyeth, 799–800
1918–present: Billy Graham, 137, 188, 951–592
1919–1972: Jackie Robinson, 966
1920s–30s
Teachers and professors praise the golden age that scientific planning would usher in, 192
1920–1986: Frank Herbert, Relativism of, 531–532
1928: Ernest Sutherland Bates published *The Friend of Jesu*, 541
1929–1933: Herbert Hoover, 698
1929: Opening of San Francisco Fox Theater, 144
1929–1968: Martin Luther King, Jr., 353, 965, 1175
1933–1945: Franklin D. Roosevelt, 40, 448, 159–160
1939: The Great Depression, 360–361, 698, 888
1939–2006: Stewart Albert, 390
1942–1994: Mario Savio, 390

Western Europe

1804–1815: Napoleon Bonaparte (France), 737–738, 1058
1804–1876: Aurore Dudevant (George Sand), (France), 327
1806–1856: Max Stirner (Germany)
Influenced by Hegel, 58
Attacked by Karl Marx for his anarchistic views, 40, 423–424
Humanism of, 40, 300
Hails *Rameau's Nephew,* 413
1806–1873: John Stuart Mill (England), 58, 59, 331
1809–1882: Charles Darwin (England)
Postmillennialism predates, 62
Faith in the omnipotence of chance, 237–238, 275, 447
Could not account for the existence of the eye by chance, 577
Defended by Huxley, 275
Held to white superiority, 1129
Modern lie that he renounced evolution before his death, 1175
1859: Publishes *On the Origin of Species*
Wide acceptance of, seen as liberation from God, 517
Crumbled the Enlightenment doctrine of nature as sovereign, 979
Hailed by Marx and Engels, 980, 1027
1818–1883: Karl Marx (Germany), 324
Saw Max Stirner as a threat, attacked his anarchistic theories with socialistic ones, 40, 423–424
And alternatives to freedom under God and liberty under law, 57

Incorporated both anarchism and socialism into his system, 59
Careless lifestyle of, 254
Utopianism of, 363
Views of taxes, 672
Attacked the abstractness of critical analysis, 411
As a tool in the hands of more evil men, 892
Idealism of, 961
1851: Fathered illegitimate child by his servant, 767
1820–1830: George IV (England), 765
1825–1895: Thomas Huxley (England), 275
1826–1875: Princess Alexandra of Bavaria, 765
1837–1901: Queen Victoria, 1220
1837–1901: Victorian Era, 794
1844–1900: Friedrich Nietzsche (Germany)
Influenced by Hegel, 58
Influenced by Emerson, 59
Called for an amoral language, 391
Views elite man as sovereign god of the social order, 413
Argued that because there is no God, there is no law, 414
Ended his life in a mental institution, 415
Hostility to marriage and women, 269, 420
Teaches that the world can only be understood by intuition, history, and the hero, 442
I hold the future of mankind in the palm of my hand, 443
Called for the death of man to prepare the world for superman, 190, 485
Utopianism of, 363
1856–1939: Sigmund Freud (Austria), 217, 344, 384, 492, 447
1858–1917: Émile Durkheim (France), 1169
1864–1886: Ludwig of Bavaria, 765
1869–1954: Henri Matisse (France), 798
1872–1970: Bertrand Russell (England), *I think if people solve their social problems religion will die out,* 384
1875–1961: Carl Jung (Switzerland), 344, 860
1883–1946: John Maynard Keynes (England)
1923: *The long run is a misleading guide to current affairs. In the long run we are all dead,* 848
1887–1975: Julian Huxley, 127
1895–1987: Cornelius Van Til (Netherlands), 559–574, 575–576
1905–1980: Jean-Paul Sartre
Influenced by Hegel, 58
Defined freedom as freedom from God, 61
Hell is . . . other people, 191, 319
Hostility to marriage and women, 269
Exalts a homosexual as a saint, 276
Viewed revolutionary thinking as heroic, 883
1914: Sinking of the *Titanic,* 810
Red Reign of Terror (Hungary), 262–263
1921–2007: Hans Koningsberger (Holland), 553
1923: German monetary collapse, 466
1928: Kellogg-Briand pact, 147–148, 196, 1128
1934–1945: Adolf Hitler, 40, 213–214, 260, 273, 293
As a theologian of humanism, 306
Idealization of the primitive Teuton, 339
Believed in neither God nor conscience, 408
As a product of past centuries, 442

Break with Stalin, 500
As a patron saint, 596
And chemical and biological warfare, 755
Pagan zeal of, 796
Definition of freedom, 883
Separation of justice and law led to, 1009
Racism of, 1129

Soviet and Pre-Soviet East

1814–1876: Mikhail Bakunin, 435
1855–1881: Alexander II
1856: *Reforms must come from above unless one wishes them to come from below,* 402
1902: Eruption of Mount Pelee (France), 850
1905–1924: Vladimir Lenin, 40, 361, 525, 883, 892
1917: Russian Revolution
As the longed-for proletarian revolution, 442
Intended the planned murder of all who represented the old order, 485
Strength of humanism in, 184
Run by Bolsheviks, fought by dupes, 354
Based on the concept of natural law, 635
Hatred of the family, 900
1921: Sailors revolt against the Bolsheviks, 354
1918–1925: Leon Trotsky, 883
Red Army under, 1121
1918–2008: Alexander I. Solzhenitsyn, 28, 482, 502
1922–1991: Soviet Union, 387, 435–439, 864
1922–1952: Joseph Stalin, 40, 525, 883, 1075
1930s
Centralized farming destroyed production, 1101

Elsewhere

1815: Congress of Vienna, 499–500
1927–1949: Red (Communist) China
Humanistic communism of, 481, 656–657
Forced abortion in, 650, 917
Exploitation of women in, 775
Glorified in America, 1075
Children used as soldiers in, 1083

The World Wars

Birth and death rates, 210
Depressions in the US short before WWI, 701
As holy crusades, 1028
Adaption of Christian hymns by other religions, 1392
World War 1, 473
Peace treaties after, 494
The old orthodox social order of the Netherlands collapsed, 563
Massacre of Armenians during and after, 500
Smyrna Massacres, 500

Constitutionalists protested the use of drafted troops, 831
Laid the foundation for WWII, settled nothing, 866
Saw the beginning of modern total war, 1034
Black voting bloc began to grow in power, 1079
Versailles Treaty, 473
World War II
Peace treaties after, 494
The US kept Biblical law concerning habitual criminals until after, 84
Turkey received huge sums after, 500
As a war between competing versions of humanism, 624
England's evacuation of children from London, 850

After World War II

Resistance to preaching that was not positive, 154
Some civil governments have raised the income tax to over 100%, 731
Rootlessness, 818
Sexual view of the nature of man, 1230
1945: One third of the US population was on farms, 854
1945–1976: Mao Tse-tung, 761, 883
1948: United Nations; Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 197
1950s: 899, 1291, 1071
1950–1953: Korean War, 27, 266, 309
1951: Albert Camus, *It is necessary to deride what is good and choose what is evil, 787*
1952–present: Elizabeth II (England), 47
1964–1980: Alexei Kosygin (Soviet Union), 201–202
1967: Met with President Johnson in New Jersey, 201
1965: Maurice Cornforth published Marxism and the Linguistic Philosophy, 230
1968–1999: Khmer Rouge (Cambodia), 485
1976–2008: Fidel Castro, 883
1989–1990, 1990–1999: Franjo Tudman, 510

United States of America

Warfare between modern establishment and Christian schools, 417
Troops in action globally, 964
1946–1953: Chief Justice Frederick Moore Vinson, 434
1948–present: Lynette "Squeaky" Fromme
1975: Attempts to assassinate President Ford, 381
1950
Low crime rate in one example city, 312
Contrasted with the high crime rate in, 312, 1070
Faith expressed in secular education, 936
Reconstruction progress since, 1265
1951: A group of prominent Americans write *The Fabulous Future: America in 1980*
Humanistic vision of, 237
1952: The Supreme Court began to dismantle Biblical premise of law, 488, 632
1954–2004: *Dragnet* (TV program), 782
1955–1975: Vietnam War, 348–349
Unconstitutionality of, 27, 266, 309
The draft, 348
Opposition to was grounded in humanism, 27
The political left hostile to the war, 348

Communist controlled demonstrations against, 348
Liberal solution to Vietnam was 'democracy,' 355, 356
1958–1967: Clark Kerr, President of the University of CA, 1217
1960s
School teacher, *In the modern world, freedom is obsolete,* 220, 273
Feminist movement of, 420
Manifestation of a war against the establishment, 831
Rushdoony had never heard "I'm bored" prior to, 836
The courts have been stripping the US of Biblical law since, 969
Freedom to do as one pleases viewed as the only valid morality, 1131
Growth of churches bypassing the seminary, 1173
Humanistic view of work in a senatorial election, 1284
Student Movement of, 730
Worldwide student action, followed by student inertia, 553
Governed by Locke's myth of consent, 404
Pits the ostensibly holy innocence of youth against the corrupt establishment, 475, 476–477
Rejection of older people, 899
Led by young ex-feminists and ex-Trotskyites, 1138
Held that work was unnecessary slavery, 1284
1961–1963: John F. Kennedy, 348, 613, 918, 1091
1963–1969: Lyndon B. Johnson
Call to world revolution, 763
Civil rights won before, 965
1948: *The civil rights program… is a farce and a sham*, 160
1967: met with Soviet dictator Kosygin in New Jersey
He and I have agreed that we want a world of peace, 201
1965: Jesse Reichek published *etcetera,* a wordless book of meaningless drawings, 969
1966
National Council Study Guide says that the church *exists for the world,* 187
18th National Convention of the Communist Party
Syncretism of, 202
Nine girls surrender without a fight to home intruder, 227
Girl kidnapped by juvenile court for persisting in wiping her utensils at school, 233
President Johnson called for gun control, 234
Federal government used tax money to set up a federal-government run newspaper, 234
State of California publishes a book on the Bill of Rights, 240–241
More than 100,000 college students threaten suicide, more than 10,000 attempt it, and 1,000 succeed, 385
1967: First Satanist wedding in San Francisco, with Lois Murgenstrumm as nude "living altar," 391
1968: "A Proposal for a Poor Children's Bill of Rights," 477
1968–1981: Robert McNamara, 1032
1969–1974: Richard Nixon, 348, 613, 1073
1970s
Mid-1970s: Senator equated morality with legality, 617, 641–642, 899
1970
High crime rate of, 312, 545
1971: Individual in California filed suit against the federal government for earthquake damages, 25
1972
Presidential election of, 212
1973
Kindergarten and primary grade teachers report lawlessness and anarchy in their students, 386

Roe v. Wade, 1072, 1136
1974–1975: 80.65 million Americans supported by taxes, 1285
1975: 381, 808
1976: about 20% of the electorate called itself conservative, 40% in 1984, 1138
1979: *Time* magazine featured book claiming cannibalism may never have existed, 459
1980
Election of, 598
Economic state of the US, 679
1981
Israel's inflation rate was down 30% from 1980, 100
Monetary Control Act went into effect, 678
1981–1989: Ronald Reagan
1982:Introduced a bill to control Christian schools and churches, 601
1982: Pastor jailed for refusing to surrender church control to the state, 1287
1983: *Bob Jones University vs. United States*, 48
1984 Presidential election, 1138
1989–1993: George H. W. Bush, 86, 1370
1991
California Governor Pete Wilson vetoed a "gay rights" bill, 86
President Bush, Vice President, and Secretary of Education work to get a school-choice voucher plan through, 86
1992:
Los Angeles riots over the Rodney King case, 198, 657, 1004
John Gotti found guilty for multiple crimes, riot breaks out, 198
1993–2001: Bill Clinton
1999: Impeachment trial of, 752
2003–2011: Iraq War, 1035, 1338

SCRIPTURE INDEX

Genesis

1 . . . . . 1101, 1172, 1175
1:1 3
1:2 789
1:3 . . . . . 591, 1100
1–11 . . . . . .126–128, 1132
1:26. . . . . 1215, 1230, 1232, 1247
1:26–28. . . . . 189, 194, 373, 470, 530, 939, 1064, 1271, 1332, 1402
1:28. 1113
1:28–31. 276
1:31. . . . . 359, 1198
2:7 1200
2:7–17 1066
2:15. 1332
2:18. 1250
2:24. 913
3 813
3:1 . . . . . 116, 410, 718, 1007
3:1–5 . . . . . .116, 358, 586, 1007, 1008, 1011, 1066, 1333
3:1–6 . . . . . .116, 117, 1332
3:5 . . . . 15, 19, 38, 131, 135, 177, 191, 199, 269, 329, 336, 338, 342, 375, 461, 469, 605, 606, 621, 623, 627, 628, 652, 1010, 1018, 1020, 1052, 1053, 1100, 1136, 1187, 1190, 1230, 1271, 1331, 1391, 1402, 1414, 1440
3:12. . . . . 814, 1248, 1332
3:13. 1248
3:15. 7
3:24. 744
4:17. . . . . 744, 849
6:9 1349
6:13–22. 1349
6:18. 1350
9:1–17 1350
11:1–9 590
11:4. . . . . 590, 890
14:6. 1052
14:14 1166
19:5. 801
25:8. 1379
25:17 1379
26:8. 944
29:35 7–8
43:32 522
49:9. 7
49:10 . . . . . .7, 8

Exodus

3:5 629
3:13–15. 1169
3:14. 1167
3:14ff 721
3:16. 1167
5:1 18
9:29. 1257
13:14ff. 913
16:12 166
20:3. . . . . .1107, 1147
20:5. 200
20:5–6 697
20:12 . . . . . 897, 900
20:14 897
20:15 . . . . . 725, 897
20:16 659
20:17 . . . . . 725, 897
21:22–25 546
21:23 653
22:1. 653

22:1–6 653
22:10–11 659
22:19 626
22:21–24 69
23:1–3 659
23:2. 1275
30:11–16 108
31:3. 427
32:26 714
34:6. 1295
34:12–16 623
34:14 1304
36:1–4 793
36:3. 1258

Leviticus
5:1 659
6:1–6 659
11:10–13 521
11:20 521
11:23 521
11:41–42 521
18. 156
18:22 521
18:23 626
18:30 521
19:2. 455
19:15 . . . . . 297, 1078
19:15–16 659
19:15–18 1325
19:20 659
19:33–37 1325
19:35–37 683
20:1–5 904
20:7. 668
22:21 1258
24:22 745
25:10 1258
25:24–28 1391
25:47–54 1391
26:36 1288
27:30–33 1259

Numbers
1:47–54. 54
10:9. 1034
14:4. 930
14:18 1295
18:21ff. 54
18:25–26 107
23:19 11
24:17 8
25:6–15. 673
35:12 1391
35:19 1391

Deuteronomy
1:17. . . . . 659–660, 1011, 1078
5:7 395
5:16. . . . . .1320, 1357
5:18. 1357
5:19. . . . . 725, 1357
5:20. 659
5:21. . . . . 725, 1357
5:33. 718
6:5 862
6:24. 56
8:3 . . . . . 130, 1070
10:14 1257
14:22–27 1259
14:28–29 1259
15:1. 1274
15:1–6 . . . . . 709, 1274
15:1–11. 683
15:3. 1274
15:4–6 1274
16:3. 1259
16:10–11 1258
16:13 1259
16:16 1259
16:20 56
17:6–7 659
17:7. 659
17:14–20 56
19:15 659
19:15–21 659
20:10–11 1034
20:19–20 1034
21:18–21 . . . . . 84, 653, 1312
22:5. 626
22:23–24 1395
25:9–10. 629
25:13–16 683
25:14–16 592
28. . . . . 385, 458, 480, 678, 808, 1268
30:15–20 697
30:19 . . . . . 533, 697
32:35 94
33:10 . . . . . .54, 925

Joshua
1:1–9 1196
1:1ff. 1232
1:3 1196
1:9 1196
5:15. 629
24:15 . . . . . 23, 87, 273, 575, 681, 711, 822, 907, 1359

Judges
2:10. 1379
5:20. 697
6:25. 600
7:18. 1383
19:22 801
21:25 . . . . . .9, 376, 1045, 1363

1 Samuel
3:10. 630
8 1260
8:15. 1258
8:17. 1258
8:18. . . . . .1261, 1269
15:22 1252
17:47 585

2 Samuel
19:10 110

1 Kings
1:6 1256
2:1–4 56
18:19 1315
18:21 . . . . . 52, 61, 1011
21:1–2 916
21:3. 897

2 Kings
15:16 1034
17:35–36 1276

1 Chronicles
28:9. 1164

2 Chronicles
19:2. 959
36:21 654

Nehemiah
6:3 515
8:9–10 444
8:10. 1409
10:30 1274
10:31 1274

Esther
4:11. 140

Job
2:1–7 116
12:1-2. 1338
13:15 . . . . . 1197, 1301–1302
19:25 1390
38:7. 1198

Psalm
book of 1299–1300
1:1–2 1299
2 . . . . . 23, 236, 651, 813, 1048
2:1–12 1425
2:2-4 977
2:4 . . . . . 189, 253, 377, 1196
2:9 . . . . . 253, 977
2:10–12. . . . . 504, 1392
4:4 1299
4:8 360
5:12. 586
8:2 1232
8:6ff. 1232
9:19. 489
9:20. 489
14:1–3 742
19:11 696
19:14 1390
22:1. 1390
22:27 8
22:27–28 63
23. . . . . .1300, 1342
23:1. 1299–1300
24:1. . . . . 54, 203, 235, 683, 905, 955, 1257, 1384
24:2. 351
27:14 1298
29:3. 1199
32:10 954
34:14 1346
36:1. . . . . .83, 131, 684, 1288
36:9. 1168
37:10 954
37:11 954
37:17 954
41:1–2 1444
46:2. 271
50:18 960
51:3–4 337
51:4. . . . . 307, 324
51:10 324
53:1–3 742
58:11 696
59:9. 586
59:16 586
62:8. 1195
63:1–2 75
66:16 684
69:9. 1278
72:8. . . . . .63, 1271–1272
72:11 . . . . . 8, 63
73:27 954
78:35 1390
84:5–7 1321

86:9. 8
90:3. 1024
91:8. 696
94:20 652
97:1. 640
97:10 . . . . . 228, 959
100:1–2. 1418
100:4 . . . . . 140, 1418
102:25 3
111:10 1275
112:7–8. 1275
115:3 1196
115:8 501
118:24 73
119 . . . . . .56, 652, 838, 1231
119:104–105 492
120:7 1319
126:5–6. . . . . 677, 681
127:1 . . . . . 103, 147, 221, 325, 498, 501, 555, 652, 669, 751, 1406
136 1316
136:26 1316
139:14 1215
139:21–22 959
144:12–15 681

Proverbs
1:7 . . . . . 158, 1275
2:21–22. 954
3:7 1323
6:6–15 691
6:23. 56
6:27. . . . . 684, 835
8:15–16. 56
8:34–36. 1231
8:35–36. 1277
8:36. . . . . 179–180, 218, 321–322, 385, 431–432, 533, 547, 669, 678, 718, 751, 756, 809, 811, 1035, 1150, 1282
10:16 692
10:22 . . . . . 725, 1004–1005
12:10 665
12:22 521
14:23 . . . . . 691, 715
14:30 1005
15:8. 521
16:4. 1197
19:23 . . . . . 143, 1287
20:23 521
22:7. . . . . 709, 1273
24:11–12 1140
26:17 122
27:4. 1005
28:1. 1275
29:18 . . . . . .220, 386, 460, 680
29:25 . . . .143, 982, 987, 1275, 1287
31:6. 1125
31:10–31 416

Ecclesiastes
3:1 962
3:8 962
11:1. 677
12:13 . . . . . 167, 1275

Isaiah
1:13. 521
1:22. . . . . 516, 768
2:1–4 326
2:22. . . . . 331, 516, 768
3:7 927
3:12. 927
6:3 1373
7:14. 1384
8:20. . . . . 57, 282, 637, 661
9:4 1383
9:6 . . . . . 109, 110, 113, 246, 866, 1030, 1107
9:6–7 . . . . . 643, 703, 1383, 1418
9:7 . . . . . 884, 1425
24:2. 102
24:16 1239
26:13 110
30:9–10. . . . . 154, 155–156
30:10 . . . . . 158, 168, 524
32:15 1238
36:12 1220
40:15 . . . . . .28, 982
40:17 253
40:23–24 28
40:30 1297
Isaiah 40:31. . . . . 703, 1297
41:10 1289
41:14 1390
41:18-19 1238
42:1. 1184
43:14 1390
43:20 1238
44:3. 1184
44:6. 1390
44:24 1390
45:5. 18
45:7. 1331
47:4. 1390
48:17 1390
49:7. 1390
49:26 1390
53:6. 98

53:12 98
54:5. 1390
54:7–8 1390
55:11 169
56:10 157
57:20–21 . . . . . 361, 1168
57:21 1385
59:1. 1206
59:1–2 1205
59:4. 1205
59:14–15 825
59:20 1390
59:21 1184
60:1. 1390
60:12 63
60:16 1390
63:16 1390

Jeremiah
8:2 1220
16:1–4 1180
50:29 659
50:34 1390

Lamentations
1:12. 1446
1:22. 659

Ezekiel
7:3ff. 1248
21:26–27 1400
21:27 8
34:4. 370
35:11 1005
36:25 905
36:25–26 1186
36:25–28 1184
36:27 1185
36:28 1185

Hosea
1:10. 1238
9:7 86

Joel
2:28–29. . . . . 17, 1184

Amos
1:13. 1034
3:3 . . . . . 866, 1251
5:15. 959

Obadiah
verse 15. 659

Jonah
4:4 1352
4:9–11 1352

Micah
4:5 5
5:5 1387
6:8 . . . . . 177, 1251

Nahum
3:16. 1273

Habakkuk
2:1–4 1180
2:4 1178

Zechariah
3:1–10 116
4:10. . . . . 439, 467, 915, 1137
14:7. 1069

Malachi
2:3 1220
3:6 . . 11, 14, 197, 342, 1167, 1206
3:8-10. 22
3:8–10 . . . . . .1258, 1260
3:8–12 . . . . . .1267, 1268

Matthew
1:21. 1389
2:1–2 1414
2:1–12 1404–1407
2:2 1422
2:16–23. 1310
4:1–11 . . . . . 117, 966
4:3–4 1108
4:4 . . . . . 118, 130, 206, 255, 1070, 1102, 1142, 1161, 1199, 1329, 1369, 1403
4:5–7 . . . . . .1108, 1311
4:7 1403
4:8–10 1108
4:10. . . . . .1074, 1403
5:6 . . . . . .1231, 1278
5:9 1369
5:11. 696
5:13. . . . . 741, 1149, 1288
5:14. . . . . .1149, 1288
5:17–18. 119
5:17–19. 117
5:17–20. 1253
5:20. 1336
5:23–24. 1368
5:38–42. 1199
6:6–15 1314

6:7–8 1315
6:9 898
6:9–10 1311
6:10. . . . . .1233, 1308
6:12. 1368
6:19–20. 726
6:24. . . . . 720, 1014, 1322
6:27. 1298
6:32–33. 725
6:33. . . . . .17, 72, 82, 136, 256, 343, 447, 809, 939, 1035, 1113, 1129, 1147, 1148, 1162, 1190, 1271, 1280, 1308, 1318, 1443
6:34. 458
7:1–2 . . . . . .1324, 1334
7:5 1074
7:7 72
7:9–10 1010
7:15–20. 72
7:16. . . . . 758, 783
7:20. . 83, 101, 102–103, 119, 1348
7:24–27. . . . . .332, 742, 907, 955
7:24–28. 1440
7:24–29. . . . . 174, 452
7:27. 158
8:22. . . . . 515, 1353
9:11. 1417
9:17. 501
10. 1213
10:14 1213
10:18 388
10:25ff. 1030
10:28 1275
10:30 987
10:32–33 585
10:34–35 . . . . . 454, 534
10:34–36 1425
10:37 919
10:39 678
11:19 1198
12:43–45 1134
13:18–22 954
13:22 247
15:6. . . . . .1160, 1336
15:11 1337
16:6–11. 1337
16:18 . . . . .79, 271, 303, 424, 600
16:25 678
17:5. 118
18:15 1366
18:15–17 1366–1367
18:16 1367
18:17 1367
18:20 91
18:21–22 1368
19. 1323
19:16–22 1251
19:18–19 1325
19:21 1260
19:24 . . . . . 725, 1004
19:26 . . . . . 725, 1309
20:12 1077
20:25–27 1004
20:25–28 . . . . . 375, 1148
20:26–28 1443
21:23 103
22:6–7 726
22:15–22 670
22:16–17 670
22:19–21 671
22:34–40 1325
22:37–39 867
23:13–33 481
23:14 998
23:23 1260
23:27 1134
23:28 1368
24:15 522
24:28 382
25:1–13. . . . . 103, 169
25:14–30 . . . . . 169, 725
25:26 169
25:30 294
25:31–46 . . . . . 247, 1368
25:31ff. 4
25:34 3
25:40 . . . . . .79, 994
25:41–46 82–83
25:45 1446
25:46 79
26:30 1425
26:52 . . . . . 399, 1102
27:40 793
28:18 . . . . . 109, 110, 938
28:18–20 . . . . 68, 76, 1196, 1206, 1218, 1225, 1227
28:19 . . . . . 22, 1177
28:19–20 . . . . . .1150, 1232

Mark

4:28. . . . . 450, 1137, 1199
8:35. 678
10:25 725
10:42–45 375
11:24 1307–1308
12:25 15
12:25–26 1379
12:30 1408
14:26 1425
15:39 830

Luke
1:26–38 1394–1398
1:29-30 1395
1:32–33 1400
1:46–50 1400
1:46–55 . . . . . 1399–1403, 1422
1:51–53 . . . . . 1399, 1400
1:52 . . . . . 1386, 1401
1:54–55 1401
1:71 987
1:74–75 987
2:1–20 1409
2:8–15 1388–1393
2:14 10
2:15 1393
2:46–55 1415
6:38 1345
6:46 304
7:34 1198
8:2–3 725
9:24 678
10:27 . . . . . 470, 862
10:27–37 1368
10:29–37 1325
10:31–32 598
11:49–51 . . . . . 97, 98
12:16–21 726
12:30–31 725
12:48 737–738
14:12–14 1368
14:18–19 726
14:27–33 874
14:35 876
16:1–8 . . . . . 720, 725
16:9 . . . . . 720, 721
16:14 1337
16:17 . . . . . 119, 280
16:19–31 725
17:7–10 1244
17:10 1244
17:33 678
18:1 1309
18:11 1328
19:1–9 725
19:8 653
19:12–27 725
19:13 . . . . . 174, 303, 400, 830, 939, 1040, 1247
19:14 . . . . . 87, 395, 483, 1041
22:42 469
23:50–53 725
24:49 17

John
1:3 . . . . . 174, 469, 637, 938, 1169, 1391
1:3–4 452
1:4 1149
1:5 591
1:9 118
1:12 830
1:14 . . . . . 794, 1390
1:29 98
2:17 1278
3:1–3 1189
3:5 1189
3:29 188
4:34 1355
5:18 1077
7:5 1417
7:17 1368
7:24 1334
8:7 158
8:9 158
8:12 981
8:31–34 1059
8:31–36 . . . . . 485, 631, 709
8:32 1066
8:32–36 1052
8:33–36 1050
8:34–36 939
8:36 . . . . . 625, 1051, 1066
10:9 1207
10:20 1417
14:1 1425
14:6 . . . . . 11, 825, 835, 939, 1059, 1066, 1231, 1271, 1278
14:13 1308
14:15 1066
14:27 . . . . . 10, 1290
15:1–8 1149
15:6 1149
15:15–17 1368
15:16 . . . . . 427, 1196, 1308
16:23 1308
16:33 . . . . . 1181, 1290, 1292
18:15–16 1117
18:33–35 951
18:36 951
18:38 . . . . . 330, 825
19:15 . . . . . 994, 1422

Acts
2:36 938
4:12 1083
5:29 . . . . . 55, 602, 1358, 1369
6 . . . . . 108, 1441
6:1 69

6:1–6 . . . . . 69, 1357
6:7 1117
6:8 1443
7 108
7:60. 1443
8:5–40 1443
9:6 1348
9:36ff.. 1147
10:28 521
15:18 360
17:28 . . . . . 897, 1308
21:39 602
21:40 602

Romans
1:16–17. 1178
1:17. . . . . .1178, 1179
1:17–21. 495
1:18. 118
1:18–20. 36
1:18ff.. . . . . .1157, 1165
1:20. 1165
1:25. 1059
1:28–32. 1181
2:13. 1181
3:10. . . . . 291, 652, 742
3:12. . . . . 376, 742
3:18. 131
3:23. 343
3:23–26. 1178
3:24. 1178
3:28. . . . . .1181, 1182
3:31. . . . . 652, 1348
5:1 . . . . . .1181, 1182
5:1–9 1294
5:8 1391
5:9 . . . . . .1181, 1182
6:4 1186
6:23. . . . . 458, 523, 681
8:2 1008
8:4 . . . . . 119, 1177
8:7 . . . . . .1180, 1187
8:19–23. 1235
8:28. . . . . 62, 63, 253, 439, 492, 507, 678, 1288, 1293–1294, 1321, 1372
8:30. 1182
8:31. . . . . 587, 872, 955
8:37. . . . . .6, 188, 424, 489, 830–831, 1188, 1196, 1291, 1385, 1411
8:38–39. 816
10:17 149
12:2. 608
12:10 196
12:18 1346
13. 1323
13:1–4 . . . . . .1093, 1127
13:1–5 1362–1363
13:1–6 1358
13:1–8 . . . . . 55, 1257
13:3. 55
13:3–4 604–605
13:5. 55
13:8. . . . . 654, 677, 709, 1274
13:8–10. . . . . .1325, 1358
13:10 . . . . . 867, 1325, 1363
13:12 1364
13:13 1364
13:14 1364
14:23 1208
15:5. 1295

1 Corinthians
1:18–31. 575
1:19–29. 1338
1:26. 1120
3:11. 742
4:2 131
6 . . . . . .76, 1147, 1441
6:19–20. 1371
6:19f. 18
6:20. 586
7:3 945
7:15. 1312
7:23. 709
9:27. 22
10:13 1291
10:26 1257
10:31 522
11:26 178
12:27 129
15:20 1199
15:21ff. 644
15:23–26 175
15:24–27 179
15:26 920
15:32 303
15:35–37 1198
15:36–38 1378
15:44 1200
15:45–47 . . . . . 285, 1389
15:45–49 1423
15:45–57 1271
15:45ff. 1247, 1449
15:47–50 130
15:53–54 1200
15:58 . . . . . 400, 445
16:22 1367

2 Corinthians
3:17. . . . 92, 420, 697, 1061, 1165
5:17. . . . . .837, 1179, 1199, 1271
5:21. 98
6:17. . . . . 334, 415
8:14. 1077
9:6 1021
10:5. 1198
11:13–15 . . . . . 116, 117
11:14–15 632

Galatians
1:7–8 117
1:14. 1077
2:16. 1182
2:16–17. 1182
2:17. 1182
3:13. 98
3:24. 1182
3:24–29. 1183
3:28. 325
4:16. 524
5:1 366
5:12. 1219
6:7 . . . . . 758, 1021
6:16. 1441

Ephesians
1:7 1391
1:17–23. 179
1:19–23. 651
1:22. 129
2 1260
2:13–14. 1386
4:1–2 80
4:5 54
4:23. 149
4:24. . . . . .149, 1064, 1215, 1230
4:25. . . . . .71, 81, 114
4:28. 1005
4:30. 149
5:14. . . . . 103, 125, 366
5:14–16. 876
5:19. 1425
6:1 1320
6:1–3 900
6:2 1320
6:4 900
6:10–13. 545

Philippians
1:1 108
2:4–8 1341
2:6 1077
2:9–11 . . . . . 47, 610, 938
2:11. . . . . .54, 585
3:2–3 1220
4:2 1340
4:4 . . . . . 987, 1377, 1409
4:4–6 1345
4:5 . . . . . 791, 792
4:7 1345
4:19. 1318
4:22. 1117

Colossians
1:16. 586
1:18. 129
3:10. . . . . 1064, 1215, 1230
3:13. 80
4:1 1077

1 Thessalonians
4:9 196
4:12. 1357
5:16. 188

2 Thessalonians
2:4 599
3:14–15. 1367

1 Timothy
2:1–2 1137
2:1–4 1370–1371
3:10–13. 108
3:16. 1183
5:8 1357
6:3 54
6:10. 726
6:15. . 109, 112, 174, 395, 610, 793, 1371, 1411, 1414, 1422, 1439
6:15–16. 590

2 Timothy
2:9 203
2:15. . . . . 411, 686, 930
3:5 . . . . . 953, 1215, 1337
6:15. 1415

Titus
1:15. 726
1:16. 521
3:5 1187
3:7 1183

Hebrews
4 1377
4:1–16 1387
4:15. . . . . .1247, 1390
5:6 1406

6:6 . . . . . 87, 1352
7:5 54
7:11. 1008
7:17. 1008
9:28. 98
10:9. . . . . 295, 1403
10:31 1287
11:6. . . . . .1305, 1306
11:7. 1350
11:10 . . . . . 439, 748
12:1–11. 696
12:2. 1318
12:14 . . . . . 196, 1345
12:15 . . . . . .1085, 1351
12:22–24 68
12:25–29 954
12:26–29 . . . . . .1384, 1400
12:27 8
12:29 1304
13:1. 196
13:5–6 1289
13:8. . . . . .1167, 1206

James
1:5–6 1309
1:6–7 11
1:7–8 412
1:25. . . . . .57, 631
1:27. 1447
2:12. . . . . .57, 631
2:14–26. 793
2:17–26. 1129
2:19. . . . . 914, 1305
2:20. . . . . .1227, 1319
2:26. . . .83, 103, 1227, 1319, 1348
4:1–3 . . . . . .1027, 1031
4:3 1308
4:12. 329

1 Peter
1:1 1228
2:13–14. . . . . .1362, 1364
2:15. 1364
2:17. 1364
2:19–25. 1364
2:24. 98
3:1–7 1364
3:7 1376
3:20. 1350
4:3 521
4:4 1228
4:17. . . . . 158, 273, 657

2 Peter
1:7 196
2:5 . . . . . 872, 1349

1 John
1:5 . . . . . .1149, 1304
3:4 . .98, 177, 334, 492, 1026, 1246
3:22. 1308
4:8 . . . . . .1161, 1304
5:4 . . . . . 175, 484, 1153, 1190, 1206, 1207, 1417, 1425
5:15. 1308
5:16. 1313
8:12. 1149

2 John
verses 10–11 . . . . . 960, 1313

Revelation
book of 849
1:3 1241
1:6 1423
2:24. . . . . .1349, 1372
3:14–16. 586
3:15–16. 1319
3:16-17 282
3:19. 154
4:2 131
4:9 131
5:9 1391
5:13. 1378
11:15 . . . . . 82, 180, 1181, 1403
12. 1254
12:9. 116
12:11 1254
12:17 . . . . . .1253, 1254
13:4. 629
13:6. 629
13:10 . . . . . 399, 1295
13:16–17 629
13:16–18 584
18:4. 18
19:16 586
20:2. 1253
21. . . . . 744, 1391
21:3. 1378
21:4. 1377
21:5. . . . . 131, 867, 1392, 1397
21:8. 1275
21:16 1077
21:27 522
22. . . . . 744, 1391
22:2. . . . . 1149, 1150, 1378, 1409, 1410, 1432
22:3. . . . . .1377, 1386
22:7. 1241
22:15 . . . . . 177, 1059

WORKS CITED INDEX

"20th Century Man Menaced by Revival of 'Black Death'" (in *Santa Ana Register*, 1/21/66), 755
"250,000 U.S. Suicides Predicted During 70s" (in *Los Angeles Times*, 6/7/70), 550
1660: The Year of Restoration (Morrah; 1960), 43
1984 (Orwell; 1949), 222, 363, 364, 443, 818, 978, 1066
"Abide With Me" (Lyte; 1847), 852
"Abortions Held Way to Avoid Tyrants" (in *Los Angeles Times*, 5/20/70), 548–549
Accent on Power: The Life and Times of Machiavelli (Marcu; 1939), 710
A Century of Hero-Worship (Bentley; 1957), 442
A Christian Theory of Knowledge (Van Til; 1954), 540
"a clown's smirk in the skull of a baboon" (Cummings; 1931), 46
A Common Faith (Dewey; 1934), 1040
"The Act of Theatre" (McKayle; in *The Modern Dance: Seven Statements of Belief*), 789
Address of Franklin D. Roosevelt as Governor of New York, March 2, 1930 (Roosevelt; 1930), 159–160
Aesthetical and Philosophical Essays (Schiller; 1902), 219, 220
A Few Figs from Thistles (Millay; 1921), 783
A Fine Madness (Baker; 1964), 364
The Age of Crisis (Rosin; 1962), 259
The Age of Discontinuity (Drucker; 1969), 854
The Age of George III (White; 1968), 854
A Glimpse of Sions Glory (Knollys; 1641), 530
A History of New England, or Wonder-Working Providence of Sion's Saviour in New England (Johnson; 1654), 946
A History of Taxation and Expenditure in the Western World (Webber, Wildavsky; 1986), 728
"A Jesuit's Barrage at Alumni" (Donahue; in *Oakland Tribune*, 10/25/67), 760
Alexander Dolgun's Story: An American in the Gulag (Dolgun; 1975), 451
"All My Heart This Night Rejoices" (Gerhardt; 1656), *1409*
"All That Talk About Gold" (Demott; in *Time*, 10/5/81), 50
"Amazing Grace" (Newton; 1779), 1375
The American Crisis (Paine; 1776), *1293*
American Heritage
October 1971, 770
June 1972, 212
American History Illustrated (October 1979), 459

American History Told by Contemporaries (Hart; 1898-1901), 946
American Legion Magazine (November 1965), 658
American Medical News
May 25, 1970, 548
June 8, 1970, 547
The American Mercury (Summer 1969), 813, 814
American Picture Palaces: The Architecture of Fantasy (Naylor; 1981), 144–145
American Psychologist (May 1967), 21, 761
The American Way of Sex (Whittaker; 1974), 270
"America," or "My Country 'Tis of Thee" (Smith; 1832), 197
America's Revolutionary Spirit (Terry; 1977), 503
An Age of Ambition (Du Boulay; 1970), 369
The Ancien Régime: French Society, 1600–1750 (Goubert; 1973), 645–646
Anecdotes of Modern Art (Hall, Wykes; 1990), 800–801
An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding (Hume; 1748), 42
An Exposition of the First Epistle to the Corinthians (Hodge; [1857] 1950), 178
Angela Davis: The Making of a Revolutionary (Parker; 1973), 365
Animal Farm (Orwell; 1945), 192
"An Indian's Plea to the Churches" (Deloria; in *Los Angeles Times*, 2/6/72, 24
An Introduction to Medieval Institutions (Zacour; 1969), 496
An Introduction to Systematic Theology (Van Til; [1955] 1976), 1058–1059, *1158–1159*
An Outline of Man's Knowledge of the Modern World (Bryson, ed.; 1960, 275–276
Ante-Nicene Christian Library (1874)
Lactantius, vol. 1, 920
The Antichrist (Nietzsche; 1895), 969
Anti-Dühring (Engels; 1878), 1101
The Antiquities of the Christian Church (Bingham; 1850), *1260*
Antiquities of the Jews (Josephus; ca. 93–94), 1260
Anti-Semitism without Jews: Communist Eastern Europe (Lendvai; 1971), 1094
"Anti-Vietnam War Teaching Called Failure" (in *Los Angeles Times*, 10/12/67), 760
Apologeticus (Tertullian; 197), 445
Apostles' Creed, 865
A Practical View of the Prevailing Religious System of Professed Christians . . . Contrasted with Real Christianity (Wilberforce; 1797), *1209*
The Arabian Nights (anon.; date unknown), *1372*, *1373*
The Arabs (Kimball; 1983), 464
"Argentina Joins the Third World" (Koningsberger; in *The Nation*, 7/2/73), 553
"Armenia and Her Claims to Freedom and National Independence" (1919), 653–654
The Arrogance of Humanism (Ehrenfeld; 1978), 917
The Art of Europe: The Dark Ages from Theodoric to Charlemagne (Verzone; 1968), 139
The Asbury Theological Seminary Herald (Summer 1982), 1287
"Ask Ann Landers" (in *Los Angeles Herald-Examiner*; 4/24/69), 264
"A Song" (Whitman; in *Leaves of Grass*), 327
A Treatise on the Millennium (Hopkins; 1793), *1239–1240*
A World in Debt (Tilden; 1935), 709, 710–711, 713–714
Barron's Weekly
December 20, 1965, 226
July 31, 1967, 761
August 28, 1967, 761
"B.C." (Hart, comic strip; November 4, 1967), *1322*
The Bearing of Recent Discovery on the Trustworthiness of the New Testament (Ramsay; 1920), 369, 889, 1049–1050, 1090
"The Beasts" (Whitman; in *Leaves of Grass*), 327
Behold, He Cometh (Hoeksema; 1969), *1253–1254*
Being and Nothingness (Sartre; 1959), 315

Bertrand Russell Speaks His Mind (Russell; 1960), 384
Between Heaven and Earth (Werfel; 1944), 529
Beyond Abortion: The Theory and Practice of the Secular State (Rice; 1979), 48
Beyond Freedom and Dignity (Skinner; 1971), 818, 980–981, 1080, 1099
Big Bunny: The Inside Story of Playboy (Goldberg; 1967), 818
The Big Spenders (Beebe; 1966), *1174*
The Bill of Rights (1966), 240–241, 242, 243
The Bill of Rights (ratified 1791), 240–246, 283
The First Amendment, 48, 285, 387
The Second Amendment, 242
The Third Amendment, 242
The Fourth Amendment, 242
The Fifth Amendment, 658–661
The Ninth Amendment, 242
The Tenth Amendment, 242
The Thirteenth Amendment, 242
The Fourteenth Amendment, 242
The Fifteenth Amendment, 242
The Birth of France (Scherman; 1989), 394
The Birth of the Modern World Society, 1815–1830 (Johnson; 1991), 787–788
Bohemian versus Bourgeois (Grana; 1964), 443
The Bond of Power (Pearce; 1981), 1402
The Book of Common Prayer, 833
The Book of Journeyman (Nock; 1930), 871–872
The Book of Mormon, 12, 152
The Book of the Courtier (Castiglione; 1528), 115, 791
Book of the Three Habitations (Patrick; date unknown), 746
The Books of Homilies (1547, 1562, 1571), *1220–1221*
Borden of Yale '09 (Taylor; 1926), *1251*
"The Bourgeoisie and the Counterrevolution" (Marx; 1848), 672
Brave New World (Huxley; 1932), 363, 364
The Brave New World of the Enlightenment (Bredvold; 1961), 258
Break-Up: The Core of Modern Art (Kuh; 1966), 915
The Bride Stripped Bare (Hobhouse; 1988), 798
The Bridge at Chappaquiddick (Olsen; 1970), *1284*
"Brink of Credit Disaster" (in *Oakland Tribune*, 8/24/68), 708
Bristol Herald Courier (January 24, 1982), 650
The Brothers Karamazov (Dostoyevsky; 1880), 1044
By What Standard? (Rushdoony; 1958), 576, 579, 1429, 1441
Caesars and Saints: The Evolution of the Christian State, 180–313 A.D. (Perowne; 1962), 1151
California Jewish Press (September 10, 1965), 665
California Real Estate (February 1975), 991
Calvin: A Life (Stickelberger; 1954), 113
Calvin and the Calvinists (Helm; 1982), 1157
"Calvin and the Social Order" (Singer; in *John Calvin: Contemporary Prophet*), 112
Calvin (Hunt; 1933), 113
The Calvinistic Concept of Culture (Van Til; 1959), 740, 795, 911, 1145
The Canterbury Tales of Geoffrey Chaucer (Lumiansky, trans.; 1960), 94–95
Can These Bones Live? (Babson, Zuver; 1945), *1226*
The Cantos of Ezra Pound (Pound; 1954), 326, 798
Capitalism and the Historians (Hayek; 1954), 777
Capitalism: The Unknown Ideal (Rand, ed.; 1967), 701
"The Captain and the Kids" (Dirks, comic strip; ca. 1914–1979), 785–786
Captive City (Demaris; 1969), 309

The Carnal Myth (Dahlberg; 1968), 890
"Casting All Your Care upon God, for He Careth for You" (Washbourne; 17th century), *1391*
The Catcher in the Rye (Salinger; 1951), 208
Cavalcade (November 1967), 760
Cavalier (August 1972), 819
"Celebrating with Dr. Leary" (Trilling; in *Encounter*, June 1967), 884
Celestial Omnibus (Forster; 1911), 363
Chalcedon Report, 103, 1130, 1132, 1214, 1297, 1444
December 1967, 702
November 1, 1972, 768
March 1974, 105
February 1977, 1331
September 1980, 597
January 1981, 596
January 1989, 1140
November 1991, 1344
April 1996, 700
"The Charge of the Light Brigade" (Tennyson; 1854), 966
Chicago Daily News (June 3, 1969), 309
Chicago Tribune (April 7, 1970), 310
Children in Collectives: Child-Rearing Aims and Practices in the Kibbutz (Neubauer, ed.; 1965), 253
The Children of Darkness (Wheeler; 1973), 1119
The Children's Crusade (Gray; [1870] 1972), 476
Christ and the Caesars (Stauffer; [1952] 1955), *1415*
Christian Art (Morey; 1935), 380
The Christian Future (Rosenstock-Huessy), 657
Christianity and Classical Culture (Cochrane; 1944), 1118, 1120
Christianity and Liberalism (Machen; 1923), *1223*
Christianity and Paganism, 350–750 (Hillgarth, ed.; 1986), 247
"Christianity — Religion of the West" (Oliver; in *The American Mercury*, Summer 1969), 813
Christianity Rightly So Called (Craig; 1946), 1226
Christian Law Association Defender, 584
The Christian Philosophy of Law, Politics and the State (Taylor; 1967), 539
The Christian Science Monitor (December 7, 1968), 32
Christian Theistic Ethics (Van Til; [1947] 1971), 576, 578–579
The Christology of the Old Testament (Hengstenberg; [1829-1835]), 5, 6, 8
Church, State and Study (Barker; 1930), 90
The Cities of St. Paul (Ramsay; 1907), 602
The City of God (Augustine; 426), 605
The Civil Law Tradition (Merryman; 1969), 621
Clarel (Melville; 1876), 349
"Clipper Ships" (Fletcher; 1915), 1242
Colorado Daily, 459
"Come, My Soul, Thy Suit Prepare" (Newton; 1779), *1305*, *1375*
The Comic-Stripped American (Berger; [1953] 1974), 785
The Coming Dark Age (Vacca; 1973), 802
The Coming of Christ (Dodd; 1951), *1188*
The Coming of the Golden Age: A View of the End of Progress (Stent; 1969), 321, 939
Commentaries on the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans (Calvin; [1539] 1948), *1179*
Commentary on Ezekiel (Jerome; ca. 410-414), 1260
Commentary on St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians (Godet; 1886), 180
Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Isaiah (Calvin; 1958), 113

Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans (Hodge; [1882], 1983), *1182*
Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans (Luther; [1552], 1954), *1178–1179*
Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians (Grosheide; 1953), 179
The Common Law (Holmes; 1881), 666
Common School Journal (January 1, 1841), 512
Communist Manifesto (Marx; 1848), 777–778
Confessions (Augustine; ca. 397-400), *1222*
Conflicting Images of Man (Nicholls, ed.; 1966), 449
"Congregation" (in *Encyclopaedia Judaica*), 67
The Conquest of Poverty (Hazlitt; 1973), 777
Constitutional View of the Late War Between the States (Stephens; 1868), 509
The Corrupted Land: The Social Morality of Modern America (Cook; 1966), 20
"The Counterintellectuals" (Steinfels; in *New American Review* no. 14, 1972), 767
The Courtesans (Richardson; 1967), 766
The Court of Richard II (Mathew; 1968), 28, 369
Courts and Rights (Roche; 1963), 496, 497
The Crack in the Cosmic Egg (Pearce; 1971), 1402
"The Creation of International Monetary Order" (Lehrman; in *Money and the Coming World Order*), 680
Critique of Pure Reason (Kant; Smith, tr.; [1787] 1934), 425
"Culling All Police" (Halverson; in *Wall Street Journal*, 10/18/67), 761
"Culture is Destiny" (Zakaria; in *Foreign Affairs*, Mar-Apr 1994), 277
Current Bases for Educational Practice (Field; date unknown), 407
Dawn of Conscience (Breasted; 1933), 774
The Death and Rebirth of the Seneca (Wallace; 1970), 886–887
Death of Ivan Ilyich (Tolstoy; 1886), 550
The Decameron (Boccaccio; 1351), 111, 1361
The Decameron of Giovanni Boccaccio (Boccaccio; Payne, tr.; [1351] 1940), 111
The Declaration of Independence (1776), 197
"Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen" (passed 1789), 636, 644
Decline of an Empire: The Soviet Socialist Republics in Revolt (d'Encausse; 1979), 680
The Decline of Liberalism as an Ideology, with Particular Reference to German Politico-Legal Thought (Hallowell; 1943), 624, 1009
The Defense of the Faith (Van Til; 1955), 576
Defensible Space (Newman; 1972), 1072
Defiance #1: A Radical Review (Rader, ed.; 1970), 382, 383
De Profundis (Wilde; 1897), 1091
The Devil's Share (de Rougemont; 1944), 883
Dictionary of Christian Antiquities (Smith, Cheetham; 1875), *1443*
The Dictionary of Philosophy (Runes, ed.; 1942), 227, 252
The Didache (anon.; ca. 1st century), 547
Digest of the Divine Law (Rand; 1943), *1257–1258*, *1260*
The Dilemma of Education (Van Til; 1954), 939
The Disaster Lobby: Prophets of Ecological Doom and Other Absurdities (Grayson, Shepard; 1973), 803
Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison (Foucault; 1977), 1014
The Disintegration of Form in the Arts (Kahler; 1968), 874, 915
Divine and Moral Songs for Children (Watts; 1715), 856
The Divine Demon: A Portrait of the Marquis de Sade (Gear; 1963), 544
The Divine Institutes (Lactantius; in Ante-Nicene Christian Library), 920
Doctor Faustus (Marlowe; 1592), 34
The Doctrine of Eternal Punishment (Buis; 1957), 543
The Doctrine of Scripture (Van Til; 1967), 12, 135, *1162*
"The Dollar Crisis" seminar (Sennholz; 1969), 812
Don Bell Reports

October 20, 1967, 759
October 27, 1967, 763
The Doomsday Syndrome (Maddox; 1973), 803
Dragnet (TV series; 1951-1959, 1967-1970), 782
The Dream King: Ludwig II of Bavaria (Blunt; 1970), 766
"Dream Song 153" (Berryman; in 1968), 799
"Drug Addiction is Not Physiologic" (Ramirez; in *Science Digest*, 5/69), 268
"Drug Toll" (in *Twin Circle*, 5/17/70), 550
"Earl Warren Asks 'New Civilization'" (in *Los Angeles Herald-Examiner*, 12/14/70), 880
"Earth Has Many a Noble City" (Prudentius; ca. 348-413), *1415–1416*
"Eb and Flo" (Sellers, comic strip; February 6, 1970, *1327*
The Economic Role of the State (Orton; 1950), 370–371, 1071
Economics of the Free Society (Ropke; 1963), 706–707
The Ego and His Own (Stirner; 1844), 300
Eight American Poets (Conarroe, ed.; 1994), 799
"The Elements of Life" (Hoagland; in *An Outline of Man's Knowledge of the Modern World*), 275–276
"Eliminating the Old" (in Twin Circle, 6/14/70), 549
Encounter
June 1967, 884
September 1955, 647
Encyclopaedia Britannica (1968–1771), 92
Encyclopaedia Judaica (1971), 67
Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics (Hastings; [1908–1927]), 796
The End of Ideology (Bell; 1960), 1091
English Bible Translations (Einwechter; 1996), 151
The Enlightenment (Gay; 1967), 42, 446
The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians (Duncon; 1934), *1182–1183*
The Epistles of Paul to the Philippians and to Philemon (Muller; 1955), *1318*
The Erotic Minorities (Ullerstam; 1966), 762
Essay on Man (Pope; 1733-1734), 979
Essays Upon Popular Education (Carter; 1826), 877
est: The Steersman Handbook (Stevens; 1970), 883
etcetera (Reichek; 1965), 969
Existence: A New Dimension in Psychiatry and Psychology (May, Angel, Ellenberger, eds.; 1958), *1236*
"Ex. Nixon Doctor Upset Over Reaction to Plan" (Nelson; in *Los Angeles Times*, 5/3/70), 310
The Exorcist (film; 1973), 399
The Fables of Pilpay (anon.; 4th century B.C.), *1275*
Fabulous Congo (Bellotti; 1954), 662–663
The Fabulous Future: America in 1980 (various; 1950), 237, 238, 239
Face and Shadow (Stampfer; 1971), 617
Factors in American History (Polloard; 1935), 55
"The Facts of Life" (Ulman; in *Wall Street Journal*, 9/19/67), 760
The Failure of the "New Economics" (Hazlitt; 1959), 700
The Fall of the Dynasties, 1905–1922 (Taylor; 1963), 810
"Farewell Address" (Washington; 1796), 859
Farming for Famine (Prentice; 1936), 226
Farm Journal
August 1966, 225–226
October 1970, 855
April 1982, 997
Faust: A Tragedy (Goethe; 1808), 34, 288

Faust Revisited: Some Thoughts on Satan (Fishwick; 1963), 542
The Federalist, no. 44 (Madison; 1788), 717
The Fifth Seal (Aldanov; 1943), 381
"The Fifty-Year Debt Cycle" (McMaster; in *The Reaper*, 6/27/80), 710
"Findings in a Case of Schizophrenic Depression" (Minkowski; in *Existence: A New Dimension in Psychiatry and Psychology*), *1236*
The Fire and the Rose (Bryant; 1966), 369
Fire in the Streets (Viorst; 1979), 831
The First Apology (Justin Martyr; ca. 155–157), 1118
The First Rites: Worship in the Early Church (Stevenson; 1989), 163
"Five Centuries of Art Collecting in Dresden" (Menzhausen, in *The Splendor of Dresden: Five Centuries of Art Collecting*), 143
The Florentine Renaissance (Cronin; 1967), 183
Foreign Affairs, 206
  April 1949, 305
  March–April 1994, 277
Forerunners and Rivals of Christianity from 330 B.C. to 330 A.D. (Legge; 1915), 53
The Foundations of Christian Scholarship (North, ed.; 1979), 576, 579, 938–939
The Foundations of Social Order (Rushdoony; 1968), 979, 1448
"Fourth Annual Message" (Pierce; December 2, 1856), 1022
Frank Harris: A Biography (Pullar; 1976), 279
"Franklin Murphy on the Return of Renaissance Man" (Bryan; in *Los Angeles Herald-Examiner*, 12/11/66), 926–927
Frederick the Second, 1194–1250 (Kantorowicz; 1957), 42–43
"The Freedom of the Church" (Rushdoony; in the *Chalcedon Report*, September 1980), 597
The Freeman, 772
Freud (Rushdoony; [1965] 1972), 384, 1122
Friedrich Nietzsche: His Life and Thought (Hoover; 1994), 1439
The Friend of Jesus (Bates; 1928), 541
"Fromm proposes volunteer group to 'humanize technology'" (Hendrick; in *The Christian Science Monitor*, 12/7/68), 32
The Future as History (Heilbroner; 1960), 192
The Future of the Future (McHale; 1971), 980
Future Shock (Toffler; 1970), 980
"Galatians" (in *Word Studies in the Greek New Testament*), *1183*
"The Garbage Pail: Outrage Against the Soul" (Goldstein; in *Cavalier*, August 1972), 819
General Theory of Employment, Interest, and Money (Keynes; 1936), 700
The German Ideology (Marx; 1932), 1101
Godly Rule: Politics and Religion, 1603–60 (Lamont; 1969), 104
"God Rest Ye Merry, Gentlemen" (anon.; ca. 16th century), *1392*, *1424*
God's Hammer: The Bible and Its Critics (Clark; 1982), 1158
"Gold and Economic Freedom" (Greenspan; in *Capitalism: The Unknown Ideal*), 701
The Golden Bough (Frazer; [1890] 1922), 287, 774
Gold: Key to Confidence (Macklin; 1967), 700
The Good Life (Baritz; 1989), *1230*
"Government: It's the Problem, Not the Solution" (Walton; in *California Real Estate*, February 1975), 991
Government's Money Monopoly (Holzer; 1981), 50
Grammatical Man: Information, Entropy, Language, and Life (Campbell; 1982), 928
"Grandfather Summit" (in *Oakland Tribune*, 6/24/67), 201
The Grand Inquisitor (Dostoyevsky; 1879), 1044
Gray (Gosse; 1899), 555, 836
The Great Money Panic (Weiss; 1980), 679
Grover Cleveland (Nevins; 1948), 758
The Growth and Decadence of Constitutional Government (Smith; 1930), 194

"Guerilla Politics" (in *Barron's Weekly*, 8/28/67), 761
The Gulag Archipelago (Solzhenitsyn; 1973), 10, 452, 483, 1075
"Had Any Lately?" (Kahm; in *Cavalcade*, November 1967), 760
Hamlet (Shakespeare; ca. 1600), *1275*
"Happiness is chemical" (in *XO*, July-August 1994), 783
Hard Times: An Oral History of the Great Depression (Terkel; 1970), 888
Harper's Encyclopedia of United States History (1901), 213
Harper's Magazine (December 1973), 531–532
"Harvard Faculty Rebukes Both Side" (in *Los Angeles Times*, 4/13/69), 263
H du B Reports (du Berrier; 1977-2001), 32
Henry James Sr., and the Religion of Community (Hoover; 1969), 472
Heralds of Their Age (Conant; 1972), *1242*
"Herman Kahn: The Squaring of America" (Ward; in *Intellectual Digest*, September 1972), 817
The Hidden Worlds of Polynesia (Suggs; [1962] 1965), 875
The "Higher Law" Background of American Constitutional Law (Corwin; 1955), 27
"High School at Berkeley Bars Singers" (Lieberman; in *Oakland Tribune*, 9/27/67), 760
Historiography, Secular and Religious (Clark; 1971), 1101
History as Myth (Stevenson; 1969), 461
The History of Charles XII, King of Sweden (Voltaire; 1731), 433
The History of Science and the New Humanism (Sarton; 1931), 282
History of the Christian Church (Schaff; 1858-1890), 108, 109
Hitler: A Study in Tyranny (Bullock; 1952), 408
"The Hollow Men" (Eliot; 1925), 60, 529
The Holy Roman Empire (Heer; 1968), 144
Holy Types; or, The Gospel in Leviticus (Seiss; 1860), 880
The Homeless Mind (Berger, Berger, Kellner; 1973), 222
Homily 4 (Chrysostom; 4th century), *1260*
Homily 64 (Chrysostom; 4th century), 1260
*Honest to God (*Robinson; 1963), 391
Hopousia: or, the Sexual and Economic Foundations of a New Society (Unwin; 1940), 862
Horace Greeley: Printer, Editor, Crusader (Stoddard; 1946), 1174
"The Hound of Heaven" (Thompson; 1893), 801
The Hour of Our Death (Aries; 1981), 1374
House of Healing: The Story of the Hospital (Risley; 1961), 1110–1111
"Howl" (Ginsberg; 1955), 477
"How to Deal with the Communists" (Ropke; in *Individualist*, Jan-Feb 1963), 982
How to Win Friends and Influence People (Carnegie; 1936), 176
Huck Finn and Tom Sawyer Among the Indians (Twain; 1884), 33
"Huck Finn & Tom Sawyer Among the Indians" (Twain; in *Life*, 12/20/68), 33
Humanist Manifesto I (1933), 379
Humanist Manifesto II (1973), 379
Human Nature in Its Fourfold State (Boston; 1730), 841
Hunger and History (Prentice; 1936), 226
Hysteria, Reflex and Instinct (Kretschmer; 1960, 322
Ideas (Grigson, Gibbs-Smith, eds.; 1957), 428, 1065
Ideas Have Consequences (Weaver; 1948), 100
If Inflation Comes (Babson; 1937), 688
The Illusion of World Government (Niebuhr; 1949), 305–306
Il Penseroso (Milton; ca. 1631?), 934
The Imitation of Christ (à Kempis; ca. 1418-1427), 775
Imperium: The Philosophy of History and Politics (Yockey; 1948), 814
The Impotent General (Pettit; 1931), 485–486
Imputed Rights (Andelson; 1971), 443–444
Individualist (January-February 1963), 982

"In Dulci Jubilo" (or, "Good Christian Men, Rejoice") (anon.; 14th century), *1424*
The Institutes of Biblical Law (Rushdoony; 1973), 510
Institutes of Biblical Law, Vol. 2: Law and Society (Rushdoony; 1982), 641–642
Institutes of the Christian Religion (Calvin; [1536] 1559), 71, 1121, *1160*, *1161*, *1162*
Intellectual Digest (September 1972), 817
The Intellectual History of Europe (Heer; 1966), 871
Intellectual Origins of American Radicalism (Lynd; 1968), 209
Intellectual Schizophrenia (Rushdoony; 1961), 188, 780, 1154, 1441
The Interpretation of St. Luke's Gospel 1-11 (Lenski; 1946), *1395*
The Interpretation of the Acts of the Apostles (Lenski; 1944), 602
"Intrinsic Dance" (Kroner; in *The Modern Dance: Seven Statements of Belief*), 788
Introduction (Mann; in *Common School Journal*, 1/1/41), 512
Iphigenia in Aulis (Euripides; ca. 406 B.C.), 287
Iphigenia in Aulis (Euripides; Merwin, Dimock, trans., 1992), 287, 288
Iphigenia in Tauris (Goethe; 1779), 288
Ishmael: A Study of the Symbolic Mode in Primitivism (Baird; 1960), 350
"Is School Making Even Smart Kids into Dumb Ones?" (in *Los Angeles Herald-Examiner*, 9/21/82), *1402*
The Italians (Barzini; 1964), 1068
James I (Scott; 1976), 988
Jane Roe et al. v. Henry Wade (1973), 1072, 1136
Jewish Life in the Ukraine: A Family Saga (Charnofsky; 1965), 459
The Jewish Targums, 7
Joan of Arc and Richard III (Wood; 1991), 91
John Calvin: Contemporary Prophet: A Symposium (Hoogstra, ed.; 1959), 112
John Calvin (Hall; 1962), 113
John Calvin: His Roots and Fruit (Singer; 1967), 112–113
John Calvin on the Diaconate and Liturgical Almsgiving (McKee; 1984), 113–114, 115
John C. Calhoun: American Portrait (Coit; 1950), 506
John C. Calhoun: Nullifier (Wiltse; 1949), 506
John Ploughman's Talk (Spurgeon; 1868), 861
Journal of Christian Reconstruction, 341, 742
The Journal of the Absurd (Siegel, Garfinkel; 1980), 1023
Journey to America (de Tocqueville; Mayer, ed.; [1831?] 1960), 508
The Joy of Life (author unknown; date unknown), 573
"Joy to the World" (Watts; 1719), *1393*, *1413*
"The Jubilee of the Constitution" (Adams; 1839), 48
Justice and the Modern Law (Abbott; 1913), 241
Justice Through Restitution (Campbell; 1977), 1013
"Just Plain Folks" (in *American Heritage*, 6/72), 212
Karl Marx: Early Writings (Marx; Bottomore, ed., 1963), 1074
"The Katzenjammer Kids" (Dirks, creator; 1897-2006), 785–786
The Kindergarten in a Nutshell (Smith; 1907), 477
The King's Two Bodies (Kantorowicz; 1957), 90
"Kinky and Country Music" (in *Los Angeles Times Calendar*, 9/30/73), 185
The Koran, 12, 152
The Kumquat Statement (Coyne; 1970), 861
Ladies' Home Journal, 477
L'Allegro (Milton; ca. 1631?), 934
Land of the Free: A History of the United States (Caughey, Franklin, May; 1966), 243
The Late, Great Planet Earth (Linsey; 1970), 1122
Law and Revolution (Berman; 1983), 99, 289
"law" (in *Encyclopedia Britannica*), 92
Leaves of Grass (Whitman; 1855), 327
Le Diable et le bon Dieu (Sartre; 1951), 883

Leftism (Kuehnelt-Leddihn; 1974), 329
Legalizing Homosexual Conduct: The Role of the Supreme Court in the Gay Rights Movement (Rice; 1984), 283
"Let's Wipe Out the Schoolyard Sex Racket!" (Hoover; in *The Week*, 8/25/57), 228
Letter of August 5, 1782 (Cheval; 1782), 459
Letter of December 7, 1971 (McCarran; 1971), 29
Letter of May 23, 1857 (Macaulay; 1857), 214
The Letters of Junius ("Junius"; 1772), 26
Letter to George Mason on October 3, 1785 (Washington; 1785), *1259*
Letter to John Scollay on April 30, 1776 (Adams; 1776), 161
Letter to William Gordon, 1637 (Rutherford; 1637), 530
Life, 267
December 20, 1968, 33
The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin (Darwin, ed.; 1959), 275, 447
"The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin" (Huxley; in *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*), 275
The Life and Letters of Lord Macaulay (Macaulay; Trevelyan, ed., 1875), 214
The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah (Edersheim; 1883), *1336*, 1408, 1411
Life Child: The End of Poverty, The Case for Licensing All Parents (Fasnacht; 1992), 920
The Life of Moses (Gregory; ca. 390), 133–134
The Life of Moses (Gregory; Malherbe, Ferguson, trans., 1978), 133–134
The Life of Richard Cobden (Morley; 1881), 1379
"Lift Up Your Heads In Joyful Hope" (Watts; date unknown), *1386*
"Listening to the Left Hand" (Herbert; in *Harper's Magazine*, 12/73), 531–532
Literature and Revolution (Trotsky; 1924), 528
"Little Lessons Along the Road" (Read; date unknown), 1100
Lloyd George: A Diary by Frances Stevenson (Taylor, ed.; 1971), 43
Lofton Letter (March 1994), 277
The Lonely Crowd (Riesman, Glazer, Denny; 1953), 847
Looking for Dilmun (Bibby; 1969), 875–876
"Lord Jesus Christ, Our Lord Most Dear" (von Laufenberg; 1429), *1190–1191*
The Lordship of Christ (ten Pas; 1978), *1215*
Los Altos Town Crier (April 22, 1970), 547
Los Angeles Free Press, 208
Los Angeles Herald-Examiner
December 11, 1966, 926–927
September 22, 1967, 760
September 9, 1968, 209
September 10, 1968, 209
April 24, 1969, 264
January 25, 1970, 513
May 14, 1970, 311
December 14, 1970, 880
June 9, 1975, *1285*
September 21, 1982, *1402*
Los Angeles Times
March 1, 1966, 234
March 9, 1966, 233
August 26, 1967, 761
October 12, 1967, 760
April 13, 1969, 263
May 3, 1970, 310
May 20, 1970, 548–549
June 7, 1970, 550
February 6, 1972, 24

Los Angeles Times Calendar
September 30, 1973, 185
Lost Children of the Empire (Bean, Melville; 1989), 1338
The Lost Library (Mehring; 1951), 527
Louis XIV (Wolf; 1968), 868
Lytton Strachey: The Unknown Years (Holroyd; 1967), 700
Machiavelli to Marx: Modern Western Political Thought (Germino; 1972), 407
Magical Child (Pearce; 1977), 1402
Magna Carta (1215), 683
The Making of a Counter Culture (Roszak; 1969), 1123
The Man-Eating Myth (Arens; 1979), 459
Manifest Destiny and Mission In American History (Merk; 1963), 881
The Man in the Roman Street (Mattingly; 1966), 349
Man Ray: American Artist (Baldwin; 1988), 921
Man's Fate (Malraux; 1933), 528
Man's Means to His End (Watson-Watt; 1961), 251
The Man Who Watched the Trains Go By (Simenon; 1946), 188
"The Man with the Blue Guitar" (Stevens; 1937), 46
"The Man with the Hoe" (Markham; 1899), *1323–1324*
Marxism and the Linguistic Philosophy (Cornforth; 1965), 230
Marx (Payne; 1968), 767
Marx's Religion of Revolution (North; 1968), 672
Mary, Queen of Scots (Bingham; 1969), 299, 300
Mary, Queen of Scots (Fraser; 1970), 765
McCulloch v. Maryland (1819), 49
The Meaning of Baptism (Osterhaven; 1951), *1189–1190*
The Medieval Papacy (Barraclough; 1968), 105
The Medieval Underworld (McCall; 1979), 94, 95
The Medieval World (Heer; 1962), 820
"Meet Abbie Hoffman" (in *Los Angeles Herald-Examiner*, 9/10/68), 209
Memoirs of a Terrorist (Savinkov; 1931), 435
Men, Ideas, and Politics (Drucker; 1971), 27
Merriam-Webster's Dictionary (date unknown), 200, 227, 727, 983, 985
The Messianic Character of American Education (Rushdoony; 1963), 477, 512, 877, 1014, 1099, 1153–1154, 1441
"Mild Atheism" (Demray; in *The Asbury Theological Seminary Herald*), 1287
Millennium and Utopia (Tuveson; [1964] 1972), 943, 946
"The Ministry Under Indictment" (Marx; 1848), 672
"Modern Art and Tradition" (Sweeney; in *Three Lectures on Modern Art*), 915
The Modern Dance: Seven Statements of Belief (Cohen, ed.; 1966), 788–789
Modern European Thought: Continuity and Change in Ideas, 1600–1905 (Baumer; 1950), 482
Modern Man and Religion (Masaryk; 1930), 836
Modern Man in Search of a Soul (Jung; 1933), 860
Money and the Coming World Order (Calleo, ed.; 1976), 680
Moody Monthly (March 1981), 78
Morgan Guaranty Survey (July 1972), 1073
Moscow Nights (Tenin; 1971), 819
The Mountain People (Turnbull; 1972), 313–314
The Mugging (Hunt; 1972), 315–316
"My Cops Forbidden to Fire at Looters" (in *Santa Ana Register*; 8/21/67), 761
The Naked Ape (Morris; 1967), 1401–1402
Nancy Cunard (Chisholm; 1979), 830
The Nation, 555
July 2, 1973, 553

National Observer (June 30, 1969), 815
Natural History (March 1970), 321
"The Nature and Destiny of Man" (Niebuhr; 1939), 168
"Negro Gang Leaders to Get Federal Jobs" (Allen, Scott; in *Oakland Tribune*, 8/11/67), 761
New American Review
No. 8, 1970, 1089
No. 14, 1972, 767
The New Elite: The Death of Democracy (Lebedoff; 1981), 604
The New Meaning of Treason (West; 1947), 636
The New Modernism (Van Til; 1946), 560
"News Briefs" (in Chicago Tribune, 4/7/70), 310
News & Letters, 1089
The New Totalitarians (Huntford; 1971), 364, 503, 596, 604, 605, 642, 986, 1040
The New Yorker (n.d.), 145
New York Post, 209
New York Tribune, 1174
No Exit (Sartre; 1944), 319
"No Man from Mars" (Nikolais; in *The Modern Dance: Seven Statements of Belief*), 788
"No More Taxes" (Marx; 1848), 672
None Dare Call It Conspiracy (Allen; 1971), 1236
"Not in the jungled city can I find . . ." (Fulbeck; 1951), 849
No title given. (Law, date unknown), 516
No title given. (Luther), 236
Oakland Tribune
January 19, 1967, 754
January 27, 1967, 755
June 24, 1967, 201
August 11, 1967, 761
September 27, 1967, 760
October 25, 1967, 760
August 24, 1968, 708
Obsolete Communism: The Left-Wing Alternative (Cohn-Bendit; 1968), 1123
Forward to Octobriana and the Russian Underground (Kuznetsov; 1971), 526
Octobriana and the Russian Underground (Sadecky; 1971), 436, 437, 438
Ode: Intimations of Immorality (Wordsworth; 1807), 476
Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity (Hooker; 1594-1597), 393–394
Ohio's Trojan Horse (Grover; 1977), 606
The Old Guard (1863-1867), 508
The One and the Many (Rushdoony; 1971), 362, 1448
On Milton's Poetry (Stein, ed.; 1970), 945
On Revolution (Marx; Padover, ed., trans.; 1971), 672
On the Origin of Species (Darwin; 1859), 517, 979, 1027
On the Plurality of Civilizations (Koneczny; 1962), 1088, 1145
On the Veiling of Virgins (Tertullian; ca. 208-209), 439
The Open Society and Its Enemies (Popper; 1945), 494
Origins of the Medieval World (Bark; [1958] 1960), 683, 1098
Out of Revolution: Autobiography of Western Man (Rosenstock-Huessy; 1938), 90, 130, 773–774
"Outwitted" (Markham; date unknown), *1323*
The Papers of John C. Calhoun (Calhoun; Merriweather, Hemphill, Wilson, eds.; 1959-2003), 507
Parade
November 12, 1967, 700
June 2, 1968, 210
Paradise Lost (Milton; 1667), 798, 1199

The Passing of the Modern Age (Lukacs; 1970), 860, 1095–1096
The Passion of St. Perpetua (anon.; ca. 3rd century), 1117
The Passion of St. Perpetua (anon.; Muncey, ed., 1927), 1118
The Paternal State in France and Germany (Gaullieur; 1898), 1088
Peace of Mind (Liebman; 1946), 836
"Penance, From Piety to Politics. Reparations as a Religious and Political Issue" (Cox; in *Renewal*, June 1967), 759
Penthouse, 598
Perfumes and Spices, Including an Account of Soaps and Cosmetics (Verrill; 1940), 663–664
"Personality Parade" (Scott; in *Parade*, 11/12/67), 700
The Peter Principle (Peter, Hull; 1969), 320–321
Philanthropy in England, 1480–1660 (Jordan; 1959), 1124
Philosophy and the Modern World (Levi; 1959), 319
Piers Plowman (Langland; ca. 1370-1390), 28, 367, 368
The Pillars of Society (Gardner; 1913), 878
The Pin-Up (Gabor; 1972), 782
The Pit: A Group Encounter Defiled (Church, Carnes; 1972), 780
"The Plague — An Ultimate Arm of War?" (Hines; in *Oakland Tribune*, 1/19/67), 754
Playboy, 282, 355, 598, 777, 818, 1230
Poems Dedicated to National Independence and Liberty (Wordsworth; 1815), 1070
Poems from the Book of Hours (Rilke; [1905] 1975), 135
Poetics of Music in the Form of Six Lessons (Stravinsky; 1947), 795
Points of Rebellion (Douglas; 1969), 309
The Political Ideas of Richard Hooker (Davies; 1946), 394
Political Power in the Ancient World (Levi; 1965), 1084
Politics (Aristotle; ca. 350 B.C.), 1049, 1168
The Politics of Experience (Laing; 1967), 209
The Politics of Guilt and Pity (Rushdoony; 1970), 1096
The Politics of Hunger: The Allied Blockade of Germany, 1915–1919 (Vincent; 1985), 1035
The Politics of Vision (Nochlin; 1989), 800
The Poorhouse State (Elman; 1966), 21
The Possessed (Dostoyevsky; 1872), 366, 436
Post-Historic Man (Seidenberg; 1950), 774
"Post-Renaissance Man" (Smith; in *Conflicting Images of Man*), 449
"Poverty Warriors. The Riots are Subsidized as Well As Organized" (in *Barron's Weekly*, 7/31/67), 761
Power (Berle; 1969), 17
The Power Elite (Mill; 1956), 892
The Presbyterian Journal (June 7, 1967), 759
The Private Life of Mr. Pepys (Wilson; 1961), 323
"Profile of an Alienated Voter" (Furlong; in *Saturday Review*, 7/29/72), 818
Proof of the Apostolic Preaching (Irenaeus; 2nd century), 133
Proof of the Apostolic Preaching (Irenaeus; Smith, trans., 1952), 133
Prophecy and the Church (Allis; 1945), 1176
Pro Vita Monastica (Sedgwick; 1923), 802
The Public Interest (Fall 1970), 122
Quiet Talks About Jesus (Gordon; 1906), *1176*
Rameau's Nephew (Diderot; 1805), 413–414
"Reagan Sees Abortions Topping Births" (in *The Register*, 4/24/70), 548
The Reaper (June 1980), 710
The Rebel (Camus; 1951, 1956), 179, 415, 787
"The Rebel and the Bourgeois" (Sokolow; in *The Modern Dance: Seven Statements of Belief*), 788
Recent American Fiction: Some Critical Views (Waldmeir; 1963), 208

Reconstruction in Philosophy (Dewey; 1920), 205
"Reflections on Authority" (Schaar; in *New American Review*, no. 8), 1089
Reformation and Society (Dickens; 1966), 60
Reformatio Sigismundi (anon.; ca. 1438), 823
The Register (April 24, 1970), 548
Reichstag Fire: Ashes of Democracy (Pritchard; 1972), 213
Religion Across Culture (*Nida; 1968), 471*
Religion and the Rise of Capitalism (Tawney; 1926), 689–690
The Religion of Humanity (Frothingham; [1872] 1875), *1449*
Religion, Order, and Law: A Study in Pre-Revolutionary England (Little; 1969), 1091
Religion, Reason, and Revelation (Clark; 1961), 565
The Renaissance in Perspective (Ralph; 1973), 378–379, 465
"Renascence" (Millay; 1917), 783
Renewal (June 1967), 759
Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders (1968), 354
Report to the Ninth National Congress of the Communist Party of China (Lin Biao, 1969), 877
Repression of Heresy in Medieval Germany (Kieckhefer; 1979), 1047
The Republic of the Southern Cross (Brussof; 1917), 364–365
Republic (Plato; ca. 380 B.C.), 344, 363, 749, 963, 1049, 1137
Requiem for Democracy? An Inquiry in the Limits of Behavior Control (Karlins, Andrews; 1971), 1080
"Respondez!" (Whitman; 1856), 528
Review of the News
August 3, 1966, 227
April 22, 1970, 309–310
November 4, 1970, 869–870
November 3, 1982, 650
Review (September 4, 1983), 740–741
The Revolt of the Masses (Ortega y Gasset; 1930), 193, 860
The Revolution of Home (Fromm; 1968), 32
"Revolution or Regeneration" (in *Chalcedon Report*, January 1989), 1140
Reynard the Fox (anon.; Caxton, trans., 1481), 824
Richard the Lionheart (Gillingham; 1978), 620
Richard the Third (Kendall; 1955), 765
Rich Christians in an Age of Hunger: A Biblical Study (Sider; 1977), 342
Rights of Man (Paine; 1791), 197
The Rise of Puritanism (Haller; 1938), 529
The Rise of Radicalism (Methvin; 1973), 773
The Road to Harpers Ferry (Furnas; 1959), 261
Robespierre: The Voice of Virtue (Scott; 1974), 414, 502, 647, 648
Robinson Crusoe (Defoe; 1719), 319
Robinson Jeffers: Poet of California (Karman; 1987), 217, 218
The Romantic Agony (Praz; 1933), 398, 431, 838
Romer v. Evans (1996), 1136
The Rules of Sociological Method (Durkheim; 1895), 276, 279–280
"The Russian Intellectuals" (Seton-Watson; in *Encounter*, September 1955), 647
Sacralizing the Secular: The Renaissance Origins of Modernity (McKnight; 1989), 111, 112
Saint Genet: Actor and Martyr (Satre; [1952] 1963), 276
Salvation and Godly Rule (Rushdoony; 1983), 836
Samson Agonistes (Milton; 1671), 798
The Sanctity of Law: Wherein Does it Consist? (Burgess; 1927), 666, 667
San Francisco Chronicle (June 24, 1991), 198
Sanin (Artsybashev; 1908), 435–436
Santa Ana Register

January 22, 1966, 234
November 21, 1966, 755
August 21, 1967, 761
August 24, 1967, 761
October 20, 1967, 761
Santa Barbara News-Press (March 4, 1966), 233
Santa Maria Times (February 20, 1975), 808
Sartre: Ideologue of Our Time (Molnar; 1968), 443, 883
The Saturday Evening Post (November 16, 1968), 33
Saturday Review (July 29, 1972), 818
Satyricon (Petronius; ca. 1st century), 738
"School Vandals Cost Whopping $2.4 Million" (Knowles; in *Los Angeles Herald-Examiner*, 1/25/70), 513
Science Digest
May 1969, 268
April 1975, 808
Scofield Reference Bible (1909), 1175
"SDS Impulses Span the Sea" (Chamberlain; in *Los Angeles Herald Examiner*, 9/22/67), 760
Second Treatise of Government (Locke; 1689), 404, 682
The Secret Six (Scott; 1979), 1022
Seeds of Time: The Background of Southern Thinking (Savage; 1959), 506
The Separation Illusion: A Lawyer Examines the First Amendment (Whitehead; 1977), 583
Sermons on 2 Samuel (Calvin; Kelly, tr., 1992), 163–164
Set Forth Your Case (Pinnock; 1967), 763
Sex and Culture (Unwin; 1934), 858–859
Sex and Status (Jonas; 1975), 1020
Sexual Behavior in the Communist World (Stafford; 1967), 767
Sexual Chaos (Vertefeuille; 1988), *1197*
Sexual Regulations and Cultural Behavior (Unwin; 1935), 859
The Shape of Medieval History (Brandt; 1966), 457
Sketches of Jewish Social Life in the Days of Christ (Edersheim; 1876), *1338*
The Social Contract (Rousseau; 1762), 443
Social Planning by Frontier Thinkers (Andrews; 1944), 369, 1090
Society and History (Thrupp; 1977), 749
The Society of the Future (Van Riessen; 1957), 362, 363, 366
"Solons disagree on When Cop can use Gun" (in *Santa Ana Register*, 10/20/67), 761
The South During Reconstruction, 1865–1877 (Coulter; 1947), 266
Speech by Holmes at the Boston University School of Law, 1897 (Holmes; 1897), 667
Speech by Holmes before the Suffolk Bar Association, 1885 (Holmes; 1885), 667
Speech in Austin, TX (Johnson; May 22, 1948), 160
Speech on the School Question (Montgomery; 1879), 512
The Spirit of Masonry (Bailey; 1957), 446
The Spirit of the Laws (Montesquieu; 1748), 226
The Splendor of Dresden: Five Centuries of Art Collecting (Hoffman, et al.; 1979), 143
The Spoils of Progress: Environmental Pollution in the Soviet Union (Goldman; 1972), 772
"Stanzas" (Cranch; 1840), 784
Star (May 9, 1959), 707
"Start a Riot — Get $29 Million Aid" (Peterson; in *California Jewish Press*, 9/10/65), 665
State v. Whisner (1976), 584
"Statist Medicine," Chalcedon Medical Report No. 8 (Rushdoony; 1980), 596
Studies in Medieval Legal Thought: Public and the State, 1100–1322 (Post; 1964), 638
Studies in Tertullian and Augustine (Warfield; 1930), 207
The Supreme Court in United States History (Warren; 1923), 241

The Surrealist Revolution in France (Gershman; 1969), 318
Synonyms of the Old Testament (Girdlestone; 1897), 1006
"The Systematic Terror of the Vietcong" (Miller; in *American Legion Magazine*, November 1965), 658
Systematic Theology in Two Volumes (Rushdoony; 1994), 577
Tarzan (film; 1932), 431
Tarzan of the Apes (Burroughs; 1914), 431
"The Teaching of Classical Puritanism on Conjugal Love" (Frye; in *On Milton's Poetry*), 945
Theology News & Notes (June 1998), 137, 138
"The Third Horseman" (in *Barron's Weekly*, 12/20/65), 226
This Independent Republic (Rushdoony; 1964), 191
"Thoughtful Action Needed to Find Middle Ground on Abortion" (Dafoe; in *American Medical News*, 6/8/70), 547
The Thought Revolution (Tung, Evans; 1967), 1075
"Thoughts on the Revival of Religion" (Edwards; 1742), *1238–1239*
Thou Shalt Have No Other Gods Before Me — Including the State (Stang; 1980), 1023
Three Lectures on Modern Art (Dreier, Sweeney, Gabo; 1949), 915
Tigers of Tammany (Connable, Silberfarb; 1967), 747–748
Time
August 2, 1948, 218
December 2, 1966, 869
September 20, 1971, 1099
October 10, 1979, 459
October 5, 1981, 50
The Time Machine (Wells; 1895), 363
The Tithe in Scripture (Lansdell; 1908), *1260*
Tolstoy (Troyat; 1967), 550
The Tome of Leo (Leo I; 449), 129
To Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch (Kant; 1795), 195
"To Us a Child of Hope is Born" (Morison; 1781), *1393*
Toward the Next Economics, and Other Essays (Drucker; 1981), 679, 680
Tree of Hate (Powell; 1971), 491
Tribes with Flags (Glass; 1992), 968
Twentieth Century Book of the Dead (Elliot; 1972), 9–10, 92
Twenty Letters to a Friend (Alliluyeva; 1967), 324
Twin Circle
May 17, 1970, 550
June 14, 1970, 549
The Two Babylons (Hislop; 1858), 1410
The Two Cities: A Chronicle of Universal History to the Year 1146 A.D. (Otto of Freising; c. 1146), 746
Two Marriage Sermons (Gataker, Bradshaw; 1620), 945
Ubu Enchaîné (Jarry; 1899), 527
"Ultimate Irony" (in *Los Angeles Herald-Examiner*, 9/9/68), 209
Ulysses (Joyce; 1922), 774
The Un-heavenly City: The Nature and Future of Our Urban Crisis (Banfield; 1970), 845, 847
The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (December 1948), 197
"Urban Pollution — Many Long Years Ago" (Tarr; in *American Heritage*, October 1971), 770
Urfaust: A Translation (Scott; 1958), 34
U.S. Constitution (1789), 55, 147, 200, 242, 266, 309, 325, 348, 358, 599, 717, 831, 832, 952
U.S. Statutes at Large, 65th Congress (1917–1918), 653–654
Valedictory Address (Patapoff; 1969), 815–816
Van Nuys News (July 1975), 535

Victor and Victim (Whale; 1960), 543
Violence (Ellul; 1969), 187
"Violence Pays, 'Liberation' School Told" (in *Santa Ana Register*, 8/24/67), 761
Voltaire's Bastards: The Dictatorship of Reason in the West (Saul; 1992), 1032
Voyages (Hakluyt; 1589), 62
The Waist-High Culture (Griffith; 1959), 255
Waiting for the End (Fiedler; 1964), 448, 449
The Wall Street Journal
September 19, 1967, 760
October 18, 1967, 761
The Washington Pay-Off (Winter-Berger; 1972), 822
"Washington Report" (Allen, Scott; in *Oakland Tribune*, 1/27/67), 755
Washington Star Service, 754
Wealth of Nations (Smith; 1776), 331
Webster's 1828 Dictionary (Webster; 1828), 727, 1087, *1216*, 1291
The Week (August 25, 1957), 228
We Hold These Truths (Murray; 1960), 55
"We Refuse to Pay Taxes" (Marx; 1848), 672
"We Scientists Have the Right to Play God" (Leach; in *The Saturday Evening Post*, 11/16/68), 33
Western Technology and Soviet Economic Development (Sutton; 1968), 976
The Westminster Confession of Faith (1646), *1158*, *1159*
The Westminster Larger Catechism (1647), 392, *1159*, 1230
The Westminster Shorter Catechism (1647), 98, 220, 840
Whatever Happened to the Human Race? (Schaeffer; film series, 1979), 1288
"What Price Privacy?" (Bennett; in *American Psychologist*, 5/1967), 21, 761
What the Hell is Justice? (Hoffman; 1974), 1011–1012
What Went Wrong with American Education (Witonski; 1973), 776
"The Wheat Shortage is Here" (Hobson; in *Farm Journal*, 8/66), 225–226
When Fathers Ruled: Family Life in Reformation Europe (Ozment; 1983), 921
When the Kissing Had to Stop (Fitzgibbon; [1960] 1973), 364
Where She Danced (Kendall; 1979), 796
Whitter Daily News (March 9, 1966), 234
Who Rules America? (Domhoff; 1967), 891
"Why the Crime Rise?" (in *Parade*, 6/2/68), 210
"Why the United States is Most Likely to Have a Financial Collapse in 1970" (Upgren; date unknown), 707
Willem de Kooning (Hess; 1959), 537
"Winced at Riot Order, Guard Chief Recalls" (Lardner; in *Los Angeles Times*, 8/26/67), 761
Wisconsin v. Yoder (1972), 584
Without Guilt and Justice (Kaufmann; 1973), 650, 1009, 1011
"The wolf: a victim of bad publicity" (in *Colorado Daily*), 459
Word Studies in the Greek New Testament (Wuest; [1944] 1974), *1183*
Works (Calhoun; Crallé, ed.; 1851-1856), 507
World Mythology (Grimal, ed.; 1965), 287
The World of Delacroix, 1798–1863 (Prideaux; 1966), *447–448*, *766*
The World of Watteau, 1684–1721 (Schneider; 1967), *766*
The World Under God's Law (Ingram; 1962), 1124
The Worst Poverty: A History of Debt and Debtors (Barty-King; 1991), 683, 684
XO (July-August 1994), 783
Yale Alumni Magazine (November 1969), 192–193
Yankee from Olympus (Bowen; 1944), 1009
Yankee (July 1978), 993
"Zion Stands by Hills Surrounded" (Kelly; 1806), 73

CHALCEDON REPORT DIRECTORY

1965

No. 1	Christian Reconstruction	1201–1202
No. 2	Hope	1203–1204

1966

No. 4	Social Unrest	662–665
No. 5	Biblical Relevance	159–162
No. 6	The Fifth Amendment	658–661
No. 7	Confiscation	233–236
No. 8	Debt and Fear	1273–1276
No. 11	Socialism	225–228
No. 12	Planning	229–232
No. 13	God's Law and Our World	250–253
No. 14	For God and Country	1356–1360
No. 15	Education and Rights	240–246

1967

No. 16	Dr. Franklin Murphy's "Cultural Awakening"	926–927
No. 17	Plague	754–757
No. 18	Subversion of Words	389–392
No. 19	Capitalization and Decapitalization	687–690
No. 20	Epistemological Self-Consciousness	537–540
No. 21	Devaluation	712–714
No. 22	Syncretism	200–203
No. 23	Authority and Anarchy	20–23
No. 24	Christian Reconstruction	1257–1262
No. 25	Prayer	1306–1309
No. 26	Grim Fairy Tales	758–763
No. 28	Economic Confiscation	700–704

1968

No. 10 Love and Hate 1322–1324
No. 29 Moralism 323–325
No. 30 Unconditional Love, Etc. 959–962
No. 31 Moral Disarmament 541–545
No. 32 Controls 1067–1069
No. 33 Drop-Outs and Drop-Ins 353–357
No. 34 Escapism 1174–1177
No. 37 Inflation 705–708
No. 38 Pelagianism 207–211
No. 39 Foundations 1109–1112
No. 40 The City 744–748

1969

No. 41 Death of God Thinking 30–34
No. 42 The Governing Class 891–894
No. 43 Social Financing 1263–1267
No. 44 Conspiracies 257–260
No. 45 More on Conspiracy Thinking 261–264
No. 47 Still More on Conspiracy Thinking 265–268
No. 48 Authority 35–38
No. 49 Responsibility and Change 812–816
No. 50 Peace and Freedom 58–61
No. 52 Humanism in the Church 186–189

1970

No. 54 Humanism and Education 512–516
No. 55 Living by Disgust 1327–1330
No. 56 The Death of an Age and Its Faith 190–194
No. 57 Anarchism 318–322
No. 58 The Establishment 308–312
No. 59 Abortion 546–551
No. 60 The Silent Majority and Decapitalization 844–848
No. 61 The Religion of the City 849–852
No. 62 Class 873–876
No. 63 Agriculture 853–857
No. 64 Drifting Classes 868–872

1971

No. 65 More on Class 877–880
No. 66 Future Orientation 881–885
No. 67 Permissiveness and Class 886–890
No. 68 Present Orientation 863–867
No. 69 Failure and Recovery 119–123
No. 70 Sex and Culture 858–862
No. 71 Decay of Humanism 1123–1125
No. 72 Dying Age of the State 1082–1086
No. 73 The State 1087–1092

No. 74 The State. 1077–1081
No. 75 The State and Simplicity. 1098–1103
No. 76 The Warfare State 1027–1031

1972

No. 77 The Failing State. 1093–1097
No. 78 Genius 440–445
No. 79 Authority 24–29
No. 80 Moral Force 525–530
No. 81 Predestination 978–982
No. 82 Peace and Security? 348–352
No. 83 Totalitarianism 983–987
No. 84 Nihilism 435–439
No. 85 Infallibility. 42–46
No. 86 Counter-Counter Culture? 817–822
No. 87 Post-Christian Era. 446–450
No. 88 A Blocked or Open Future? 1234–1241
No. 88 The Humanistic Myth. 764–769

1973

No. 89 Locating Our Problem. 212–216
No. 90 Utopia 362–366
No. 91 Sterile Protest and Productive Work. 367–371
No. 92 Failure of Statism 1070–1074
No. 93 Imitation. 775–781
No. 94 Get a Horse?. 770–774
No. 95 The Iks. 313–317
No. 96 Moral Paralysis 552–556
No. 97 Christians 1117–1119
No. 98 Faith and Society 1120–1122
No. 99 Civilization's Civil War 183–185
No. 100 Suicidal Humanism 384–386

1974

No. 101 Relativism 531–533
No. 102 Pragmatism 204–206
No. 103 Pilgrimage 398–400
No. 104 Irrelevance of Churchmen 104–106
No. 105 Politics and Theology 326–329
No. 106 Dating 802–804
No. 107 Experience. 466–468
No. 108 History 493–495
No. 109 Justice and Authority 496–498
No. 110 Freedom Versus Security 1049–1051
No. 112 Depending on Evil. 499–501
No. 112 The Word, The Person, and the Song: Comments on Luke 2:8–15. .1388–1393
Incarnation and History: "He Whose Right It Is" [speech, 12/7/74] . . 7–10

1975

No. 113 Law Versus Self-Interest 330–332
No. 114 Work and Culture 1281–1283
No. 115 Necessary Roles 826–828
No. 116 Justice and Purpose 823–825
No. 117 Necessity Versus Law 638–640
No. 118 Estate and Calling 807–809
No. 119 Theology and Recovery 254–256
No. 120 Millers and Monopoly. 990–992
No. 121 First Line of Defense. 1142–1144
No. 122 Work. 1284–1286
No. 123 Kwan-Yin Versus Christ 534–536
No. 124 Disposable Man 451–453

1976

No. 125 Disposable Man or Dominion Man? 372–374
No. 126 Bureaucracy 222–224
No. 127 Rational Reforms 401–403
No. 127 The Failures of Humanistic Salvation 346–347
No. 127 The Search for a Humanistic Eden 1075–1076
No. 128 March to a Dumping Ground 381–383
No. 129 Laissez-Faire. 693–695
No. 130 Evolution, or Providence? 237–239
No. 131 Providence 454–456
No. 132 Doctrine of Selective Depravity, Part 1 290–292
No. 133 Doctrine of Selective Depravity, Part 2 293–295
No. 134 Doctrine of Selective Depravity, Part 3 296–298
No. 135 Selective Obedience 299–301
No. 136 Consequences of Selective Obedience 302–304
No. 136 The Necessity for Christian Schools. 938–939

1977

No. 137 Depravity or Natural Goodness? 305–307
No. 138 Critical Analysis 410–412
No. 139 Myth of Consent and Locke. 404–406
No. 140 Locke's Promises. 407–409
No. 141 Myth of Consent. 39–41
No. 142 Diderot: The Gardener and the Worm. 413–415
No. 143 Natural Law 635–637
No. 144 Sin and Virtue 338–340
No. 145 Slavery and Human Nature 1057–1059
No. 146 Social Justice. 647–649
No. 147 Women. 419–421
No. 148 Reason and Politics 416–418

1978

No. 149 Education and Law 936–937
No. 149 Original Sin 269–271

No. 149 The Meaning of Accreditation. 930–931
No. 149 The New War on Religion. 606–609
No. 150 Autonomous Man 617–619
No. 150 What Is the Church?. 67–68
No. 151 Innocent III 473–475
No. 152 Children's Crusade 476–478
No. 152 Religion and the State 51–52
No. 152 The Retreat of Theology. 1216–1218
No. 153 Crusading 479–481
No. 154 The Church and the School 925
No. 154 The City and Order 749–751
No. 155 Hostility to Christianity. 502–504
No. 155 Who Is the Lord? Conflict With Caesar. 53–55
No. 156 Equality and Freedom 1054–1056
No. 156 Who Is the Lord? 993–994
No. 157 The Grand Inquisitor 1044–1046
No. 158 Law and Sin 628–630
No. 159 Doing Nothing 482–484
No. 159 We Are at War. 583–587
No. 160 Restitution. 653–655

1979

No. 161 Law as Reformation 1013–1015
No. 162 Law as Regulation. 1016–1018
No. 163 Is God Now Shrivelled and Grown Old? 14–15
No. 163 Law as Redistribution 1019–1021
No. 164 The "Omnipotence of Criticism" 1331–1333
No. 166 The Case of the Mired Horse 1036–1038
No. 167 Abelard 620–622
No. 168 "Let My People Go!" 18–19
No. 168 The Modern State, an Ancient Regime 644–646
No. 169 Existentialism 422–424
No. 170 Covenants and Law 623–625
No. 171 Liberation Theology. 341–343
No. 171 The New Adam, Jesus Christ 1424–1425
No. 171 Wise Men Still Adore Him: Matthew 2:1–12 1404–1407
No. 172 Locale of Meaning. 457–458

1980

No. 173 Wolves 459–460
No. 174 Humanistic Doctrines of Sin 333–334
No. 175 Early Church Buildings 139–141
No. 176 Perfection Versus Maturity 358–359
No. 177 "I Am the Door" 1207
No. 177 Peace as a Right? 195–196
No. 178 "The Crucifixion of the Guilty". 279–280
No. 179 The Arrogance of Evil 281–282
No. 180 Dream of Total Justice. 485–487
No. 181 Debt 709–711
No. 181 False Solutions. 1022–1024
No. 182 Power Alignments 16–17

No. 184 Family Law 901–903

1981

No. 186 The War Against Christ's Kingdom [Chalcedon Alert No. 1] . . . 595–600
No. 185 Christ's Birth: The Sign of Victory 1383–1387
No. 185 Medical Model or Moral Model? 335–337
No. 189 Passive "Christianity" 78–79
No. 192 Taxation as Revolution 730–733
No. 192 The Economics of Death 677–681
No. 193 Amateur Christianity 1214–1215
No. 193 God, the Devil, and Legal Tender 717–719
No. 194 Outlaw Social Goals. 829–831
No. 195 Humanism and Change 378–380
No. 195 The Principle of Change 49–50
No. 196 Detente 612–614

1982

No. 198 Inflation 100–101
No. 199 Executive Privilege; or, the Right to Steal 988–989
No. 200 Tipping 1268–1269
No. 201 Humanism and Christ's Kingdom [Chalcedon Alert No. 2]. . . . 601–605
No. 201 Do We Need a License to Die?. 999–1000
No. 201 Why We Aid Russia 976–977
No. 203 Freedom or Slavery? 1060–1061
No. 203 Power Over the People. 995–996
No. 204 Are We Using Language to Confuse Ourselves?. 685–686
No. 204 Whatever Happened to Deathbed Scenes?. 1374–1376
No. 206 Are We Robbing Widows?. 997–998
No. 207 Justice and the Law 1009–1012
No. 207 What Is Civil Religion? 88–89
No. 208 Justice and the State 641–643
No. 208 The Magnificat 1399–1403

1983

No. 209 Injustice in the Name of Justice 650–652
No. 211 Grammar and Faith 928–929
No. 212 The Fear of Freedom. 1062–1063
No. 215 Should We Clean Up Television? 1134–1135
No. 216 The New Inquisition. 1047–1048
No. 216 What Is Law? 666–669
No. 217 The New Sovereign or God [Chalcedon Alert No. 3] 47–48
No. 219 Secularism 1208–1210
No. 220 Religion and Culture 740–741

1984

Mild Atheism [Chalcedon News No. 4] 1287–1288

No. 222 The New Idolatry 461–462
No. 223 Covert Theonomists 626–627
No. 224 The Myth of Neutrality 463–465
No. 225 A Christian Manifesto. 970
No. 225 Capitalization Is the Product of Work and Thrift 691–692
No. 225 Freedom Under God 56–57
No. 225 Love Thy Neighbor: What Does It Mean? 1325–1326
No. 225 Rewards and Punishments. 696–697
No. 225 Socialism and Inflation Both Decapitalize an Economy. 715–716
No. 225 Is Wealth Moral? 725–726
No. 227 Postmillennialism Versus Evolution 62–63
No. 227 The Marxist Separation of Church and State 387–388
No. 228 The "Right" to Abortion 1001–1002
No. 229 The Lust for Instant Gratification 840–841
No. 230 The "Right to Privacy" and the "Right" to Sin 283–284

1985

No. 234 The New Power in the "Christian Right" 1138–1139
No. 237 The Ten Fundamentals of Modern Statism 973
No. 237 Trusting God 1289
No. 241 Community and Strength 1354–1355

1986

"We Have Met the Enemy . . ." [Chalcedon News No. 6] 1126–1127
No. 252 The Smiling Face of Evil. 523–524
No. 255 Despotism 974–975

1987

No. 258 Good Guys, Bad Guys. 1347–1348
No. 269 Praying for the Impotent. 1224–1225

1988

No. 276 Clipper Ships 1242–1243
No. 277 Jesus and the Tax Revolt 670–672

1989

No. 283 History's Purpose 1197
No. 285 Revolution or Regeneration: A Further Word 1140–1141
No. 287 Good Preaching 154

1990

No. 295 Are You Astonishing? [previously untitled] 1228–1229

1991

	Abominations [no date; published in *Roots of Reconstruction*]	.521–522
No. 301	The Budgetary Process	727–729
No. 307	In Paper We Trust?	.147–150
No. 311	Being "Evil Spoken Of"	.1317
No. 312	Do You Want "Sweetness and Light?" [previously untitled]	155–156
No. 313	Dumb Dogs, That Cannot Bark	.157–158
No. 314	Honoring Ungodly Men	1370–1371
No. 315	Faith and Pettiness	1340–1341
No. 316	Coarseness	1342–1343
No. 317	On the Birth Of Our Lord	1408–1409
No. 317	The Messenger of Light	.116–118

1992

No. 318	Heaven	1377–1378
No. 318	The Life of the Church: 1 Timothy 5:1–2	.69–71
No. 319	Demanding the Best	1344–1346
No. 319	Selling Out Christ	610–611
No. 319	Towards a Biblical Economics	682–684
No. 320	How Not to Pray	1310–1311
No. 320	Loss of the Past	490–492
No. 320	"Showing the Lord's Death"	178–180
No. 321	God Loves His Creation	1198–1200
No. 321	Is Caesar Our Lord?	.86–87
No. 321	The Artist as the Prophet of Rebellion	787–790
No. 322	"God Is No Buttercup"	1303–1304
No. 322	The Death of Justice	1006–1008
No. 322	The Menace of Arianism	.393–395
No. 323	Copycat Churchianity	.84–85
No. 323	The Meaning of Freedom	1064–1066
No. 324	God Is Not Queen Victoria	1219–1221
No. 324	Indulgences	.93–96
No. 324	Praying by the Yard	1314–1315
No. 324	Privilege, Power, and Envy	1003–1005
No. 324	The Church: What Is It?	.129–131
No. 324	The Laws of War	1034–1035
No. 325	Irrelevant Church Members	.102–103
No. 325	True Preaching	.163–164
No. 326	The Humanistic Heresy of Rights	.197–199
No. 326	The Valley of Misery	1320–1321
No. 326	Two-Cow, No-Cow Justice	656–657
No. 327	Can We Force God's Hand?	1255–1256
No. 328	A Death Wish?	1277–1278
No. 329	Phariseeism	1336–1339
No. 329	The Birth of the King	1412–1413

1993

No. 330	Justification	1178–1183
No. 330	The War Threat	1032–1033
No. 331	The Family	907–908

No. 332 The Name of Power 5–6
No. 333 Inhumanism 217–218
No. 333 "Seek Ye First" 1147–1148
No. 334 Anti-Christianity on the Rise 488–489
No. 334 Stoicism 1211–1213
No. 334 The False Doctrine of the Holy Spirit 90–92
No. 334 "The Lord's Hand Is Not Shortened, That It Cannot Save" . . . 1205–1206
No. 335 No Part-Time Christianity. 742–743
No. 336 Rationalism and the Holy Spirit. 1163–1165
No. 336 Reacting Instead of Acting 673–674
No. 336 The Trinity and Man 165–167
No. 337 The Major Media 168–169
No. 338 The Grand Opera Life. 791–792
No. 339 "This Is the Victory" 174–175
No. 340 The Age of Confiscation. 219–221
No. 340 The Culture of Duties 1244–1245
No. 341 Everyday Romanticism 428–430
No. 341 The Birth of the Great King 1414–1416

1994

No. 342 Holy Poverty. 247–249
No. 342 Judgment 1334–1335
No. 343 Architecture 142–146
No. 343 In Praise of Noah 1349–1350
No. 343 Psychobabble in State and Business 176–177
No. 343 Sabbath or Revolution. 360–361
No. 344 Art and Culture 795–797
No. 344 Spare-Tire Religion 1115–1116
No. 345 "A Vagrant Liberty?" 1222–1223
No. 345 The Good Life. 1270–1272
No. 346 Accidental Man 274–278
No. 346 Testing. 1293–1294
No. 346 The War Against Chastity. 285–286
No. 347 The Lonely Grave 1279–1280
No. 347 The Unknown John Calvin 111–115
No. 347 Trivializing the Church 72–73
No. 348 A "Root of Bitterness" 1351–1353
No. 348 Classical Learning and Christian Education 934–935
No. 348 Respectable "Christianity" 1318–1319
No. 349 Our Acts. 1226–1227
No. 350 The Faithful 1253–1254
No. 351 "Awake, Thou That Sleepest" 124–125
No. 351 Faith 1305
No. 351 The Demand for Perfection in the Church 80–81
No. 351 What Is Man? 1230–1231
No. 352 The Opportunity and the Need 1444–1445
No. 353 The Incarnation 1417–1418

1995

No. 335 Sports and Culture 805–806
No. 354 Government and the Diaconate 107–110

No. 354 The Bond of Guilt Versus the Bond of Faith. 842–843
No. 355 "For the Healing of the Nations" 1149–1150
No. 355 World Weariness. 836–837
No. 356 Chalcedon's Direction 1441–1443
No. 356 The Worship of Feeling 782–784
No. 357 Education for Chaos. 1145–1146
No. 357 On Being Holier Than God 1250–1252
No. 357 The Fallacy of Politics 965–966
No. 358 Dr. Cornelius Van Til 575–576
No. 358 The Van Til I Knew: An Interview With R. J. Rushdoony 559–574
No. 358 Who Rules? 1195–1196
No. 359 Our Man-Centered Folly 375–377
No. 359 Waiting on God 1297–1298
No. 360 Women and Children First? 810–811
No. 361 A Letter on Logic and Idolatry 577
No. 361 Is It Nothing to You Who Pass By? 1446–1447
No. 361 Our False Premises 425–427
No. 362 Judgment and Atonement 97–99
No. 362 Unconstructive Religion 82–83
No. 363 Chalcedon 1438–1440
No. 363 False Atonements 287–289
No. 363 Van Til's Christian Theistic Ethics 578–579
No. 363 Why Chalcedon?. 1448–1450
No. 364 Revealing Ourselves 785–786
No. 364 Self-Government Under God 968–969
No. 365 Incarnation, Life, and Art 793–794

1996

No. 366 Gathered Unto Their Fathers 1379–1380
No. 367 The Reconstructionist Worldview. 1107–1108
No. 368 Art: Christian and Non-Christian. 798–801
No. 368 Sin Defined 1246–1247
No. 369 The Disastrous War 505–509
No. 370 Science and Magic. 471–472
No. 370 Stress. 1290–1292
No. 370 Valerian's Persecution 1151–1152
No. 371 Reflections at the Close of the Twentieth Century 1039–1041
No. 371 The Family as Government 897–898
No. 371 The War Against the Family. 899–900
No. 372 God and Mammon 720–722
No. 372 Silly Surrenders 1410–1411
No. 373 A Chicken in Every Pot 698–699
No. 373 How to Be Blessed. 1372–1373
No. 374 Freedom Under God's Law 631–632
No. 374 The Mystery of the Social Order 737–739
No. 374 What Is Freedom? 1052–1053
No. 375 The Right to Rape and Murder?. 272–273
No. 376 Political Apostasy 1136–1137
No. 377 The Birth of the King 1422–1423
No. 377 The Freedom to Sin 1042–1043

1997

No. 378 The New Barbarians. 834–835
No. 379 Abominations 1248–1249
No. 380 Total Meaning. 469–470
No. 381 The Church 76–77
No. 382 From Ape Man to Christian Man 431–432
No. 383 The Received Text 151–153
No. 384 Snake Oil Peddlers. 832–833
No. 385 This Is the Victory. 1153–1154
No. 386 Classical Education 932–933
No. 386 Praying Against God 1312–1313
No. 387 The Pastor and His Duties. 170–171
No. 388 Patience 1295–1296
No. 389 Born Rich 1431–1432

1998

No. 390 The Failure of the Conservative Movement 1128–1130
No. 391 The Process God. 126–128
No. 392 Psychopaths 433–434
No. 393 Modernism Old and New, Part 1 132–134
No. 394 Modernism Old and New, Part 2 135–136
No. 395 On Spontaneity 838–839
No. 396 Is America a Christian Nation? 1131–1133
No. 397 The Power of Heresy 633–634
No. 398 The Importance of Six-Day Creation 1172–1173
No. 399 Evangelicalism. 137–138
No. 400 Trivializing the Faith 74–75
No. 401 The Doctrine of God and Infallibility. 11–13

1999

No. 402 The Psalms. 1299–1300
No. 403 Why I Am Reformed. 1429–1430
No. 404 The Cultural War 593–594
No. 406 The Family. 909–910
No. 407 Fatherhood 1433–1434
No. 408 The Collapsing Right Wing 963–964
No. 409 Precisionism 172–173
No. 411 Twentieth-Century Plans of Salvation. 344–345
No. 413 Consistent Faith 1170–1171

2000

No. 415 For His Mercy Endureth Forever 1316
No. 417 Culture Versus Faith. 911–912
No. 418 Gnosticism Today 396–397
No. 418 War 1025–1026
No. 419 Blind Faith. 517
No. 420 The Sovereignty of God 3–4
No. 421 Dominion 1113–1114

No. 422 Exaggeration and Denial 510–511
No. 423 Politics and Faith 967
No. 424 Covenant Wealth 723–724
No. 425 Christmas 1419–1420
No. 427 The Necessary Future 588–589

2001

No. 426 Though He Slay Me 1301–1302
No. 428 My Last Days 1435
No. 428 The Dark Ages Defined 752–753
No. 429 On Death and Dying 1436–1437
No. 430 Man's Creation and Dominion 1232–1233
No. 434 The Use of Scriptures in the Reformed Faith 1157–1162
No. 435 Biblical Faith and American History, Part 1: The Past 943–948
No. 436 Biblical Faith and American History, Part 2: The Present. 949–952

2002

No. 437 Biblical Faith and American History, Part 3: The Future 953–955
No. 439 On Knowing God 1166–1169
No. 440 The Biblical Doctrine of Submission, Part 1 1361–1365
No. 441 The Biblical Doctrine of Submission, Part 2 1366–1369
No. 444 Family and Government. 916–918
No. 445 Family and Civilization 919–922
No. 446 Faith and the Family. 913–915
No. 447 A Barn to House Thee. 1421

2003

No. 448 Baptism Into His Justice. 1184–1185
No. 449 The Covenant and Baptism 1186–1188
No. 450 Molech Worship and Baptism 904–906
No. 451 Except a Man Be Born Again 1189–1191
No. 452 Christ Versus Satan 590–592
No. 458 The Annunciation: Luke 1:26–38 1394–1398

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Rousas John Rushdoony (1916–2001) was a well-known American scholar, writer, and author of over thirty books. He held B.A. and M.A. degrees from the University of California and received his theological training at the Pacific School of Religion. An ordained minister, he worked as a missionary among Paiute and Shoshone Indians as well as a pastor to two California churches. He founded the Chalcedon Foundation, an educational organization devoted to research, publishing, and cogent communication of a distinctively Christian scholarship to the world-at-large. His writing in the *Chalcedon Report* and his numerous books spawned a generation of believers active in reconstructing the world to the glory of Jesus Christ. For the last twenty-six years of his life, he resided in Vallecito, California, where he engaged in research, lecturing, and assisting others in developing programs to put the Christian Faith into action.

THE MINISTRY OF CHALCEDON

CHALCEDON (kal-SEE-don) is a Christian educational organization devoted exclusively to research, publishing, and cogent communication of a distinctly Christian scholarship to the world at large. It makes available a variety of services and programs, all geared to the needs of interested ministers, scholars, and laymen who understand the propositions that Jesus Christ speaks to the mind as well as the heart, and that His claims extend beyond the narrow confines of the various institutional churches. We exist in order to support the efforts of all orthodox denominations and churches. Chalcedon derives its name from the great ecclesiastical Council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451), which produced the crucial Christological definition: "Therefore, following the holy Fathers, we all with one accord teach men to acknowledge one and the same Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, at once complete in Godhead and complete in manhood, truly God and truly man . . ." This formula directly challenges every false claim of divinity by any human institution: state, church, cult, school, or human assembly. Christ alone is both God and man, the unique link between heaven and earth. All human power is therefore derivative: Christ alone can announce that, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth" (Matt. 28:18). Historically, the Chalcedonian creed is therefore the foundation of Western liberty, for it sets limits on all authoritarian human institutions by acknowledging the validity of the claims of the One who is the source of true human freedom (Gal. 5:1). The Chalcedon Foundation publishes books under its own name and that of Ross House Books. It produces a magazine, *Faith for All of Life*, and a newsletter, the *Chalcedon Report*, both bimonthly. All gifts to Chalcedon are tax deductible. For a complimentary trial subscription, or information on other book titles, please contact:

Chalcedon • Box 158 • Vallecito, CA 95251 USA
www.chalcedon.edu